Shannon Mattern & Paul Feigelfeld

episode 1

The Culture & Technology Podcast

Episode 1: The Relationship Between Culture and Technology
Shannon Mattern x Paul Feigelfeld

INTRODUCTION

What feelings does technology evoke? Thanks to pop culture, Hollywood, and the media, technological narratives tend to swing between the utopic or dystopic – the glorious or the terrifying. For Episode 1 of The Culture and Technology Podcast, Host Severin Matusek invites Professor of Anthropology Shannon Mattern and media theorist and curator Paul Feigelfeld to deconstruct the concept and explore its

intersections with culture.

GUESTS

Shannon Mattern is Professor of Anthropology at The New School for Social Research in New York City. She teaches and writes about the infrastructure, spaces and architecture of media, and examines the changing role of essential cultural tools and technologies such as libraries, maps and cities.
newschool.edu/nssr/faculty/shannon-mattern

Paul Feigelfeld is a media theorist, curator and cultural scientist who researches how media and technology change the way we think and work and produce art.
twitter.com/paulfeigelfeld

HOST

Severin Matusek is a writer, producer and editor who has spent the last decade researching how technology transforms culture, communities and society.

IDEAS AND PEOPLE IN CONTEXT

- **Deus ex machina** is a Latin phrase describing a plot device in Greek and Roman tragedy. Its meaning carries through to contemporary theatre, where it refers to a thing or person that is unexpectedly introduced into a situation and devises an artificial solution.
- **The Singularity** is a hypothetical future moment at which artificial intelligence will surpass that of humans. Popularised by futurist Ray Kurzweil in his book 2005 *The Singularity is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology*, the concept is generally regarded within the computer science community as strictly in the realm of fiction.
- **Slime mold** describes unrelated organisms that live independently as singular cells but can come together to create a multicellular amoebic form.
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slime_mold
- **Marshall McLuhan (1911–1980)** was a Canadian philosopher and media theorist best known for coining the expression, "The medium is the message".
wikipedia.org/wiki/Marshall_McLuhan
- **Langdon Winner** is a political theorist, and educator who has written extensively on science, technology, and society. langdonwinner.com
- **Speculative design**, also known as critical design or design fiction is an approach to problem-solving and idea creation established by Anthony Dunne and Fiona Raby in their book *Speculative Everything*.
mitpress.mit.edu/books/speculative-everything
- **Tristan Harris** is an American computer scientist and entrepreneur and former Google Design Ethicist who co-founded the Center for Humane

Technology, which works towards catalyzing technology towards the common good. tristanharris.com

CREDITS

The Vienna Business Agency supports businesses, the economy and the city in developing the Austrian capital's creative industries and shaping its future trajectory. viennabusinessagency.at

Editorial Team: Paul Feigelfeld, Anna Dorothea Ker, Severin Matusek, Elisabeth Noever-Ginthör, Elisa Stockinger, Heinz Wolf.

Theme Music by Zanshin.

The topics of the Culture & Technology Podcast will be further discussed at the Creative Days Vienna 2021 - part of Vienna UP'21. https://viennaup.com

TRANSCRIPT

"...Technology doesn't start with the computer. Technology starts [at] the very moment when we start to make models for ourselves, when we start to translate some kind of perception or knowledge or understanding of the world into something else."

Hello and welcome to the Culture and Technology Podcast. I'm your host, Severin Matusek. The Culture and Technology Podcast is a virtual salon initiated by the Vienna Business Agency in which experts from Vienna and around the globe explore how technology is reshaping the future of culture.

Let's start with a simple question: are you scared of technology?

As a matter of fact, many of us are. Think about artificial intelligence as an example: a future where computers make decisions instead of humans is scary. I get that.

But then I think about the history of human culture and realise that technology has always been part of how we make things. Take one of the most ancient forms of artistic expression: painting. In order to paint, you need a brush and a canvas. You need colours. Even the most ancient art we know – the paintings of animals in the caves of Lascaux in France – were painted using tools that were forged through a technological process.

So I wonder: can culture only exist through the interface of technology? And if so, how does technology shape the way we experience and create culture today?

In order to find out, I invited Shannon Mattern and Paul Feigelfeld to join our virtual salon.

Our first guest is Shannon Mattern. Shannon is a Professor of Anthropology at The New School for Social Research in New York City. She teaches and writes about the infrastructure, spaces and architecture of media.

Our other guest is Paul Feigelfeld, who is joining me from Vienna. Paul is a media theorist, curator and cultural scientist who researches how media and technology change the way we think and work and produce art.

I was fortunate to sit down with Shannon and Paul to explore the intricate relationship between culture and technology.

—

Severin Matusek
Thank you very much. So to start with, my personal curiosity in this topic is that and especially in talking to both of you is, once upon a time I studied philosophy, and when you study philosophy, you dive into a lot of different topics, you have Greek philosophy, Western philosophy, Continental, and so on. And I have to admit, the first few years studying philosophy as well, I was really lost, I didn't really know what I was interested in.

And I was overwhelmed by all these thoughts and structures, until I discovered media theory, which to me, gave me this very handy tool to understand the world we're living in, by giving me these tools of understanding what the internet is, what technology is, how to think of them as media. And I think you come from a similar school and develop from there. So my first question would be, maybe to you Shannon, and you start, how does technology shape our understanding of the world?

Shannon Mattern
Where to begin? So first of all, technology shapes the world we live in. We obviously need technology to shape the built landscape to shape the apartments who live in the cities, we live in, our modes of transit, our modes of communication – we would not be with one another right now, if it weren't for technology. Technology is also the medium through which we experience cosmic forces – things like space and time. Technology also kind of mediates our relationships with one another. Obviously, in this age of a pandemic, technology is a necessary kind of mediating factor, allowing for sociality to continue when physical proximity isn't possible. So these are just a couple of the ways in which technology kind of shapes the substrate, the container, the infrastructures, the conduits, the channels, the content – all those things to kind of shape the world that we live in together?

Severin Matusek
How would you define technology? Because the first thing we think about is: technology is a computer, a mobile device, software. But I also understand that a lot of your research goes into materiality, for example, like the screen or the chips, the silicone that they're made of. So what would be your definition of technology?

Shannon Mattern
Well, that's kind of a persistent question, especially being a non-anthropologist and anthropology program or department. This is where, like, imposter syndrome kind of seizes up a little bit, because it's been one of the central questions to anthropology – and I would say to media scholars, and cultural critics, as well. So we tend to, I guess, in general parlance, tend to think of technology as something that is perhaps acquainted with a tool, a material object. But instead, I prefer to think of it as – again, maybe drawing from my media theory trends training in graduate school, and before – that it's a more capacious definition that also includes things like practices, standards, protocols.

Paul Feigelfeld
I just had this thought, when you mentioned the imposter syndrome – which of course we're all familiar with – is something that we might be able to apply to the question of what technology is because I think sometimes we model technology to be somewhat of an imposter. Whereas it's actually not, you know. We always think of it as some sort of an add on, an intermediary. Something that's in between and pretending to be something, it's not like an extension of the physical body, something that's reverse engineering, something that we perceive of as natural.

And I think this is where one of the main problems lies in terms of how we relate to technologies: we always historically have somehow placed them outside of our Lebenswelt, instead of perceiving it and understanding it is something that is in a symbiotic relationship with, with us and always has been, as you said, technology doesn't start with the computer or with the simple tool.

But I would say that technology starts in the very moment when we start to make models for ourselves, when we start to translate some kind of perception or knowledge or understanding of the world into something else. To make it easier for us to understand, which then, of course, starts to shape the way we think about it. So if we translate the perception of something like a number, into lying stones into the sand, it will eventually create the next step in this sort of core evolutionary process. So maybe we should stop thinking about technology and ourselves as imposters. Because this is something that we might look back to today, where we, you know, design technologies to, try to pose as us and design tests to distinguish us from our technologies, by trying to, you know, identify images of streetlights online.

Shannon Mattern

Just the fact that you even use the term translation gets at the idea that some theorists of technology even include language itself, and, and a long history of writing systems of mark making within the realm or under the umbrella, the big umbrella, of technology.

Paul Feigelfeld
Yeah.

Severin Matusek
Now we look into the term culture, which is another such a big term, because culture is not something separate from technology or not something separate from our existence as humans, it's intrinsically part of it, isn't it? So culture technology, where do we begin even to start understanding that relationship?

Paul Feigelfeld
Well, we could start in the Greek theatre and with this, you know, very famous term of the deus ex machina, which is so often used these days to talk about sort of some sort of spiritual quality of technologies or some, you know, point in time where there is a convergence or singularity when in the literal sense of the word, it's, it's a theatrical machine that just heaves some actor onto the stage, who then, again, is an imposter for a god. So if we look at it that way, there's really no distinction between culture and technology, both can't exist without each other. And they're just sort of two qualities of the same mode of existence.

Shannon Mattern
But there are also people who think of culture more broadly and say that it's not something that's specific to the human, as well; that you can share values and rules of behavior that maybe, again, it depends on how capaciously you define technology. We could think of other species having certain cultural practices in common like swarming behaviors, or how do bees build a beehive, or how to kind of wolves go on a hunt together?

Maybe we can't necessarily say that they're using culture to do that. But they do have a shared set of practices. That's, some of it is innate. Some of it is learned behavior, but culture, in mostly human contexts – and in some kind of non-human contexts as well – technology is certainly a container or a mediating factor within a cultural practice.

Paul Feigelfeld
Wow, that's super interesting. Maybe that's a good direction to go in if we think about the non human aspects, not just when it comes to animals, but maybe also to ecosystems and all kinds of organisms that organise in some some way or the other, technologically and culturally.

Shannon Mattern

Well, slime mold in particular has been a popular topic of research in recent years, in part because people who do generative planning, kind of generative design, have found some inspiration in the almost accidental design that slime mold produces transportation planners, people who are looking at logistical systems are wondering at the on the sense of awe at the ability for a slime mold, for instance, to self organize and produce this really efficient kind of geographic connection from different points, where I think given the rudimentary biological nature of a signpost, some slime mold, some folks might be reluctant to say that a slime mold has a culture. But there is kind of a self-organizing behavior happening there. And not only self, but like a community organization of behavior. Or perhaps even the definition culture might apply to a set of organisms as seemingly simple as that.

Paul Feigelfeld

Well, especially when we talk about molds, right? We call them cultures, you know?

Shannon Mattern

Yeah, yeah.

Paul Feigelfeld

Fungi in general. So yeah, I think that's interesting. But then what do we make of the fact that there is sort of also these different definitions of what culture is, you know, this very situated, 'high' culture that we have in Vienna and this understanding of culture that is mainly museums, theaters, operas – a certain kind of conservative approach to it – so how can we open up the discussion even more to think about these terms more broadly? For the Viennese audience, for example?

Shannon Mattern

That's a great question. I think it's just kind of expanding the legacy and realizing that even these seemingly rudimentary – we might even use it in scare quotes the term "primitive" – aspects of culture that we're talking about are part of the legacy of being able to have things like opera houses, and kind of historically significant architecture in the performing arts, etc. So any type of these rudimentary forms of self-organizing or community organization, community organized behaviors are necessary for these kind of more rarefied manifestations of it. I also think that drawing from German language scholarship, a lot of the cultural techniques research and media theory that originated in the German language, is really useful, particularly in the field of media and technology for expanding that definition. What counts is culture? What is a technique? which then goes back to your previous question about how generously do we want to find define technology to

Paul Feigelfeld

Yeah, I mean, I think we could start with trying to convince the audience of the Vienna Opera House that there is a relationship between, you know, the Fibonacci

numbers and the golden ratio and the architecture of the building itself. But it might be harder to convince them that there is a relationship between the behavior of a slime mold and the way that they start to, you know, go into the theater and find their seats. But it might be necessary actually to actualize an understanding of culture and technology that's somehow more contemporary, or even future oriented.

Severin Matusek
One thing that's interesting is, I wonder if the technology of today, let's say, what came up in the last 20 to 30 years: thinking about the internet as a technology that connects billions of people around the world, digital devices that we all have in our pockets that serve as navigation, translation devices, and so on, or even extended reality or virtual reality.

Do these technologies allow us maybe to think beyond this human centric view of the world, you know, that it even allows us to think of slime cultures as interesting, relevant things to explore? Because these technologies maybe open up to us to look at human nature beyond us being the center of the universe, which was such a prevalent theme of the last 2000 years, I would say.

Paul Feigelfeld
Human nature is such a funny term, actually. Because what people generally mean by it is something that has nothing to do with nature at all. It's something that – human nature is by definition, trying to set oneself apart from nature by producing culture. What I was thinking about more is like if we think about the distribution of technology and the ubiquity of technologies these days, and over the past couple of decades, is how it changes the way that culture is produced and distributed.

Because it's not, you know, concentrated into just, you know, the venue of the theater, or the museum or the archive. And especially this year, everything has opened up even more, because all these venues are necessarily closed and have to find different solutions to stream. So maybe that's something that we could start to think about also what that means, you know, how presence and absence and mediation change the content and, and the perception and the ethics of it all, because that's something that I feel is missing greatly.

Shannon Mattern
And that's something where I feel like this current moment has opened up a lot of new possibilities, of course, we'd prefer to not be in a pandemic. But if we want to look at the potential positive outcomes are new questions that this exceptional opportunity has raised is there's been so much interesting experimentation in the arts, anything that requires people gathering together in a space to watch a live performance, where we have a people in the theater, people in live music, performance, visual arts, television, film, etc, who are really experimenting with what how will how presence has historically been regarded as necessary for their art form,

and how we can perhaps recreate that, simulate that, mediate that, or do away with it altogether, in rethinking what the fundamental kind of nature of going back to your term, – it's a problematic term, nature – but what the essence of their art form is. There's been so much interesting experimentation in the Zoom-based kind of practice over the past year.

Paul Feigelfeld
That's true. And it's also, I mean, there's a lot of discussion about going on about whether it's something entirely new: I would say no, because this is something that has been happening gradually over the past decades, or always has always been happening, it's always been a question of, you know, gapping, distance and proximity.

And, then inviting and inventing new forms of intimacy and an affectation, if this is the right word. But of course, the massive scale of this year where it literally applies to everyone in the world, you know, and it's not an option, but it's a necessity, is something that is interesting, and I think also inhibiting for many people to think about it properly. Because you're, it's hard to think about it when you're totally in it.

Shannon Mattern
And when you're in it by necessity, I think you're free to point out the look of the long history of this type of work, you know, that you have the history of telepresence art, you have – even some of the early uses of the telephone were to broadcast kind of musical performances to democratize a lot of these art forms, these cultural forms, and make them accessible to people who don't necessarily have access to a city or to the so-called quote-unquote "cultural resources" of a metropolitan area. So some of the really early uses of our telecommunication technologies for the distribution join back to one of your channels, Paul, earlier, of cultural forms.

Severin Matusek
Does democratization – is that related to it – you know, that the big theme of technology of the past decades of democratizing access so suddenly, somewhere who lives on a mountain in the middle of nowhere, can meet people at the other end of the world, find resources exchange, and so on. And then there's the critical voices that say, well, democratization is not really true, because the power structures have just shifted and their new power structures. So what are your thoughts on that when it comes to power structures, democratization, access of culture to the people?

Shannon Mattern
Well, one of the standard histories or ways of framing technological history and media history is that most new inventions come out of the military. So there that's a very different way of thinking about power structures. So there's a lot of government funding military applications, and then it is quote-unquote "democratized", commercialized, used in more kind of quotidian civilian contexts.

So there, we're already sorted with a bit – not a bit, but a major – power imbalance. So and and I think that every technology, even in its moment of origination, you could find multiple genealogies for a lot of the technologies that have historically been used and are used today, some of which have a mix of these democratizing ideals and, ah, uses of the technology for the purposes of control and domination.

I think maybe McLuhan and some of the other kind of technological 'lite' determinists might disagree and say that there are certain kinds of political balances that are built into Langdon Winner and his idea that artifacts, not politics... Maybe a bomb was not meant to democratize me, all I can do is dominate. That's one technology, that's a pretty clear purpose, leaning towards one political orientation. But in most tools and technologies we think of there is a mix of democratizing potential and domination potential, if that we can think of those as necessarily opposites. But that's what came to mind immediately for me.

Paul Feigelfeld
Yeah. But maybe there's been a shift a little bit over the past, say, two, three decades, that the culture of technology might have changed so much globally, in terms of, you know, the way it became a dominating industry, that it might have started to bypass the military application, I think the vector might have changed a little bit, whereas it used to come out of the military into the private sector into the general populace. Now, it's the private sector, then it's the general public. And then, as we can see, it's becoming weaponized, again, you know, as as a tool for political manipulation, or, you know, psychological warfare, for example, or even as a tool of surveillance, you know.

Shannon Mattern
You're absolutely right, yeah. And that has a lot to do with things like where funding sources come from. Especially in the United States, we have such an impoverished kind of public funding for things like technological and cultural development, whereas in the Cold War era, and before, that wasn't necessarily the case.

Severin Matusek
One thing we can't deny is that technology is now very widely available to very many people. And I wondered what your opinion is on, who creates culture nowadays, especially when I think of 'high' culture as Paul mentioned, when it comes to museums, art, theater, performances, music, there is a democratization happening in terms of power structures being reversed – that you don't need to go through a traditional career in order to be at the peak of it, able to reach an audience at the opera. You can now reach an audience of millions anywhere by being a bedroom producer, basically. Is this something you think about in your research as well, of like, who creates culture and how does it change culture?

Shannon Mattern
 I'll give you two examples. One – and I work with public libraries – there's been so much theorization, about the archive over the years, – it's a really kind of sexy thing to think about – a lot of theory about the archive. This is in part why early in my work, I started to focus on libraries, because comparatively hardly anybody theorizes the library.

The modern conception of the library has been more about democratization, about kind of publicly outlets with all of its kind of Foucauldian implications, granted, but in public libraries in particular today. there's an acceptance or kind of a a promotion of the idea that local cultures, local populations, local communities are producers of a valuable and valid knowledge as well.

So encouraging local communities to bring in material the family heirlooms kind of user-produced content, family media, and recognizing that is a really important part of knowledge production of a city or neighborhood. Recognizing kind of indigenous knowledge is other forms of knowledge performance as a form of kind of knowledge production. So these are some things that public knowledge institutions are grappling with – recognizing what constitutes culture, what constitutes public knowledge is broader than the more kind of elitist and, and, and perhaps more narrowly defined definitions.

And then if we look at the other side, I am a relatively late adopter to TikTok, and am trying to understand what the medium is all about. I can appreciate certain art forms certain cultural forms are really specific to TikTok. Of course, we can find kind of longer genealogies of those too. and then reading several articles about it celebrating, kind of, especially teen culture, and new art forms that are produced on TikTok, I mean, I appreciate them for the novelty they offer for the democratization potential they bring.

But I have to admit kind of in my 40-something curmudgeonly-ness I have a little bit of a difficulty recognizing that as having kind of long term value as much as our more rarefied forms of culture. And this is my own bias to get over but, but these are forums where even in my own scope, I would like to imagine this as somewhat enlightened and generous perspective have a bit of trouble looking at kind of the pranks and jokes that we see on TikTok as a form of cultural production.

Severin Matusek
I love that we landed at TikTok. So, Paul, what are your thoughts on TikTok?

Paul Feigelfeld
Well, I mean, in general, I really agree with, with Shannon and I can just emphasize that it's very important to have a broader grasp of work, cultures, and technologies and techniques and how all these different I mean, this, this is not enough time here

to grapple with all these different terminologies. But they make up a good toolbox to sort of describe the practices, you know, I think the example of what it means to have a library and how to use it in a very haptic sense, and as a place of community, etc. That collects a lot of different things is brilliant, and says it all. Whereas we have to differentiate between an institution and an infrastructure or an institution and a platform.

Because the platform has a very, very distinct focus, you know, it's, it's made to do something very specific. it's not just a collection that offers a variety of different uses – of course, platforms also invite contingency, you know, and people will always misappropriate it in some way or other and make it creative somehow. But I think TikTok as sort of the most radically algorithmically catered platform we have thus far, you know, it really, really, rams it down your throat. It tries to, I think, exclude this kind of contingency, because it's very, very narrowly focused on what you can do. And it will just enhance and enhance and enhance this.

So people might all do seemingly strange things at first, but if you look at it from from, from a bird's eye view, to come back to the perspective that you said, we should prefer, in the beginning, um, you might see that it's very streamlined in the end, and that there is very little contingency and very little surprise in there, because it's designed that way, it's the main idea, because this is something that will, it's, it's a collection, but it's two different forms of collection, one is the collection that's already there, and that it will invite you to use the collection. The other one is something that is made to collect a certain form of data, and it will make you behave in a way that will give them the most refined form of data that they can ask for.

Shannon Mattern
And I think this idea that TikTok and newer platforms are algorithmically controlled, gets to another important factor in terms of who gets to define what culture is, and this is curatorship. Whereas, you know, in older forms, there's like a limited supply, there's the virtuoso, the particular gatekeepers, often who – who are institutions to go back to one of the terms of distinguishing the infrastructure, the platform from the institution will determine what rises to the top, we have kind of standards of quality control, etc.

But when an algorithm is deciding what gets pushed to the top of the feed, it tends to promote certain types of behaviors, formats, that have proven popular. The algorithm as curator is very different from the head of an arts institution, or the programming director of an arts institution as curator, which tends to favor different types of quote-unquote, "content."

Paul Feigelfeld
Yeah, absolutely. It's like, it's like, you know, the recommendation algorithm of Amazon, which is surprisingly bad. You know, I just recently bought a pair of pants,

you know, like hiking pants, or a TV, you know, and then of course, for the next couple of weeks, it will offer me to buy ever more TVs, as if I need to.

It's the same principle, you know, so curation, of course, and there's been a lot of discussion about algorithmic curation and and selection processes and the, you know, creative potential of machine learning, etc, etc. It's still not there yet.

And I think it's a question like, where we go, which turns we take right now in terms of designing these systems and, and critiquing these systems thinking about these systems, because given that, the vectors might have changed, but the vectors of development is still quite a unidirectional, you know, with very little communication going on, and very little critical thinking going on in the way that it's designed. And, and I mean not to sound pessimistic, but people like Shannon and me are usually you know, we're, we're the last in the loop, then it's already falling down on us. And we have very little time to think what it might do. Or just, you know, watch from the smoldering aftermath.

Severin Matusek
I have one last question. Okay. So I think we've developed quite well to this understanding of the underlying infrastructure of culture and technology. And my question is, let's say there are institutions that still are curators that have certain power, because they have this physical manifestation and the reputation of being institutions, then we have cultural producers who might be all of us at some point.

And then we have artists who are also culture producers, but maybe also have more established positions. So what are the responsibilities of us as these cultural producers in order to use these technologies, to maybe design platforms differently? Maybe to curate differently, maybe to open up new forms of culture? What do you think?

Shannon Mattern
Well, this kind of makes me think of something I posted on Twitter that was based on a conversation I had with a student a couple days ago,I had a student who was thinking about who wants to develop new pedagogical systems to work with different community groups to help them think about how they can understand facial recognition, and perhaps resist it.

So at the end of the workshops, she didn't want to just leave them with a pessimistic view or a sense of deflation or disempowerment, but instead help them to imagine how technology can be designed differently. But you didn't want to go through the frame of speculation because that term is carrying some baggage. So she wanted to think beyond speculation with all of the perhaps negative connotations that term has taken on in certain circles.

And I tweeted, you know, "I wish this term hadn't become so kind of subsuming or all-consuming." And someone tweeting, well, this is exactly what like Tristan Harris, and the tech for good movement is doing. I'm thinking, "No, they're still within Silicon Valley. They're still within the institutions." They wanted to think beyond: What would it be beyond thinking about technology as driven by market considerations?

So it's not about the purely practical kind of self sustaining markets of technological development. Her conception of how we think outside the box is so far beyond somebody like Tristan Harris, and a tech for good organization can think because they're still thinking within the institutions.

Severin Matusek
Paul?

Paul Feigelfeld
I just had one word, actually, it's awareness. I think it's about the education of an awareness that everyone, whether they want it or not, are part of the creative process when like, we're all co-designing, whether we want it or not the technological infrastructures, we are participating be it just with our data, our facial features, our you know, behavior online and adding transparency to this infrastructure and making it possible to to implement more circuits of choice where you can actually make conscious decisions, whether you want something or not.

—

That's it for this episode of The Culture and Technology Podcast. In our next episode, we'll explore how extended reality can create a deep sense of intimacy between an artwork and its viewer.

If you're curious, as I am, in digging deeper into the theories and arguments mentioned throughout today's conversation between Shannon and Paul, check out the show notes in your podcast app. We've created a handy list of links and resources for you to dive deeper into it.

The Culture and Technology Podcast is produced by the Vienna Business Agency – The Vienna Business Agency supports businesses, the economy and the city, developing Vienna's creative industries further and in doing so, shaping the city.

I hope you'll join us for the next episodes where we'll explore how technology impacts the future of culture.