



Cambridge
International

Professional Research Thesis

Titled

*The impact of using artificial intelligence in the production of
theatrical and cinematic performances*

Researcher

Dr.Safaa Zohir

Supervisor signature

2026



Chapter Two. Cinemasteria — Problems of the Medium and Its Development

Section One. The Problem of the Term — Why a New Term?

This section stands upon the threshold of a conceptual problem that is at once delicate and vital: is there anything that necessitates the proposal of a new term to describe those artistic experiments which have come to bring together theatre, cinema, and artificial intelligence technologies within a single aesthetic entity? In answering this question it is not sufficient to claim that the old is inadequate; the matter requires rather that we analyse with precision the nature of that inadequacy, and that we trace with care the features of the two media that preceded this new entity and contributed to its formation.

This section is accordingly organised into three consecutive subsections. The first analyses the gaps in the prevailing conceptual frameworks and the justifications for proposing a new term; the second presents theatre as the first frame of reference and as the backbone of the history of human performance in all its aesthetic and philosophical dimensions; while the third treats cinema as the second frame of reference, which brought about a revolution in the conception of image, time, and audience.

*Subsection One: The Gaps in the Prevailing Conceptual Frameworks
and the Justifications for the New Term*

First: The Present Conceptual Landscape and Its Limits

At the beginning of the third millennium, the art critic and the academic researcher found themselves confronted with a phenomenon difficult to grasp and resistant to the descriptive frameworks available: theatrical performances employing the screen, video, and artificial intelligence to such an extent that they become closer to cinema in certain of their moments; and cinematic films confined within exhibition studios from which one detects the scent of theatre, the presence of the audience, and the immediacy of performance. Neither the theatrical term alone can accommodate this experience, nor can the cinematic term alone contain it.

Lehmann diagnoses this condition when he observes the rise of what he terms ‘postdramatic theatre’, which transcends the boundaries of traditional classifications founded upon genre and medium and resists any closed definition. Fischer-Lichte adds that contemporary forms of performance embody the aesthetic phenomenon of ‘transformation’, which will not submit to any existing classification, because it produces

something genuinely new rather than a mere blending of two older things.

On the digital plane, Manovich observed how the emergence of digital media opened up what he terms a ‘hybrid visualisation space’, in which the classical classifications lose their explanatory lustre and their capacity for precise aesthetic distinction recedes. This observation constitutes one of the most pressing theoretical premises justifying the need for a new term.

Second: The Terms Previously Proposed and Their Shortcomings

Researchers in the field of the visual and dramatic arts were not confronted with a complete terminological void prior to the proposal of Cinemasteria. Several terms had been devised in order to grasp this hybrid space; yet each of them carries within its structure a fundamental gap that renders it incapable of fully encompassing the phenomenon.

The first term is ‘visual theatre’ or ‘cinematic theatre’, which suggests the importation by the theatrical performance of cinematic elements. In reality it refers to the performance that employs video and image projection as a decorative addition rather than as an element constitutive of the fundamental aesthetic structure. It therefore preserves

the authority of the theatre and does not acknowledge any genuine structural transformation in the nature of the medium.

The second term is ‘mixed media’ or ‘multimedia’, which describes, on a broad scale, any artistic work that employs more than one expressive medium. The difficulty is that this description is so loose as to encompass any musical performance accompanied by moving images, or any exhibition of visual art accompanied by ambient sound. It is a description in which the aesthetic specificity distinguishing the Cinemasterian performance from others is lost.

The third term is ‘experimental cinema’ or ‘expanded cinema’, the term used by Gene Youngblood in 1970 to describe works that move beyond the frame of the traditional screen towards alternative and multiple spaces of exhibition. It is, however, a term that remains bound to the cinematic frame of reference and does not accord the living theatrical component its due place in the definition of the aesthetic entity.

The fourth term, and perhaps the closest to Cinemasteria, is ‘intermedial performance’, devised by Pavis to describe artistic experiments that borrow from multiple media and construct their identity upon the boundaries between them. This term is the most precise of those preceding it; yet it lacks sufficient specificity to distinguish the

cinematic-theatrical hybrid enhanced by artificial intelligence from other medial hybrids, such as theatre with live music and the visual arts.

Third. The Aesthetic Justifications for the Term

‘Cinemasteria’

In the face of these conceptual gaps, the term ‘Cinemasteria’ is proposed, derived from the word Cinema and from the Greek word Theáomai, meaning ‘to behold with full presence’ — in reference to that particular quality of comprehensive sensory viewing which this hybrid medium affords. This term does not confine itself to describing a mere union between two media, but points rather to the emergence of a new aesthetic entity possessing its own independent poetics, its own audience, and its own experiential space.

The justifications for proposing this term are distributed across three integrated dimensions. The first is the aesthetic dimension: Cinemasteria

offers a sensory experience that combines the physical presence of the theatre with the dense affective dimension of the cinematic image and with interactivity generated by artificial intelligence — and this threefold intersection produces an experience that none of the preceding terms is able to name with precision. The second is the technical dimension, in that this medium rests fundamentally upon artificial intelligence, not as an instrument of visual effect but as a partner in constructing the artistic event itself and in shaping it moment by moment. The third is the dimension of reception, in that this medium addresses an audience that practises a new mode of viewing, combining physical presence within the space of performance with visual transposition into digital worlds generated in real time.

“The new term in art is neither a linguistic luxury nor a claim to novelty — it is an epistemic necessity when existing terms prove incapable of describing a genuine aesthetic phenomenon that resists every previous classification.”

— Pavis, P. (2016). Dictionnaire de la performance et du théâtre contemporain. Armand Colin, p. 91.

The proposal of Cinemasteria as an independent term does not entail the abolition of the terms that preceded it, nor any diminution of their

value within their original contexts. What it does entail is that the present aesthetic field has produced a phenomenon that has attained such a degree of maturity and definition as to require a name of its own — one that distinguishes it and that enables academic research to address it and to accumulate knowledge around it.

*Subsection Two: Theatre — The First Frame of Reference and Its
Aesthetic Dimensions*

*First: The Ontological Essence of Theatre — Presence and the
Decisive Moment*

When one asks what theatre is in the simplest of its possible definitions, there comes to mind the answer formulated by Peter Brook with that rare capacity for reducing the complex to a concise phrase: any person may occupy an empty space and call it a stage; one person walks

across this space while another watches him — and this is all that is required for a theatrical moment to come into being.

In this brief phrase the ontological essence of theatre is condensed: the physical existence of the performer in the presence of the spectator, and the absolute immediacy of an event that occurs once and is not repeated in the full sense. This is what distinguishes theatre essentially from cinema, which freezes the moment and replays it without variation; for in the theatre every performance carries within itself the possibility of error, of surprise, and of creative transgression — which is what makes every theatrical evening a unique event that is not repeated.

Although Aristotle, in his Poetics, laid down the first philosophical foundations for the definition of drama as the ‘mimesis of action’, this definition has remained too narrow for the actual theatrical experience and does not accommodate its full sensory, social, and contextual dimensions.

Fischer-Lichte adds a fundamental dimension when she points to what she terms the ‘autopoietic feedback loop’ in the theatre: the living relationship between performer and spectator in which each reshapes the other in real time, transforming the theatrical performance from a

completed text into an event permanently open to transformation and to the unforeseen.

Second: The Major Currents in Theatre Theory — From Catharsis to Performance

The history of theatrical thought has produced major theoretical currents that remain present within the current academic debate concerning the nature of theatre and its purpose, each of them revealing a vital dimension of the identity of this oldest of the performing arts.

Stanislavski represents the first tendency, which makes the sincerity of the inner embodiment of the character the supreme end of theatrical performance. In his method, founded upon ‘emotional memory’, the actor is required to summon genuine lived experiences with which to move his character from within rather than from without, thereby establishing what has come to be known as ‘interior acting’, which has influenced the art of performance in cinema and theatre alike.

On the opposing side stands Bertolt Brecht with his theory of ‘epic theatre’, which clearly declares its rejection of the notion of emotional identification with the character. Brecht wishes the spectator to think rather than to feel, to analyse rather than to become emotionally involved; and to this end he devised his celebrated technique of ‘estrangement’

(Verfremdungseffekt), which breaks the dramatic illusion and reminds the spectator continually that he is in a theatre watching a performance and not living a reality.

*Antonin Artaud, for his part, offers a radically different vision in his book *The Theatre and Its Double*, calling for a ‘theatre of cruelty’ that abandons the written text and addresses the body, the senses, and the unconscious depths of the spectator. Artaud wishes to make of the theatre an intense ritual ceremony that emulates the forces of nature in their randomness, their grandeur, and their primordial character.*

These three currents — Stanislavski, Brecht, and Artaud — represent three theoretical poles that between them constitute the semantic field of theatre as an art defined within a continuous relationship between actor, spectator, space, and the immediate event. Cinemasteria will find itself in direct intertextual dialogue with this legacy when it poses these same questions anew within a contemporary digital context: does the spectator believe or does he analyse? Does he engage bodily or does he observe? Is the performance a ritual or a communication?

Third. Postdramatic Theatre and the Transformation of the Medium

The term ‘postdramatic theatre’, theorised by Hans-Thies Lehmann in 1999, represents the most decisive turning point in contemporary theatrical thought, in that it describes those theatrical forms which abandon drama in its classical conception, founded upon plot, character, and conflict, and set in its place ‘performance’ as an end in itself.

In postdramatic theatre, the theatrical performance transcends the traditional boundaries between the performing arts, employing video, digital sound, interactive technologies, and virtual bodies alongside the living actor. These elements are not present as visual effects but as constituents of meaning and of the language of performance itself. Here is born the bridge between theatre and cinema, and here begins the path of the emergence of Cinemasteria.

In their field study, Feigl and Stamer observed instances of European postdramatic theatre that employed artificial intelligence as a partner in the construction of the performance, generating texts, movements, and responses in real time, dissolving the traditional boundaries between author, director, and actor, and opening the way to the concept of the ‘live algorithmic performance’.

*Subsection Three. Cinema — The Second Frame of Reference and Its
Development towards Hybridity*

*First. The Emergence of Cinema and the Definition of the New
Medium*

When the Lumière brothers screened, in the basement of the Grand Café in Paris on the twenty-eighth of December 1895, a group of their short documentary shots before an audience paying for tickets for the first time in history, no one in the room — not even the Lumière brothers themselves — knew that they were witnessing the birth of an artistic medium that would reshape human culture in the century to follow.

Cinema in its first emergence was imbued with documentary modesty: a train arriving at a station, workers leaving a factory, a wave breaking upon a shore. In its beginnings, cinema appeared to be no more than a mechanical addition to what the human being could accomplish with his eyes. Yet what no one perceived at that moment was that the camera does not see the world as the eye sees it — it sees in an entirely different manner.

As soon as the language of cinema had developed at the hands of Brighton, Griffith, and Eisenstein in the first and second decades of the twentieth century, it became clear that montage, angle, movement, and

frame together constitute an independent visual language rather than a merely mechanical recording. Eisenstein founded his theory of montage upon the principle that two juxtaposed images generate a third meaning that is present in neither of them in isolation from the other.

Second: The Major Theories of Cinema and Their Aesthetic

Dimensions

The great French critic André Bazin laid the cornerstone of his cinematic theory around the concept of ‘realism’, defending with profound philosophical passion the unique capacity of cinema to grasp reality in its immediacy and its complexity. Bazin saw in cinematographic recording what he termed a ‘mould of time’, and set himself against excessive human intervention in the image, since therein lies a betrayal of the essence of the medium.

Laura Mulvey, by contrast, developed a theory of an entirely different orientation in her celebrated essay ‘Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema’ (1975), in which she analysed the manner in which the classical cinematic camera is constructed in accordance with a ‘male gaze’ that subjugates the female body to visual pleasure and entrenches the authority of the male spectator’s look. This essay contributed to the

establishment of feminist cinema as a theoretical and creative project of considerable influence.

Deleuze adds a distinctive philosophical dimension when, in his pairing of the ‘movement-image’ and the ‘time-image’, he distinguishes between two different media within cinema itself: the first presents time as subordinate to movement and to narrative, while the second makes of time itself a direct visual object that closes upon itself and opens onto contemplation. This precise distinction will subsequently become a vital theoretical instrument in analysing the temporal dimension of Cinemasterian performances.

Third: The Crisis of the Frame and the Digital Revolution — From the Screen to Space

For a century the rectangular frame of the cinema screen remained the limit that the medium did not exceed: what lies outside the frame does not exist, and what lies within it alone constitutes the cinematic world. Yet with the 1980s and 1990s, cinema began to feel the constriction of this obligatory frame when it was confronted with television, video, installation art, and interactive live performance.

In their pioneering book Remediation, Bolter and Grusin observed a fundamental mechanism in the development of media: every new

medium rests to some extent upon the ‘remediation’ of earlier media, retaining their memory while at the same time surpassing them. This is precisely what digital cinema did when it redefined the relationship between image, space, and spectator.

With the emergence of augmented reality, virtual reality, and immersive cinema, the traditional cinema screen began to lose its exclusive status as the sole vessel of the cinematic visual experience. It became possible for visual space to surround the audience on every side rather than being looked upon from without.

“Cinema did not die when television came, nor when video came, nor when the internet came — but on each occasion it changed and redefined what it meant. Artificial intelligence is not the killer of cinema; it is the most recent and the most profound of its transformations.”

— Elsaesser, T., & Hagener, M. (2010). Film Theory: An Introduction Through the Senses. Routledge, p. 183.

Hence, when the Cinemasterian experiments appeared, bringing together the living theatrical space and the cinematic image generated by artificial intelligence, they did not come out of a historical void — they came as the continuation of a long developmental path in which cinema

itself underwent a journey from the single screen towards multi-dimensional space.

Fourth. Auslander and the Crisis of 'Liveness' in the Age of Digitisation

Philip Auslander's book Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture is put forward as one of the most controversial theoretical interventions at the point of intersection between theatre and cinema. Auslander argues that the concept of 'liveness', which for so long distinguished theatre from cinema, no longer rests upon any solid ontological foundation in the age of digitisation.

For what is it that makes a theatrical performance depending for the most part upon LED screens, digitally generated images, and virtual performance 'live' in any essentially different sense from the cinematic film? The answer that Auslander offers is that liveness has become a matter of degree rather than a binary — a spectrum of presence and mediatisation rather than a sharp dividing line. This transformation in the definition of liveness is the philosophical ground from which Cinemasteria emerges as a medium existing upon that spectrum rather than at one of its extremes.

In the light of this dual analysis of theatre and cinema, what is required of Cinemasteria as a proposed medium becomes clear: that it should answer the deeper aesthetic question posed by Auslander, Lehmann, and Fischer-Lichte together — how can there exist an artistic performance that transcends the boundaries of the two media without abolishing them? And how can the experience of viewing combine theatrical physical presence, cinematic visual depth, and intelligent interactivity within a single unified moment?

*Section Two: The Development of the Audio-visual Medium
towards Cinemasteria*

When accelerating transformations befell the audio-visual medium during the past two decades — from the digitisation of production chains to the spread of digital platforms, from the growing role of algorithms in recommendation and framing to the proliferation of forms of live broadcasting and the instantaneous delivery of content — the gulf widened between the classical definitions of cinema on the one hand and emergent audio-visual practices on the other, until it became impossible to encompass this development by relying upon conceptual frameworks born before digitisation. What deepens this impossibility, perhaps, is that the transformation did not touch technology alone, but reached — more profoundly — the relationship between performance, body, screen, and spectator, thereby redrawing the map of the concepts upon which theories of the medium rested throughout the twentieth century.¹

Accordingly, this section treats the path of the development of the audio-visual medium across three interwoven axes. The first proceeds from the concept of performance as a pivotal concept for reading this transformation, inasmuch as it is the point at which the theatrical tradition intersects with the cinematic image, and from which both theatre and cinema return to their shared roots. The second axis deepens

André Bazin, *What Is Cinema?*, trans. Nabil Farouk, Arab Cultural Centre, Beirut, 2010, pp. 11–14. ¹
[in Arabic]

this path through an analysis of the screen as the space within which reception is constituted, and as the point of departure for the emergence of a new viewing experience no longer governed by the boundaries of the darkened auditorium nor even by the dominance of the domestic television set. The section concludes with the third axis, which treats the effect of the digital transformation in redrawing the boundaries of the medium itself, and in the birth of hybrid entities — such as Cinemasteria — that pose the question of classification anew.

Subsection One: Performance as a Pivotal Concept

Since the late 1950s, the concept of performance has attracted the attention of researchers belonging to widely separated disciplines: Victor Turner treated it as a social ritual, and Richard Schechner approached it from the standpoint of expanded theatrical behaviour, before the German philosopher Erika Fischer-Lichte addressed it as a comprehensive aesthetic framework making it possible to understand the full dynamic of the living scene — from the rhythm of the body, to the interaction of spectators with it, to the effects of lighting, sound, and movement in the production of meaning.²

Erika Fischer-Lichte, *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics*, trans. Saskya² Iris Jain (Routledge, London, 2008), pp. 17–28.

By performance, in this context, is meant not merely the act of representation before spectators, but rather that moment in which a collective act shared between performer and spectator is constituted within a single spatio-temporal domain. Cinema has long regarded this concept with theoretical caution, since it transmits performance and reproduces it, yet — according to the classical philosophical approach — does not embrace it in its immediate manifestation. Roland Barthes summarised this paradox when he distinguished between the ‘text of the spectacle’, which is lived by living corporeality, and the ‘text of viewing’, which is redistributed through a technical medium, noting that the passage between the two texts is never innocent but reconstitutes meaning on each occasion.

The thesis of this section, however, proceeds from the premise that performance is not confined within the limit drawn for it by classical cinema, but extends into the region in which cinematic practice intersects with theatrical practice — particularly when a film is re-presented within a living space that accommodates a present audience, or when cinematographic recording is integrated directly into the structure of a theatrical performance broadcast simultaneously to multiple screens. In both cases, the concept of performance returns to the forefront of analysis, because what produces meaning is no longer the film alone, but the entire

*network of relations between performer, cinematographer, screen, spectator, auditorium, and digital platform at one and the same time.*³

Performance thereby becomes a pivotal concept for deconstructing the relationship between cinema and theatre within digital space, in that it reveals that both media were, from the outset, dealing with a common material — the human body in a state of visible action — and that the difference lay not in the material itself but in the conditions of its presence. When these conditions change — with the appearance of recording first, then live broadcasting second, then algorithmic interaction third — performance changes in turn, and new questions are opened concerning the meaning of presence and absence, of authenticity and reproduction, of the single shot and the ramified shot.

Subsection Two: The Screen and the Emergence of a New Space of Reception

Theories of cinema have long regarded the screen as a ‘window’ or a ‘frame’ through which the spectator looks out upon the depicted world, as in Louis Delluc’s celebrated phrase describing the screen as a mental stage opening onto the world. Yet this understanding — for all its richness — did not in essence go beyond the limits of the traditional cinematic

Peggy Phelan, *Unmarked: The Politics of Performance* (Routledge, London, 1993), pp. 146–166.³

model, founded upon the relationship between the darkened auditorium and a single large image suspended upon a wall in front. When the screen is freed from this rigid spatial frame, it recovers the material dimension that institutional cinema long concealed, and poses anew the questions concerning the nature of the space within which reception is constructed.

In this context, Friedrich Kittler's observations concerning the 'material medium' of the screen acquire particular importance, in that he indicates that the screen was never a neutral surface but is rather an 'apparatus' that necessarily produces determinate conditions of seeing and hearing, and that the transformations occurring in its physical properties — in respect of size, number, illumination, position, and portability — necessarily give rise to transformations in the sensory structure of the spectator. The silver screen in the great auditorium, then the domestic television screen, then the laptop screen, then the smartphone screen, are but stages in a single historical gradation in which the spectator passes from collective immersion to mobile individual interaction.

This reading extends — as Lev Manovich observes — beyond the limits of the physical correspondence of the screen to what he terms the 'cultural logic' that each new screen carries. The giant screen in an IMAX

*auditorium, for example, reactivates the spectator's relationship to the classical cinematic performance while adapting it to the conditions of the contemporary body, whereas the smartphone screen produces an entirely different logic: the logic of browsing, of fragmentation, of rapid reading, and of perpetual interruption, in which the image competes for a scattered and divided attention.*⁴

When multiple screens are integrated into the structure of a single audio-visual work — as occurs in Cinemasterian performances — the classical question, ‘which screen produces the deeper experience?’, loses its meaning, since a new structure of interaction between screens is constituted which redefines what Jacques Rancière terms the ‘virtual space of the spectator’. The screen thus becomes, in addition to being a visual surface, an institution of reception, a stage for the interpenetration of the real, the simulated, and the augmented, and a marker of the emergence of a new aesthetic paradigm known neither to classical cinema nor to traditional theatre.

Subsection Three: The Digital Transformation and Its Effect in Redrawing the Boundaries of the Medium

Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001), pp. 27–48.⁴

The digital transformation was not a mere technical updating behind the scenes; it reformulated — at the level of the medium itself — the chain of relations binding the director to the performer, sound to image, and audience to screen. With the passage of the film industry from the filmic to the digital format, from narrow cinema auditoria to open platforms, and from the model of linear consumption to that of ramified access, the ‘medium’ was no longer a fixed given but became a dynamic structure susceptible to continual reconstitution. Henry Jenkins indicates that what we are witnessing is ‘convergence culture’ par excellence, in which cinema intersects with television, video games, live performance, and social networks within a single audio-visual fabric.

The dimensions of this transformation become clearer still if we note that cinema was traditionally defined by a set of interlocking institutional, technical, and aesthetic characteristics: recording by camera, the linear construction of the story, collective exhibition in a darkened auditorium, a rhythm controlled by the editor, and the presence of a silent spectator. Yet these characteristics are no longer necessarily interlocking within the digital environment, since a single audio-visual performance may be broadcast live, recorded, edited, and redistributed across different

*platforms, and may bring together at one and the same time an audience physically present and an audience dispersed across digital space.*⁵

This transformation has produced — alongside the erosion of the boundaries between media — what may be termed the ‘diminution of the authority of the single medium’ in favour of a new logic permitting the generation of hybrid experiences. Filmed theatrical performances broadcast live, films screened within performance spaces, and performance works that incorporate narrative or virtual-reality-enhanced cinematic elements have all become — in Georges Didi-Huberman’s expression — manifestations of the ‘post-theatricality of theatre’ and the ‘post-cinematicity of cinema’ at one and the same time, which calls for a profound revision of the concepts adopted by theories of media in the twentieth century.

It is precisely within this context that Cinemasteria derives its justification for existence as a name for a new audio-visual mode, reducible neither to cinema nor to theatre, but operating upon their margins. When performance is reconceived as a multi-layered act, the screen as a ramified space, and the medium as a structure open to continual updating, there arises an epistemological need for a designation

André Gaudreault and Philippe Marion, *The End of Cinema? A Medium in Crisis in the Digital Age*⁵ (Columbia University Press, New York, 2015), pp. 13–32.

that gathers these elements within a single conceptual entity. The matter here is not merely a claim to the founding of a new academic classification, but is rather — in Pierre Lévy's terms — an acknowledgement that modern classifications are no longer necessarily unitary, but have become hybrid structures describing hybrid experiences.⁶

It emerges from the foregoing that the development of the audio-visual medium towards Cinemasteria is not a unidirectional path represented in a simple technical succession, but rather a ramified path in which the classical concepts — performance, screen, and medium — acquire new charges under renewed digital conditions. This is what makes the following section concerned with the applied manifestations of this development, and with the study of the forms in which Cinemasteria is crystallised as a unified artistic entity possessing its own independent aesthetic characteristics.

Pierre Lévy, *Les technologies intellectuelles: une tentative de définition suivie de l'hypertexte*, un ⁶ nouveau média pour la connaissance (Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, Paris, 1990), pp. 11–25.

Conclusion

At the close of this study, it becomes apparent that a subject which began, on the surface, as a technical question concerning the employment of algorithms in artistic production in fact conceals within its depths questions of a far more fundamental order: what is creativity? What is the human being in confrontation with the machine? And which artistic form is the most capable of accommodating these questions and of embodying them aesthetically?

In its first chapter, the study revealed that artificial intelligence did not come to cinema and theatre out of a void, but arrived rather as the culmination of a long evolutionary path in which technology and aesthetics have been intertwined from the invention of the camera to the revolution of CGI and deep learning; and that the present employment of this technology across the three stages of production — pre-production, production, and post-production — is redrawing the map of creative work in the audio-visual art industry in a manner that no previous historical moment has known.

In its second chapter, the study demonstrated that the convergence of theatre and cinema within a new hybrid medium is not an incidental phenomenon but rather an inevitable outcome of structural

transformations that have affected the concepts of performance and of the screen alike; and that the term ‘Cinemasteria’ merits recognition as an independent medium, because it embodies an aesthetic entity possessing its own poetics, its own logic, and its own nascent conventions, which cannot be reduced to its antecedent components.

As for the third chapter, it made clear that Cinemasteria, in its applied manifestations, offers the spectator a unique experience in which temporal and sensory layers are multiplied, in which authorship is distributed, and in which the possibility of actual participation in the making of the performance is opened up; and that the ethical considerations associated with this medium are not obstacles standing in the way of its potential, but rather frameworks that guarantee that the human being remains at the heart of the system and not at its margins.

The study affirms, in conclusion, that the future awaiting Cinemasteria is not traced along a single line, but branches out into several paths determined by the aesthetic, ethical, and political choices made today by artists, researchers, and legislators. Hence academic study in this field acquires its practical importance: it does not merely record what has taken place, but contributes to charting what may yet take place.

Findings

- *Artificial intelligence in cinematic and theatrical production represents the fourth stage in the history of cinematic technology, moving beyond practical effects, computer-generated imagery (CGI), and digitisation techniques towards a structural participation in the making of the artistic work itself, rather than in its embellishment or its support.*
- *Artificial intelligence does not operate within the cinematic and theatrical context in a single manner, but along a graduated spectrum extending from the simple tool to the participating generative system; its aesthetic and ethical value is determined by the level at which it is employed and by the awareness of the human creator who directs it.*
- *The necessity of the term ‘Cinemasteria’ has been established for the purpose of describing the hybrid medium arising from the convergence of theatre, cinema, and artificial intelligence, since the prevailing terms — cinematic theatre, composite media, and*

intermedial performance — have proved incapable of encompassing its aesthetic specificity and its independent existence.

- *The poetics of Cinemasteria rests upon seven integrated and essential characteristics: hybrid presence, multiplied time, structural interactivity, distributed authorship, dual medial awareness, a non-linear viewing experience, and ethical openness — and these characteristics combine to produce an aesthetic experience that neither of the two media affords on its own.*
- *The study has established that cultural bias within generative artificial intelligence systems is a structural rather than a superficial bias, one that requires to be addressed through the construction of culturally diverse training data rather than through the mere adjustment of outputs; failing which artificial intelligence will remain a vehicle of Western cultural hegemony in a modern technical guise.*
- *The study has revealed that the problems of intellectual property, of creative labour, and of the authenticity of the artistic work within the Cinemasterian context have not yet been resolved, either legislatively or theoretically, and that the present legal void exposes*

the rights of human creators to violation on an increasing scale as the employment of artificial intelligence expands.

- *The study has concluded that the ‘integrative vision’ constitutes the most appropriate framework for the relationship between artificial intelligence and the human creator within Cinemasteria: artificial intelligence extends the possibilities available to the creator without taking his place, while the purposes of the performance, its meanings, and its position within cultural dialogue remain contingent upon human creative will.*
- *The study has established that Cinemasteria possesses promising potential beyond the Western centre — particularly within the Arab context, which carries a long-established performative and narrative heritage — yet the realisation of this potential is conditional upon building the technical and financial infrastructure and the specialised cadres that combine technical competence with cultural depth.*
- *The study has arrived at a fundamental philosophical conclusion: Cinemasteria, as a hybrid medium, does not close off the major aesthetic questions but rather poses them anew within a contemporary context — the questions of authorship, of*

authenticity, of presence, and of reception — and in this sense it is not the end of the history of the medium but its most novel beginning.

Recommendations

- *Calling upon academic researchers in the field of cinematic and theatrical studies to adopt Cinemasteria as an independent field of research, and to establish specialised study programmes bringing together the theory of the performing arts, computer science, artificial intelligence, and aesthetic philosophy.*
- *Directing legislative and rights bodies towards the establishment of clear legal frameworks that regulate the ownership of content*

generated by artificial intelligence in artistic production, and that safeguard the rights of the human creators whose creative heritage is employed in the training of intelligent systems.

- *Urging the development of Arab, African, and Asian cultural training data for the generative intelligent systems employed in artistic production, and the funding of regional research initiatives that address cultural bias within these systems at its roots.*
- *Encouraging cultural institutions, theatres, and Arab arts funds to allocate support programmes for experimental Cinemasterian projects led by Arab artists, thereby contributing to the building of Cinemasterian traditions that carry an authentic cultural identity.*
- *Adopting the principle of ‘aesthetic transparency’ as a binding ethical standard in Cinemasterian performances: creators should disclose clearly, to their audiences and to their funding institutions, the extent to which artificial intelligence has been employed in their performances.*
- *Calling upon universities and institutes of the arts to develop training curricula that prepare a new generation of artists capable of engaging with artificial intelligence as a conscious creative*

instrument, and not as a purely technical tool or an existential threat to be feared.

- *Recommending that theatre, cinema, and performing arts bodies include Cinemasteria within their official classifications and within the categories of their festivals, so as to allow these experiments to appear, to circulate, and to be critically evaluated within recognised cultural space.*
- *Harnessing Cinemasterian experiments as a space for dialogue between the generations: the older artistic generations, which carry cultural depth and performative heritage, and the younger generations, which are adept at employing technology — so as to produce performances that hold root and horizon in balance.*
- *Working towards the establishment of a specialised international research network in Cinemasteria in which Arab, African, and Asian universities are actively represented, so as to ensure that this emerging field of knowledge takes shape in accordance with multiple cultural perspectives rather than with a single, monocultural vision.*

References

Arabic References

- 1- Badr, Abdel-Karim. (2017). *Theatre and Cinema: The Dialectic of the Two Media*. *Arab Journal of Communication Sciences*, 4(2), pp. 22–44. [in Arabic]
- 2- Hassan, Sarah. (2022). *The Digital Shaping of Cinematic Space: Towards a New Concept of the Visual Experience*. *Arab Cinema Journal*, 8(1), pp. 67–89. [in Arabic]
- 3- Zain Al-Abidin, Mohamed; & Hassan, Sarah. (2021). *The Virtual Actor Produced by Artificial Intelligence and Its Effect upon the Experience of the Cinematic Spectator*. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 2(4), pp. 87–114. [in Arabic]
- 4- Salman, Tarek Abdel-Aziz. (2022). *The Employment of Artificial Intelligence in Screenwriting and Its Effect upon Dramatic Structure*. *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Sociology*, (81), pp. 192–210. [in Arabic]
- 5- Farid, Reham Abdullah. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence Technologies in Theatrical Production: Visual Design, Lighting Management, and*

Live Effects. Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Arts — Damietta University, 23(1), pp. 345–382. [in Arabic]

Foreign References

- 1– Aristotle. (1996). *Poetics*. Translated by M. Heath. Penguin Books.
- 2– Artaud, A. (1958). *The Theatre and Its Double*. Translated by M. C. Richards. Grove Press.
- 3– Auslander, P. (1999). *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*. Routledge.
- 4– Barthes, R. (1977). *The Death of the Author*. In *Image, Music, Text*. Translated by S. Heath. Fontana Press, pp. 142–148.
- 5– Bazin, A. (2005). *What Is Cinema? Vol. 1*. Translated by H. Gray. University of California Press.
- 6– Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Polity Press.
- 7– Bolter, J. D., & Grusin, R. (1999). *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. MIT Press.
- 8– Bordwell, D. (1989). *Making Meaning: Inference and Rhetoric in the Interpretation of Cinema*. Harvard University Press.

- 9- Bordwell, D., & Thompson, K. (2020). *Film Art: An Introduction* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- 10- Brecht, B. (1964). *Brecht on Theatre*. Translated by J. Willett. Methuen.
- 11- Brook, P. (1968). *The Empty Space*. Simon & Schuster.
- 12- Casetti, F. (2015). *The Lumière Galaxy: Seven Key Words for the Cinema to Come*. Columbia University Press.
- 13- Deleuze, G. (1986). *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. University of Minnesota Press.
- 14- Deleuze, G. (1989). *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. University of Minnesota Press.
- 15- Eisenstein, S. (1977). *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*. Edited and translated by J. Leyda. Harcourt.
- 16- Elsaesser, T. (2018). *Film History as Media Archaeology: Tracking Digital Cinema*. Amsterdam University Press.
- 17- Elsaesser, T., & Hagener, M. (2010). *Film Theory: An Introduction Through the Senses*. Routledge.

- 18- Feigl, A., & Stamer, P. (2022). *Machine Creativity in Theatre: Case Studies in AI-Driven Performance and Audience Interaction*. *Theatre Research International*, 47(2), 148–167.
- 19- Fischer-Lichte, E. (2008). *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics*. Routledge.
- 20- Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). *Deep Learning*. MIT Press.
- 21- Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., & Bengio, Y. (2014). *Generative Adversarial Nets*. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 27.
- 22- Gurevitch, L. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence in Film Production: Automation, Creativity, and the Future of Cinematic Authorship*. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 26(4), 865–881.
- 23- Huang, S., & Rust, R. T. (2018). *Artificial Intelligence in Service*. *Journal of Service Research*, 21(2), 155–172.
- 24- Laffly, T. (2022). *Algorithmic Films and Post-Human Authorship*. Edinburgh University Press.

- 25- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). *Deep Learning*. *Nature*, 521(7553), 436–444.
- 26- Lehmann, H.-T. (2006). *Postdramatic Theatre*. Translated by K. Jürs-Munby. Routledge.
- 27- Manovich, L. (2001). *The Language of New Media*. MIT Press.
- 28- Manovich, L. (2020). *Cultural Analytics*. MIT Press.
- 29- Mulvey, L. (1975). *Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema*. *Screen*, 16(3), 6–18.
- 30- Murch, W. (2001). *In the Blink of an Eye: A Perspective on Film Editing* (2nd ed.). Silman-James Press.
- 31- Pavis, P. (2016). *Dictionnaire de la performance et du théâtre contemporain*. Armand Colin.
- 32- Phillips, D. (2021). *Digital De-aging and the Ethics of Cinematic Performance*. *Journal of Film and Video*, 73(2), 3–18.
- 33- Prince, S. (2012). *Digital Visual Effects in Cinema: The Seduction of Reality*. Rutgers University Press.
- 34- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2022). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

- 35– SAG–AFTRA. (2023). *AI Provisions in the 2023 Contracts: Summary and Analysis*. SAG–AFTRA.
- 36– Stam, R. (2000). *Film Theory: An Introduction*. Blackwell.
- 37– Stanislavski, K. (2008). *An Actor’s Work*. Translated by J. Benedetti. Routledge.
- 38– Writers Guild of America. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Creative Work: WGA Position Paper*. WGA West.
- 39– Zain Al–Abidin, M., & Hassan, S. (2021). *The Virtual Actor and Its Effect on the Cinematic Spectator’s Experience*. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 2(4), 87–114.