

Argument

1. We should work in science domains. We make the dual argument that:
 - (a) Researchers in CC would benefit from applying their work to scientific domains.
 - i. there is “low hanging fruit” there. (Some) aspects of (some) sciences are very close to the arts domains. We argue that this is the case in geology and maths.
 - ii. the bits that are different to the arts will lead to interesting developments in CC (trigger for progress, eg in methodology/evaluation)
 - iii. The arts domains *may* reach a saturation point for CC. The novelty of computer-generated art may wear off. In any event, other parts of AI (constructive ML) are already taking over the generative aspects of our subject. In order to keep the field alive we would need to (a) focus on other aspects of creativity [see our framing paper]; (b) find other domains to apply our work to (as argued in this paper).
 - (b) Researchers in scientific domains would benefit from CC applications to their work.
 - i. ML is being increasingly used in science. [evidence]
 - ii. But, ML is limited and can be wrong: “crisis in science”. replicability, understandability, explanation, predictability, [does FACE reflect the scientific method? what is the scientific method now? what are values in science?]
2. Here’s how to do it.

A series of concrete recommendations for people.

 - (a) How to collaborate: Team up with a domain expert. problem of where to publish/how to fund.
 - (b)
 - (c) How to evaluate: cf Anna, Graeme, FACE
3. Two visions:

how it would work in maths/geology. what would it take to have a mixed initiative collaborator?