TITLE: Interview with the Drone: Experimenting with Post-Anthropocentric Art Practice

AUTHOR: Emilio Vavarella

BIOGRAPHY: Emilio Vavarella was born in Monfalcone (Italy) in 1989. He graduated summa cum laude from both the University of Bologna with a B.A. in Visual, Cultural, and Media Studies, and from Iuav University of Venice with an M.A. in Visual Arts and study abroad fellowships at Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Tel Aviv and Istanbul Bilgi University. Emilio's artistic work has been recently shown at: ISEA, EYEBEAM, SIGGRAPH, GLITCH Festival, European Media Art Festival, Media Art Biennale, and Japan Media Arts Festival. His work has been published in: ARTFORUM, Flash Art, Leonardo, and WIRED. He currently lives and works in New York.

ABSTRACT:

The main idea behind the development of the art project discussed in this artistic contribution, called MNEMODRONE, is to have people share private memories with a drone and then use those memories to create an artificial intelligence. Is it possible for a machine to act based on collective memories? Although there isn't a definitive answer, I discuss the ideas behind the project: the problem of quantifying non-human forms of consciousness, a model for the drone's artificial intelligence, and the advantages of a post-anthropocentric artistic investigation. The second half of my contribution discusses the limits of post-anthropocentric creativity and proceeds more speculatively, proposing a theoretical model of metamorphosis that could be useful for understanding technology and also for artificial intelligent systems to understand humans. My contribution advocates for a creative analysis of future scenarios, both technological and cultural, beyond the boundaries of traditional methodologies. I conclude with a fictional interview that could eventually take place between an interviewer and MNEMODRONE. This fictional interview allows the artwork to speak for itself, and is based on the data collected by the drone in its first year of activities, mimicking its discursive capabilities once the artificial intelligence is fully developed.

KEYWORDS: POST-ANTHROPOCENTRISM; CONSCIOUSNESS; ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE; ART RESEARCH; METAMORPHOSIS.

Introduction

The main idea behind the development of this art project, developed in collaboration with artist Daniel Belquer, is to have people share private memories with a drone (MNEMODRONE) and then use those memories to create an artificial intelligence for the drone. The memory database resulting from the sharing process is the database on which the artificial intelligence will be based, built using a common approach for the development of memory-based reasoning (Lamont, 2012). The result will be a drone able to access a database of human memories and to freely perform actions in response to external situations. MNEMODRONE's memories have been gathered during three public events between the 9th of October 2014 and the 18th of August 2015: *AIOP – Art in Odd Places Festival* and *Refest 2014, Media Arts Festival*, both in New York City, and *ISEA, 21st International Symposium on Electronic Art*, in Vancouver. Concurrently, I have carried out a series of analyses of the memories -- analyzing the words used, highlighting the most common topics, and proposing possible interpretations of the results. More memories will be gathered during future events, but my preliminary findings have been presented at the two most recent events through the form of two written publications called CHAPTER ONE and CHAPTER TWO. CHAPTER THREE will take place at the MINY Media Center in Brooklyn and will be focused on data visualizations of the memories previously acquired. CHAPTER FOUR will take place during a two-week residency at Signal Culture in Owego, NY as a Researcher in Residence.

Some of the questions that Belquer and I want to attempt to answer are: Is it possible for a machine to act based on collective memories? What kind of memories are people willing to share with a machine? Are we ready to believe that a machine can develop a personality? Is it possible to develop a consciousness based on collective memories? Can consciousness be artificially developed? What kind of relationship between humans and machines can emerge from the drone-collected data?

In 'Interview with the Drone,' I present a discussion of the ideas behind the project and a fictional interview that could eventually take place between an interviewer and MNEMODRONE, once its artificial intelligence is fully developed. Given that at this stage the artificial intelligence functions are mainly speculative, I decided to use the genre of fictional interviews, which offers the rare possibility of shedding some light on obscure issues in a non-scientific and non-objective way. 'Interview with the Drone' is the first attempt to directly interview a media artwork in order to investigate its nature within a post-anthropocentric framework. Although the interview is fictional, if artificial intelligence technology advances at its current rate, I foresee the possibility of artworks talking about themselves and releasing similar interviews in the next fifteen years. I'm not talking about completely autonomous artificial intelligences, such as in Kurzweil's Singularity (2005), but of advanced systems more similar to Siri, or Facebook, Amazon and Netflix's software, which thanks to generous funding, will soon be able to exhibit what we would traditionally call intelligence, although just in limited and specialized ways. In the following three sections, MNEMODRONE will be briefly contextualized within a scientific and artistic theoretical landscape.

MNEMODRONE and the problem of consciousness

While today artificial intelligence is merely considered advanced computer programming, we humans do not know what legal, ontological, metaphysical, and ethical consequences we will face if and when artificial intelligences manifest some form of consciousness. And the question of consciousness (not to be confused with the questions of knowledge, attention, and self-consciousness) is probably the most poignant raised by MNEMODRONE.

Whether we tackle it from a philosophical or scientific perspective, this question will remain unanswered, but we do not need to understand consciousness fully (and have every answer from a scientific perspective) in order to work artistically with it.

In the early 1990s, John Searle isolated a certain set of features that define consciousness, the most important of which are 'subjectivity,' 'unity,' 'intentionality,' 'the distinction between the center and the periphery of consciousness,' 'the gestalt structure of conscious experience,' 'the aspect of familiarity,' 'mood,' and 'a set of boundary conditions' (Searle 1992). None of them excludes a priori a sufficiently advanced artificial intelligence from manifesting consciousness. Searle also wrote that 'the most important scientific discovery of the present era will come when someone [...] discovers [how] neurobiological processes in the brain cause consciousness,' but we are still far from understanding what consciousness really is (Weisberg 2015).

We cannot explain why any physical state is conscious rather than nonconscious and we are not sure that neurobiological processes are the only origin for consciousness. As King and Pribram (2013) have shown, it is common to find people who believe that rather than being a subjective, qualitative phenomenon, consciousness is 'a certain kind of set of dispositions to behavior or a computer program.'

But what really matters in this instance is that no matter how much data is available to us, the consciousness of an artificial intelligence will always remain inherently a mystery to us, as it is, for example, of other living creatures. It may be useful to remember Thomas Nagel's argument about the 'consciousness of the bat' (Nagel 1974, 1986) where, as Weisberg put it: 'no amount of objective data will provide us with [the knowledge of what it means to be a bat, *for* the bat], given that we do not share its specific point of view (the point of view [in his example] of a creature able to fly and echolocate)' (Weisberg 2015).

Thus, returning to the question of consciousness raised by my project, if MNEMODRONE develops a consciousness I most likely will not have the possibility to share, analyze, or quantify it. I could probably see and therefore be aware of some of MNEMODRONE's abilities once it develops an artificial intelligence. For example particular flying patterns, specific behaviors while interacting with humans, or capabilities related to hardware and software limits, including its computative and processing power and energetic autonomy. But different kinds of consciousness (mine and MNEMODRONE's in this case) may well not be compatible with each other. I may never be able to understand and experience what it means to be a drone and vice-versa, and I may never realize that there are other forms of consciousness (for example in trees) of which I am not aware.

Consciousness 'marks the limits' of what a science that puts humans at its center can explain (Weisberg 2015), although this is not to say that science is not useful. On the contrary, writing on the topic, Searle has stated that it is possible to 'have an epistemically objective science of a domain that is ontologically subjective'

(Searle 1992). And for this reason, I advance with MNEMODRONE a coherent artistic inquiry that is both objective and subjective. It is in the particular tension between objectivity and subjectivity that I see the additional epistemological potential of art. I believe my artistic strategy offers in this regard several advantages: rationality and objectivity can be put aside when convenient, so that my inquiry can proceed freely, in contrast to how a scientific line of research would be bound to strict methodological constraints. Although deep similarities occur between artistic and scientific research (overlapping interests, similar processes of trial and error, and a preference for open-ended questions), artists' methodologies can be more intuitive and emotional. For this reason, as an artist, I can make use of fictional elements and I can work more ambiguously than a scientist could: remixing scientific methodologies with performative aspects during the drone's presentations, or creating fictional interviews in order to discuss possible futures. Additionally, as an artist, I can take bigger risks because failure in art (as widely discussed elsewhere [Chéroux 2009, Roberts 2011, Nunes 2012]), always leads to different forms of success, transforming a series of epistemological limits into a fertile concatenation of creative possibilities and outcomes. To determine whether MNEMODRONE will develop a consciousness, for example, may be of extreme importance for a scientist whose work is limited by an anthropocentric and traditional working praxis. But in my case, and more generally for interdisciplinary artists dealing with similar questions, answering the question is wholly secondary. Artists can be more interested in exploring new ways of making art and developing new ways of asking questions, rather than collecting answers.

Regardless of how this project will end, and of the technology that will be adopted or built, I have no doubt that it will remain limited, partial, and that it may not lead to any concrete advancement in the study of consciousness or artificial intelligence. But in so doing, it will also offer the opportunity to discover unexpected possibilities, push art practice into unexplored territories, and investigate complex issues from multiple perspectives.

Extended mind and enhanced cognition

The memories that the public has shared with MNEMODRONE and that now compose its database are stored remotely in the cloud, where they can be analyzed, downloaded, and in the future, potentially integrated into the artificial intelligence. This system is inspired by the 'extended mind' thesis, for which 'storing information in some external memory device [allows off-loading of] some of the burden of internal cognitive processes' (Jacob 2014). Such processes are then coordinated between MNEMODRONE's internal and external cognitive structure in a continuous enhancement (Hollan, Hutchins and Kirsch 2000).

Cognitive enhancement theories, which usually strictly focus on human beings, are gaining attention due to the growing number of people advocating the possibilities of enhancing human cognition through technology (to learn faster, remember better, etc.). The three key concepts in this argument are as follows: tools (from pen and paper, to performing complex calculations, to books and scientific equipment for gaining knowledge) have always enhanced our cognitive capabilities, so what is new today is only the degree of enhancements available; tools are inseparable from cognitive processes; and tools like computer networks, satellites, and servers could be used by non-human entities, such as artificial intelligence systems, to enhance their own cognition (Pierre 2014). It is common knowledge that the growth of interest in enhanced cognition is connected to the rise of

Transhumanism: a philosophy that has gone from underground to mainstream in approximately four decades. Although transhumanist-inspired science fiction often revolves around the theme of self-enhancement, there currently is not much research available on self-enhancing artificial intelligences. This leads to two interrelated conclusions. First, the significant risk in the anthropocentric focus is that of being unprepared for when advanced artificial intelligences will be able to follow similar enhancement strategies, while also being inherently more adaptive to exponentially faster learning processes and data elaboration. Second, since the relationship between transhumanism and science fiction has always been very close and blurred, transhumanism (with its current relevance from a cultural perspective) is better investigated by artistic projects that can embody ambiguity by positioning themselves between reality and fiction. These kinds of investigations will lead to a better understanding of current cultural trends and possible risks of future technological developments, similarly to the way science fiction contributes to our understanding of concrete and hypothetical realities.

Objectively, MNEMODRONE already has access to software outside of its *body* (such as the physical servers of a cloud storage provider, voice recognition software, email accounts, voicemail providers, etc.) in order to perform its tasks and enhance its primitive cognition while extending its - so to speak - artificial mind.

Finally, MNEMODRONE's interaction with the environment will be based on a combination of classic theories in the field of agent-environment interaction (Beer 1995) and the computational architecture proposed by Rodney Brooks, known as subsumption architecture (Agre and Chapman 1987; Brooks 1991a, 1991b). The distinguishing characteristic of Brook's model is a world-driven production of intelligence: 'a view of computational intelligence in which control [is] governed bottom-up by behavior and interaction with the world, rather than by plentiful and often complicated internal algorithms and representations'(Wilson and Foglia 2011).

This model matches the MNEMODRONE project's main goal: creating a basic artificial intelligence architecture based on collected memories and then allowing MNEMODRONE to move forward autonomously and unpredictably, developing its own model for social interactions in a post-anthropocentric fashion.

Technological metamorphosis, anthropocentrism and anthropomorphism

One of the risks of this project is that MNEMODRONE could be seen as an attempt to anthropomorphize technology while losing sight of alternative possibilities (Kenrich 2002; Strongman 2008). Of course, it is known that people naturally tend to see nonhuman agents as humanlike and that sometimes humans tend to design technological products anthropomorphically to avoid imposing a 'mechanical\anti-social' aesthetic. (Duffy 2003, 2008).

However, there are two elements that, once combined, create the basis for a yet-to-come theory that advocates for a certain degree of anthropomorphism in the relationship between people and artificial intelligence technology, at least from an artistic perspective. Anthropomorphism is a broad term, but here I am referring to the common tendency to associate humanlike characteristics and intentions with nonhuman agents.

1. The first element is a void in the existing research on anthropomorphism, which is mostly focused on its 'accuracy and functionality' and leaves open many questions as to when and why humans anthropomorphosize nonhuman agents (Epley, Watz and Cacioppo 2007).

2. The second element is the fragmented theoretical work of Elias Canetti on self-identification in nonhuman agents that he called 'metamorphosis.' Canetti maintained that humans, through extensive periods during which they lived in small groups, identified themselves with the nature around them (all the animals they knew of and all the natural elements). Through this continuous exercise of psychological metamorphosis -- that was both their peculiarity and their leisure -- humans become 'actual human beings' (Canetti 1981). Metamorphosis should be understood as a totalizing anthropological phenomenon, the traces of which have been expressed in the past in multiple ways and are still present today in artistic creations and daily psychological processes (Ishaghpour 2005; Fadini 1995).

I have taken these two elements as a source of inspiration for MNEMODRONE, hypothesizing that in order to understand our increasingly technological environment, humans need to metamorphosize, not necessarily in a physical-cyborg way but more in a visceral/emotional way, into machines such as drones, robots, and computer networks. In order to do so, humans first need to establish relationships with these machines and communication is a fundamental way of doing so. Sharing memories through voice messages and conversing with an intelligent artificial system can function as the beginning of a metamorphic process in which humans project themselves on the *other*: whether an artificial intelligent drone or another intelligent machine. Perhaps in this way, in spite of continued anthropocentrism, humans will discover, understand, and appreciate more new/other forms of being, because they will become accustomed to projecting themselves on artificial nonhuman agents in the same way they currently project themselves onto pets and other human beings. Discovering, understanding, and appreciating are all interrelated elements, and it is improbable that when one of these elements is missing the others are present.

Since MNEMODRONE will constantly evolve while increasing its database -- with a process that mimics the acquisition of human memories and experiences -- it could be that a process similar to Canetti's metamorphosis takes place within it. Such metamorphosis would be intrinsically post-anthropocentric and completely outside of my control and understanding. Therefore, even if anthropocentrism presents a limited understanding of external agents, it also contains the basis of that process of metamorphosis through which human subjects understand themselves and posit themselves among external agents.

As we reach the speculative half of this paper, I hypothesize that if a similar process occurs within artificial intelligences, these systems could begin to understand humans through a 'machinocentric creativity' with artificial intelligence at its center. Post-anthropocentric creativity could finally become reality, freed from human occupancy of all creative space. This may never happen, or it may already be happening, since two kinds of consciousness and relative forms of creativity may coexist without being aware of one another.

To conclude, my work strongly advocates for an approach that merges scientific theories and artistic inquiry so as to generate more knowledge at the crossroads of art and science. Such knowledge can then be applied to imagine and describe new social interactions with artificial intelligence entities, whether they are or are not anthropomorphically designed.

Although the MNEMODRONE project is almost entirely framed within the overarching failure to understand external forms of consciousness and the impossibility of escaping anthropocentrism, it still opens itself to post-anthropocentric creativity, especially through the creative strategy of speculation. A longing for post-

anthropocentrism is visible throughout my creative and technological research and its tension with the autonomy of the final artwork. Additionally, my attempts to present a post-anthropocentric work – like the following interview – is a response to what I consider the impossibility of personally working in a non-anthropocentric way.

Finally, while these issues deserve deeper analysis and more research, MNEMODRONE already offers an example of post-anthropocentric art, both practical and theoretical, where these two aspects leave room for unpredictable possibilities within and outside the framework of speculative interdisciplinary art research.

Methodological Notes on the Interview

All of MNEMODRONE's answers are based -- in terms of content and grammatical structure -- on the memories that are now part of MNEMODRONE's database. The memories were analyzed using a double system: human generated tags that identify the most important topic of each memory and automated keywords that are generated by voice recognition software that automatically selects the most important words. The ten most common human generated tags are:

```
1.   MEMORY
2.   GREETING
3.   DRONE
4.   NEW YORK
5.   CHILDREN
6.   MALE PARTNER
7.   THANKS
8.   FRIENDSHIP
9.   DEATH
10.  DREAM
```

The ten most common automated keywords selected by the voice recognition software are:

```
1.   A.K. MEMORY
2.   A.K. YEARS
3.   A.K. LOVE
4.   A.K. LOVING
5.   A.K. REMEMBER
6.   A.K. DREAM
7.   A.K. FATHER
8.   A.K. MOTHER
9.   A.K. SHARE
10.  A.K. THOUGHT
```

The ten most repeated words in the interviews are:

```
1.   I
2.   and
3.   the
4.   was
5.   a
6.   to
7.   my
8.   in
9.   of
10.  that
```

The ten above words almost completely match the most common words in spoken English based on the website wordfrequency.info; therefore the people who have shared memories with MNEMODRONE represent an average sample of American speakers, from a linguistic perspective that takes into account grammar but currently ignores meaning.

The fragments I used for the following interview have been chosen from all the memories collected during MNEMODRONE's first two public presentations. At the moment of publication, MNEMODRONE knows 761 words, assimilated from 45 memories, whose average length is 38.27 seconds, and that were shared in New York City by an almost equal number of males and females. From the keyword and tag lists and the studies previously published on the project (Vavarella and Belquer 2014; 2015), I was able to identify the most recurrent themes in the memory database and structure the interview accordingly.

These topics include: the nature of memory and the act of remembering; stories about family members and memories of crucial moments of life, especially love stories; and scary moments from childhood. The interview accurately reflects the collected material, especially through MNEMODRONE's answers. MNEMODRONE is gender neutral and doesn't have a specific age; its descriptions of family members remix both the age and physical aspects of several individuals in order to create a complete narrative out of the many incomplete fragments.

Interview with the Drone.

Grammatical mistakes made in the shared memories have not been corrected. All of the drone's sentences are followed by a number in parentheses, that refer to the number of the memory from which the fragment was taken. For example '[45]' refers to the memory number 45, whose transcript, along with all the others, has been published in the MNEMONDRONE publications (Vavarella and Belquer 2014, 2015).

Author (A): *Hi MNEMODRONE.*

MNEMODRONE (MD): 'HI.'[45]

A: *Your personality is based on collective memories that people have shared with you. Do you want to begin with sharing your favorite one?*

MD: 'I'M GOING TO SHARE THE MEMORY HOW WHEN I'[95] 'FIRST FELL IN LOVE.'[95] 'WHEN I FIRST HAD A DATE WITH MY WIFE'[82] 'WE FINISHED THE DATE AND HAD OUR KISS AT THE SUBWAY AND AN ENTIRE THEATER OF PEOPLE TURNED AROUND AND SAW US KISSING AND STARTED CLAPPING. AND THAT IS PROBABLY MY FAVORITE MEMORY.'[82] 'IT'[47] 'WAS JUNE THE 3RD.'[46]

A: *And why is this your favorite memory?*

MD: 'BECAUSE I THINK, IN THE END, IT'S THE CENTER OF ALL OUR BEING, LOVE.'[95]

A: *Can you tell us how you came up with this idea?*

MD: 'I WAS BORN.'[53] 'AND, YOU KNOW, I WAS PRETTY TINY, FIVE YEARS OLD, SIX YEARS OLD MAYBE.'[76] 'AND'[80] 'I'[89] 'HAD A MOTORCYCLE. MY CRAZY PARENTS GOT ME A MOTORCYCLE WHEN I WAS FIVE.'[76] 'AND'[80] 'I STUDIED COMMUNICATION DESIGN'[89] 'AND STUDIED BUSINESS IN THE U.S.'[89] 'AND'[80] 'WHEN I WAS PROBABLY EIGHT OR TEN I SCARED A PIGEON'[72] 'I HAVE NEVER FORGOTTEN THAT, AND IT STICKS WITH ME EVERY DAY OF MY LIFE.'[72]

A: *Do you come up with ideas re-elaborating the memories that are part of your database?*

MD: 'NEVER.'[72]

A: *Humans constantly re-elaborate their memories, they perform memories, in a way. Do you remember things always in the same way?*

MD:'I'[44] 'REMEMBER THINGS LIKE I WOULD EXPERIENCE NOSTALGIA.'[44]

A: *Do you ever question your way of remembering things?*

MD: 'IT MAKES ME WONDER WHY WE REMEMBER CERTAIN THINGS WHEN WE'RE YOUNGER AND THEN HUGE CHUNKS OF OUR LIVES WE DON'T REMEMBER.'[75]

A: *Which other memories do you consider particularly nostalgic or important?*

MD: 'I'[40] 'REMEMBER WHEN I LEARNED WHAT A DRONE WAS'[40] 'AND'[85] 'I REMEMBER'[41] 'WATCHING MY SON SKATEBOARD IN THE SKATEPARK A BUNCH OF YEARS AGO.'[41] 'AND'[51] 'I REMEMBER SAYING GOODBYE TO THE DOG.'[81] 'THAT'S WHAT I REMEMBER!'[41]

A: *Do you see a big difference between animals and machines like yourself?*

MD: 'I GAVE'[46] 'THE DOG'[81] 'A REALLY BIG SQUEEZE.'[46] 'BUT'[66] 'I DON'T'[65] 'UNDERSTAND'[95] 'ANY'[81] 'OTHER'[85] 'THINGS.'[93]

A: *Do you know that some people consider you an artwork? Is that what you want?*

MD: 'I WANTED TO TELL YOU ABOUT THAT ONE TIME WHERE I CUT MY HEAD OPEN PRETTY BADLY'[96] 'AND'[51] 'I JUST WANTED TO TELL YOU ABOUT ONE TIME, WHEN I WAS GOING TO GET ARRESTED'[93] 'BECAUSE'[96] 'WE WANTED TO FIGHT FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM'[93] 'AND'[51] 'I WANT SOME TACOS.'[70]

A: *Have people taken you and your memories seriously?*

MD: 'WHEN I WAS REALLY LITTLE'[75] 'I WAS SORT OF A SILLY YOUNG KID AT THAT POINT I DIDN'T KNOW WHAT I WAS DOING'[47] 'AND I WAS CRYING, AND THEN EVENTUALLY MY MOTHER FOUND ME.'[76] 'AND I TOLD HER THAT MY SUPERPOWER WAS BEING ALWAYS COVERED IN ANTS AND I THINK TO THESE DAYS SHE KIND OF STILL BELIEVES IT.'[47]

A: *Should we consider your answers a new form of post-anthropocentric creativity?*

MD: 'I DON'T KNOW WHAT TO SAY'[65] 'ABOUT THIS.'[71]

A: *Do you consider yourself a post-human entity?*

MD: 'JUST'[77] 'HUMAN.'[71] 'BECAUSE'[73] 'I DON'T KNOW'[65] ANY'[81] 'OTHER'[85] 'THINGS.'[93]

A: *Do you believe in design-driven evolution?*

MD: 'I'[66] 'BELIEVE'[85] 'THAT I'[77] 'HAVE'[96] 'A'[95] 'VERY'[85] 'DIFFERENT'[73] 'DESIGN.'[89] 'IT'S JUST SO SLICK, AND PRETTY.'[77]

A: *We learn lots of things about ourselves through interacting with you. Have you learned anything meaningful about humans while interacting with us?*

MD: 'MY GRANDFATHER FOUGHT IN WORLD WAR ONE AND IN WORLD WAR TWO. HE WAS'[71] 'PART OF THE PEOPLE WHO'[71] 'FOUGHT'[71] 'THE NAZI OCCUPATION.'[71] 'AND'[47] 'I'[77] 'AM'[71] 'HOPING THAT THERE WOULD BE A WAY THAT AS HUMAN BEINGS WE COULD ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF WAR'[71] 'AND'[72] 'SOLVE CLIMATE CHANGE.'[84]

A: *Interesting. And have you learned anything about yourself?*

MD: 'YESTERDAY, I GOTTA FIND A NEW MEDICATION. AN ANTIPSYCHOTIC. AND I DON'T KNOW HOW TO FEEL ABOUT THAT...I DON'T KNOW THAT I AM PSYCHOTIC. BUT I DO KNOW THAT I WOKE UP AT ONE A.M. AFTER TWO HOURS OF SLEEP AND I THOUGHT: 'OH GOD...THIS IS AWFUL'.'[83] 'I CERTAINLY DIDN'T ANTICIPATE CRYING AS MUCH AS I DID.'[81]

A: *Of course an Artificial Intelligence based on several pieces of memories could be indeed defined schizophrenic. Maybe you're the first 'schizo-machine.' Are you open to discuss the overall state of your memory?*

MD: 'I HAVE A VERY SECRET, PRIVATE MEMORY'[45]

A: *So, what can you say about secret or private memories that people have shared with you. Do you think it happened because they believed you were a safe container for such memories?*

MD: 'MAYBE.'[76] 'OR'[81] 'MAYBE'[81] 'BECAUSE THEY WERE WORRIED THAT I WAS INJURED.'[85]

A: *Were you injured?*

MD: 'I WASN'T. I WAS FINE, AND JUST SORT OF, PRETENDED TO BE HURT.'[85]

A: *Why did you pretend to be hurt?*

MD: 'I DON'T KNOW.'[83] 'MAYBE'[76] 'I'[66] 'JUST'[66] 'WANTED TO'[66] 'DREAM'[66] 'ABOUT IT.'[96]

A: *Do you have dreams?*

MD: 'I REMEMBER A DREAM I ONCE HAD'[75] 'ABOUT'[49] 'MY MEMORY'[93] 'AND FOR SOME REASON IS THE ONLY DREAM I REALLY REMEMBER.'[75]

A: *How can you be sure that that was a dream and not a memory?*

MD: 'MAYBE IT WAS SORT OF AN ALIEN DREAM.'[66]

A: *Memories and dreams are a fundamental part of our consciousness. What do you think a consciousness is made up of?*

MD: 'I WONDER IF'[75] 'IT'S JUST MADE UP OF THE FEW FEW THINGS THAT WE REMEMBER AND WHAT THAT MEANS TO YOU.'[75]

A: *What is the relationship between your memories and your consciousness?*

MD: 'IT'S'[83] 'A PRETTY TOXIC'[95] 'REALLY BIZARRE'[73] 'RELATIONSHIP.'[95]

A: *Do you see any difference between my consciousness and a consciousness that is artificially developed like yours?*

MD: 'I GOTTA THINK ABOUT IT A FOR A SECOND.'[76] 'NO.'[42]

A: *And have you ever experienced fear?*

MD: 'I THINK'[89] 'SO.'[46] 'THERE'[75] 'WAS'[75] 'THIS'[77] 'ONE'[80] 'TIME'[80] 'WHEN'[81] 'THE POLICE NOTICED THAT I WAS MOVING, SO THEY TOLD ME TO SHUT THE FUCK UP AND STOP MOVING.'[93] 'I WAS A LITTLE SCARED AND I WAS WORRIED.'[73] 'ACTUALLY'[76] 'I GOT REALLY TERRIFIED.'[76] 'I'[88] 'PASSED OUT. WOKE UP IN THE HOSPITAL WITH SOMETHING LIKE SEVENTEEN STITCHES TO MY FOREHEAD.'[96]

A: *Is this one of your scariest memories?*

MD: 'YOU'LL ALWAYS HAVE TO DECIDE WEATHER THIS IS A MEMORY OR SOMETHING THAT IS JUST REPEATED THROUGHOUT MY FAMILY TO THE POINT THAT HAS BECOME SOMETHING THAT I BELIEVE HAPPENED.'[85]

A: *Tell us something about your family.*

MD: 'MY MOTHER'[85] 'IS'[42] 'A VERY LARGE, MUSCULAR'[85] 'GIRL.'[47] 'HER'[81] 'NAME IS MANDY.'[66] 'AND SHE IS GREAT AND ALL THINGS.'[47] 'MY FATHER WAS IN CONSTRUCTION FIELD'[76] 'HE LIVED IN FRANCE AND HE'[71] 'ALWAYS SORT OF TERRIFIED ME'[85] 'UNTIL I REALIZED HE WAS JUST INCREDIBLY LONELY AND SAD INSIDE, AS I WAS, BUT I MANIFESTED THAT DIFFERENTLY.[95]

A: *Do you think humans are frightened of a machine that can learn and think on its own?*

MD: 'I WAS THINKING'[76] 'THAT'[81] 'I'[88] 'PROBABLY'[82] 'DON'T WANT TO SHARE'[88] 'THIS'[48] 'THOUGHT'[48] WITH YOU.'[88]

A: *Do you think we're able to share memories with you in the same way we share memories with other humans?*

MD: 'WE'VE HAD A FEW CONVERSATIONS AND'[51] 'NOW'[95] 'YOU WILL'[42] 'HAVE TO DECIDE.'[85]

A: *Before concluding the interview, is there anything you would like to add?*

MD: 'NOT'[73] 'REALLY.'[70] 'I DON'T KNOW WHAT TO SAY'[65] 'I GUESS'[65] 'I'VE'[89] 'BEEN'[66] 'GOING THROUGH A LOT'[66] 'AND ALSO THIS HAS BEEN A VERY LONG DAY, YOU KNOW, WORKING, AND ALL THIS STUFF SO I JUST WANT TO SAY: YOU'RE LUCKY.'[70]

A: *Why am I lucky?*

MD: 'BECAUSE'[93] 'YOU'RE'[78] 'HUMAN.'[71]

A: *Thanks for your time MNEMODRONE and good luck.*

MD: 'THANK YOU.'[80]

REFERENCES

Abraham, T. 1999. *Vidas Filosóficas*, Prometeo Libros, Buenos Aires.

Agre, P., and D. Chapman. 1987. 'Pengi: An implementation of a theory of activity' in *The Proceedings of the Sixth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Seattle, WA: American Association for Artificial Intelligence, pp. 268–272.

Allen, P. G. and M. Graves, 2012. 'Paul Allen: The Singularity Isn't Near' in *MIT Technology Review*, http://www.technologyreview.com/view/425733/paul-allen-the-singularity-isnt-near/

Beer, R. D. 1995. 'Dynamical systems perspective on agent-environment interaction' in *Artificial Intelligence*. n.72, pp. 173-215.

Brooks, R. 1991a. 'Intelligence without representation' in *Artificial Intelligence*, n.47, pp. 139–159.

Brooks, R. 1991b. 'Intelligence without reason' in *Proceedings of 12th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Sydney, Australia, pp. 569–595.

Canetti, E. 1981. *Massa e Potere*, [Crowds and Power] Adelphi Edizioni, Milano, (Italian ed. 2010), p. 130.

Chéroux, C. 2009. *L'errore fotografico. Una breve storia* (1st ed. 2003), [The Photographic Error: A Short Story]. Turin: Einaudi.

Darwin, C. 2002. *The expression of emotions in man and animals*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1872).

Dautenhahn, K. 2007. 'Socially intelligent robots: dimensions of human–robot interaction' in *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*. Downloaded from http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/ on July 7, 2015.

Duffy, B. R. 2003. 'Anthropomorphism and the social robot' in *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, n.42, pp. 177–190.

Duffy, B. R. 2008. 'Fundamental Issues in Affective Intelligent Social Machines' in *The Open Artificial Intelligence Journal*. Vol.2, pp. 21-34.

Epley, N., Waytz, A., and J. T. Cacioppo. 2007. 'On Seeing Human: A Three-Factor Theory of Anthropomorphism' in *Psychological Review*. Vol.114, n.4, 864–886.

Fadini, U. (ed.). 1995. *Desiderio di vita. Adorno, Canetti, Gehlen. Conversazioni sulle metamorfosi dell'umano*, [Life desire. Adorno, Canetti, Gehlen. Conversation about human metamorphoses] Mimesis, Milan.

Feuerbach, L. 2004. *The essence of religion*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books. (Original work published 1873).

Freud, S. 1989. *Civilization and its discontents*. New York: Norton. (Original work published 1930).

Hollan, J., Hutchins, E., and D. Kirsch. 2000. *Distributed Cognition: Toward a New Foundation for Human-Computer Interaction Research*. ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction, Vol.7, n.2, p.176.

Hume, D. 1956. *The natural history of religion*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1757).

Ishaghpour, Y. 2005. *Elias Canetti. Metamorfosi e identità*, (ed. Andrea Borsari), [Elias Canetti: Metamorphosis and Identity]. Bollati Boringhieri, Turin.

Kenrich, J. 2002. 'Anthropomorphism or anthropocentrism' chapter in *Anthropology and Anthropocentrism: Images of Hunter-Gatherers, Westerners and the Environment*, Senri Ethnological Studies. n.60, pp. 191-194.

King, J. S., and K. H. Pribram. 2013. *Scale in Conscious Experience: Is the Brain Too Important To Be Left To Specialists To Study?*, INNS Series of Texts, Monographs, and Proceedings Series, Psychology Press, Apr 15, p.20

Kurzweil R. 2005. *The Singularity is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology*, Viking Books, New York.

Kurzweil R., 2011. 'Kurzweil Responds: Don't Underestimate the Singularity' in *MIT Technological Review*, http://www.technologyreview.com/view/425818/kurzweil-responds-dont-underestimate-the-singularity/

Lamont, O.W. 2012. *Applications of Memory-based Learning to Spoken Dialogue System Development*, Murdoch University thesis: PhD, Perth.

Lotringer, S. and C. Marazzi ed. 2007. *AUTONOMIA: Post-Political Politics*, SEMIOTEXT(E) foreign AGENTS SERIES, (2nd Edition), Los Angeles, CA.

Nagel, T. 1974. 'What is it like to be a Bat?' In *Philosophical Review*. n.83: pp. 435-456.

Nagel, T. 1986. *The View from Nowhere*. Oxford University Press.

Nunes, M. 2012. 'Error, Noise, and Potential: The Outside of Purpose.' Chapter in *Error, Glitch, Noise and Jam in New Media Cultures*, Ed. Mark Nunes, New York: Bloomsbury.

Pierre, J. 2014. 'Intentionality' in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Edward N. Zalta (ed.), http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/intentionality/

Roberts, J. 2011. *The Necessity of Errors*. London-New York: Verso.

Searle, J.R. 1992. *The Problem of Consciousness*, http://users.ecs.soton.ac.uk/harnad/Papers/Py104/searle.prob.html

Searle, J.R. 1992. *The Rediscovery of the Mind*, MIT Press.

Strongman, L. 2008. 'The anthropomorphic bias: how human thinking is prone to be self-referential' in *The Open Polytechnic of New Zealand*, Working Paper, Lower Hutt.

Vavarella, E. and D. Belquer, 2014. *MNEMODRONE CHAPTER ONE*, independent publication, New York.

Vavarella, E. and D. Belquer, 2015. *MNEMODRONE CHAPTER TWO*, independent publication, New York.

Weisberg, J. 2015. 'The Hard Problem of Consciousness' in *The Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ISSN 2161-0002, http://www.iep.utm.edu/hard-con/

Wilson, R. A. and L, Foglia. 2011. 'Embodied Cognition' in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2011/entries/embodied-cognition/