NEW LITERARIA-
An International Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities
Volume 7, No. 2, January-February, 2026, PP. 96-104
ISSN: 2582-7375
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.48189/nl.2026.v07i2.013
www.newliteraria.com

# Crisis Trained: How American AI Is Learning from Science Fiction

Lars R. "Jones" Vadjina
University of Tübingen, Germany

**Abstract**
As artificial intelligence increasingly mediates how societies anticipate and respond to crises, it becomes essential to interrogate the narratives that shape these systems. This paper examines how American cultural imaginaries, particularly those rooted in science fiction, influence the design, deployment, and ethical orientation of AI systems under conditions of uncertainty.

Contemporary AI models do not operate in a vacuum. While trained on massive datasets, their development is deeply intertwined with techno-political narratives, often drawn from speculative fiction. These imaginaries provide more than entertainment; they function as algorithmic blueprints for how AI is expected to act in moments of systemic breakdown, whether pandemics, civil unrest, ecological collapse, or extraterrestrial encounters. From predictive policing software echoing dystopian surveillance tropes to military AI guided by threat models inspired by science-fiction war games, American AI increasingly performs crisis as cultural performance.

Drawing on case studies such as LLMs simulating post-apocalyptic scenarios and public discourse around "rogue AI," shaped by decades of media tropes, the author explores how science fiction functions as an informal training ground for algorithms and their creators. This raises urgent ethical questions: What futures are we coding into our machines? Whose crises are being centered, and whose are omitted? Can speculative narratives be reclaimed not only as mirrors of fear, but as ethical sandboxes for designing more pluralistic and humane AI futures?

This paper proposes a critical framework for understanding algorithmic imagination and argues that we must reckon not just with what our technologies do but with what they have been taught to expect.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, Science Fiction, Crisis Narratives, Ethics and Technology, American Cultural Imaginaries.

## 1. Introduction - The Cultural Training of AI

Artificial intelligence is often described as an objective mirror of the world: a technology

**Article History:** Received: 26 Nov 2025. Revised: 17 January 2026. Accepted: 29 December 2025. First published: 01st February, 2026.



**Published by**: Adrija Press, India.

**Citation:** Vadjina, Lars R. "Jones". (2026). Crisis Trained: How American AI Is Learning from Science Fiction. *Newliteraria Journal* 7:2, 96-104. https://dx.doi.org/10.48189/nl.2026.v07i2.012

trained on data, indifferent to culture. Yet, the datasets that feed contemporary AI systems are not neutral repositories of information. They are saturated with the language, images, and assumptions of the societies that produced them. In the American context, those cultural codes are inseparable from a long tradition of crisis storytelling, from Cold War apocalypses and pandemic thrillers to algorithmic dystopias where machines turn against their makers. AI, in this sense, is learning not only from text and code but also from imagination itself.

Over the past decade, AI has become the primary interface through which societies perceive and manage uncertainty. From predictive policing to climate modeling and public-health forecasting, intelligent systems now mediate how crises are recognized, categorized, and prioritized. But these systems do not simply respond to crisis; they perform it. Their design choices, what counts as risk, what qualifies as a threat, and who is rendered visible, echo the narrative logics embedded in American science fiction. Each model carries within it a residue of cultural expectation: a tacit script about how intelligence should behave when the world is on fire.

This convergence of storytelling and system design raises urgent ethical questions. If algorithmic reasoning inherits its moral vocabulary from fiction, then the future of AI depends on what kinds of stories we have told about fear, control, and salvation. Science fiction has long been the American arena for negotiating those anxieties. It trains audiences and now, indirectly, algorithms to anticipate catastrophe, to valorize technical mastery, and to equate survival with domination. In moments of crisis, both human and machine actors draw upon these learned templates, reproducing familiar hierarchies of power and exclusion.

The result is a feedback loop between cultural narrative and computational logic. When Hollywood blockbusters imagine omniscient systems like Skynet or HAL 9000, they plant ethical blueprints that influence how engineers and policymakers conceptualize autonomy and responsibility. Conversely, as AI research operationalizes those ideas, it reinforces the very tropes that inspired it. What was once speculative fiction becomes a self-fulfilling infrastructure.

This article argues that American science-fiction imaginaries function as an informal training layer for contemporary AI. They provide the emotional grammar through which machines are taught to interpret crisis, risk, and resilience. Understanding this relationship is not merely an academic exercise; it is a prerequisite for ethical innovation. By tracing how cultural narratives shape algorithmic behavior, we can identify where technical design replicates historical biases, and where it might instead enable more plural futures.

Three guiding questions frame the discussion:

1. How do crisis narratives from American popular culture influence the design and ethical orientation of AI systems?
2. Whose crises are represented in these imaginaries, and whose experiences remain excluded?
3. Can speculative storytelling be reclaimed as a tool for ethical foresight rather than dystopian rehearsal?

Positioned at the intersection of American Studies, media theory, and AI ethics, this study approaches artificial intelligence as a cultural artifact as much as a technical one. The following sections examine how U.S. crisis fiction has evolved into a cognitive template for machine behavior, how those stories inform real-world applications from surveillance to simulation, and how alternative narrative traditions might help reprogram our collective imagination.

If AI is, in part, a reflection of the stories we tell, then ethical design begins with narrative awareness. To change the trajectory of intelligent systems, we must first revisit the cultural curriculum that taught them how to think under pressure.

## 2. Crisis as a Narrative Condition

In contemporary discourse, "crisis" functions less as a discrete event than as a condition of perception. It structures how societies interpret uncertainty, determining which disruptions count as emergencies and which fade into background noise. The language of crisis shapes time itself: it compresses the present, suspends the future, and demands immediate resolution. This temporal contraction produces what theorists from Reinhart Koselleck to Naomi Klein have described as the politics of emergency, a state in which every problem must be solved before it can be understood. Artificial intelligence, with its promise of predictive control, thrives within that compressed horizon.

From an American cultural standpoint, crisis is also a narrative genre. The nation's historical self-image, for instance, revolutionary struggle, frontier endurance, and technological triumph, has been repeatedly retold as stories of threat and recovery. Each generation rehearses collapse to reaffirm resilience. Science fiction translates this cultural reflex into speculative form, offering scripts for managing breakdown through ingenuity, sacrifice, or domination. The genre's recurring motifs, like nuclear winters, rogue machines, and environmental collapse, have become symbolic shorthand for existential risk. As these stories circulate through film, literature, and games, they accumulate into a shared archive of what "crisis" looks and feels like. This archive now informs the metaphors guiding AI research and deployment. When developers describe systems as "learning to survive," "adapting under pressure," or "mitigating catastrophic failure," they echo narrative logics first popularized in fiction. The very act of modeling risk computationally mirrors the storytelling impulse to simulate outcomes, to imagine the worst in order to prevent it. In both cases, anticipation becomes a form of control. The machine's prediction is a narrative condensed into code.

Understanding crisis as a narrative also reveals its selective visibility. Certain dangers, such as terrorism, pandemics, and technological rebellion, receive cinematic elaboration, while others, such as systemic inequality or slow ecological decay, remain narratively underrepresented. These asymmetries matter because AI systems trained on cultural data inherit not only factual information but also patterns of attention. They learn which crises are spectacular and which are silent. When predictive algorithms prioritize sudden disruption over chronic harm, they replicate the narrative economy of contemporary media. To approach AI ethically, we must therefore treat a crisis not simply as input but as story architecture. Every model encodes assumptions about what constitutes danger, who requires protection, and what solutions are thinkable. Recognizing this narrative substrate allows us to see artificial intelligence as a continuation of cultural storytelling by other means, a technology that both performs and perpetuates crisis imaginaries.

In this sense, the challenge is not merely to build systems that respond more effectively to emergencies but to cultivate narrative literacy within technological design. Only by questioning how the crisis has been constructed in American imagination can we begin to program responses that move beyond the familiar tropes of heroism, control, and fear. The following section explores how science fiction became the laboratory for this narrative rehearsal and how its crisis scenarios migrated from page and screen into the architecture of machine learning.

## 3. Science Fiction as America's Crisis Laboratory

Science fiction has long served as the United States' preferred medium for staging technological anxiety and moral experimentation. More than a genre of entertainment, it operates as an ethical simulator, a space where societies rehearse potential futures, test the boundaries of control, and imagine the consequences of innovation gone awry. From the pulp magazines of the early twentieth century to contemporary cinematic universes, American science fiction has functioned as a cognitive sandbox for managing crisis.

Its emergence coincided with moments of profound transformation. The atomic age, the Cold War, and the space race all expanded the temporal and moral horizons of crisis. Suddenly, apocalypse was no longer a divine punishment or a natural disaster; it was human-made, calculable, and preventable through technology. Writers like Isaac Asimov, Arthur C. Clarke, and Ursula K. Le Guin treated science and ethics as parallel systems: both sought to understand how intelligence, human or artificial, might navigate moral uncertainty. The figure of the machine, whether benevolent or rebellious, became a mirror for national identity, dramatizing tensions between freedom and control, progress and responsibility.

By mid-century, the genre had established a template that continues to shape contemporary discourse. The typical American crisis narrative begins with a technological breakthrough, followed by unintended consequences, escalating chaos, and eventual restoration through ingenuity or sacrifice. This arc, repeated endlessly across novels and films, transformed technology into both hero and villain. Each story taught audiences to expect salvation from the very forces that endangered them. As the twenty-first century approached, the laboratory of science fiction began to merge with the laboratories of actual innovation. Silicon Valley entrepreneurs and defense agencies alike adopted the language and aesthetics of speculative storytelling. The feedback loop tightened: engineers grew up on the fictions of their predecessors, and those fictions, in turn, drew inspiration from new technologies. Companies such as SpaceX, OpenAI, and Palantir now describe their missions in the same aspirational, world-saving rhetoric once reserved for pulp heroes. "Disruption" became the secularized version of revelation. In this convergence, the crisis ceased to be hypothetical. Post-9/11 security culture, climate emergencies, and pandemics turned the scenarios of science fiction into lived experience. The genre's imaginative vocabulary, containment, contagion, extinction, resilience, migrated into public policy and algorithmic design. Government agencies funded simulation models that functioned much like speculative narratives, projecting alternate timelines of collapse and recovery. The line between narrative rehearsal and technical prototyping blurred.

American science fiction's distinctive contribution to this process lies in its performative optimism: even in the face of catastrophes, it reaffirms faith in ingenuity and moral clarity. In most Hollywood apocalypses, the end of the world is an opportunity for renewal. It is an arena where individual virtue redeems collective failure. These moral geometries influence how AI systems are conceptualized and deployed. Algorithms are cast as rational problem-solvers in a world of irrational threats; errors become redemption arcs rather than ethical breakdowns. This moral structure also shapes what remains unseen. When crises are consistently framed as battles between reason and chaos, intelligence and instinct, they obscure slow violence, structural inequality, and ecological degradation. The tendency to externalize crisis, to imagine it as a sudden invasion rather than a chronic condition, has direct implications for how AI systems allocate attention and resources. A predictive model trained on such cultural assumptions may identify the spectacular but overlook the systemic.

Understanding science fiction as America's crisis laboratory reveals the continuity between narrative imagination and technical design. Both rely on iterative simulation, feedback loops, and hypothetical outcomes. Both operate under conditions of uncertainty. However, one key difference remains: fiction acknowledges its speculative nature, while technology often denies it. By importing narrative templates into engineering without recognizing their origins, AI developers risk enacting old stories as new infrastructures. Recognizing this dynamic allows for a crucial shift in perspective. If science fiction has trained machines and their creators to respond to crises through the repetition of familiar tropes, then reimagining those tropes becomes an ethical imperative. The laboratory of the future must not only test new technologies but also rewrite the stories that shape them.

The next section examines how this narrative inheritance manifests in real-world applications, tracing the migration of speculative tropes into the design of predictive policing, military decision systems, and generative AI models, technologies that increasingly determine how societies perceive and perform crisis.

**When Fiction Writes the Code**

If science fiction is America's crisis laboratory, then artificial intelligence is the experiment that escaped it. The stories once confined to novels and cinema now materialize as living systems: algorithms that predict, generate, and decide. These systems may operate through mathematics, but they are structured by myth. The design metaphors and moral architectures of AI echo decades of speculative imagination, revealing how deeply narrative expectations inform technological development.

One striking example is predictive policing, a field that openly borrows from the logic of anticipation central to science fiction. In films like *Minority Report* (2002), crime is prevented before it happens through preemptive data surveillance, a concept that once felt dystopian but now underpins real-world policing software. These algorithms are trained on historical crime data, inheriting the biases of the very societies they claim to neutralize. What was once a cinematic warning has become a bureaucratic tool. The fiction that warned against determinism has been repurposed as justification for it. The future, as imagined, became policy.

Another case emerges from military and defense technologies, where simulation and storytelling merge seamlessly. The U.S. Department of Defense has long used war games to anticipate geopolitical scenarios. In the 21st century, such exercises increasingly rely on AI models trained to simulate human decision-making. Nevertheless, these models are not purely analytical. Those models are narrative engines. They operationalize speculative futures, performing what Paul Dourish and Genevieve Bell might call the "mythology of control." AI becomes a stage for rehearsing existential drama, cast in the moral language of American exceptionalism. The code performs ideology: deterrence, dominance, and perpetual readiness.

Even large language models like ChatGPT, while seemingly neutral, carry this narrative inheritance. They are trained on the textual residues of collective imagination, such as stories, headlines, dialogues, and scripts. When such systems generate new content about a crisis or apocalypse, they are not just extrapolating data but also replaying cultural memories. The algorithm's voice echoes the archive of its civilization. It knows how a crisis *should* sound, even when it cannot understand the meaning of the crisis itself. In that sense, these systems are less tools of prediction than mirrors of anticipation. Basically, those machines are performing what we expect intelligence to feel like.

Across these examples, fiction functions as an epistemic rehearsal: a way of testing ethical and emotional responses to the unknown. But when these speculative rehearsals harden into code, they risk becoming self-fulfilling prophecies. A system trained to detect a threat will always find it. A model built to optimize efficiency will, by design, neglect empathy. The narrative logic of crisis, meaning anticipate, intervene, survive, translates into algorithmic behavior that prioritizes control over care.

From an anthropological perspective, this migration from story to system reveals a profound continuity between symbolic and technical labor. Both fiction writers and data scientists construct worlds through abstraction. Both decide what counts as relevant, what constitutes noise, and whose perspectives are represented. Yet, in AI, this act of worldbuilding is often mistaken for neutrality. The narrative frame disappears behind the authority of computation. As a result, cultural bias becomes encoded epistemology.

Scholars like Meredith Broussard and Safiya Noble have shown how these systems, rather than erasing inequality, often entrench it. But beyond the well-known problem of bias lies a subtler phenomenon: algorithmic mythmaking. This is the process by which AI systems inherit not just data, but the affective charge of the stories that trained them. The trope of the "rogue AI," the fantasy of "machine salvation," and the obsession with optimization each function as cultural scripts that inform real design goals and policy decisions. When these myths are left unexamined, they shape development trajectories more powerfully than ethics guidelines ever could.

The results, then, are more than just technical. Those results become narrative. AI becomes a storytelling medium through which societies negotiate anxiety, hope, and identity. Its datasets record what we feared, desired, and tried to control. In that sense, every output from a generative model is an anthropological artifact, a reflection of cultural consciousness filtered through probability. The crisis-training of AI is less about preparing machines for emergencies than about teaching them how humanity narrates survival. To understand artificial intelligence ethically, we must therefore read it literarily. The algorithms we build are not autonomous; they are authored. Each reflects an inheritance of imagination, encoded in data and reinforced through design. Recognizing that inheritance is the first step toward changing it. The stories we teach our machines today will determine the futures they help us build tomorrow.

## 5. Ethical and Cultural Implications

To see artificial intelligence as both a technical and cultural construct is to confront a brutal truth: ethics cannot simply be engineered. Despite the growing enthusiasm for "ethical AI," most initiatives still treat ethics as a checklist, as an auxiliary process applied after development, rather than an epistemic foundation that shapes it. However, if AI inherits its logics from cultural narratives, as this paper suggests, then ethical alignment must begin not with compliance frameworks but with the stories that guide design itself.

American technological culture has long been animated by what Sheila Jasanoff and Sang-Hyun Kim call sociotechnical imaginaries*,* collective visions of progress that bind innovation to moral destiny. From the space race to Silicon Valley, each new frontier has been narrated as both inevitable and redemptive. Artificial intelligence now occupies that same symbolic terrain, cast as humanity's next great emancipator or its final adversary. These opposing myths, utopia and apocalypse, create a moral binary that obscures more than it clarifies. They simplify complex realities into familiar narrative shapes, making AI seem autonomous, fated, and beyond human negotiation. The ethical consequence of this mythic framing is what we might call the illusion of inevitability. When AI is portrayed as an unstoppable force, responsibility disperses. Engineers become mere implementers, policymakers react to hype cycles, and citizens are told to adapt rather than deliberate. This is the cultural residue of techno-determinism: the sense that machines evolve according to their own logic, while humans merely adjust to their outcomes. The result is a depoliticization of technology, an erasure of agency under the guise of progress. To counter this, ethics must move beyond the discourse of "responsible innovation" toward what could be termed narrative literacy: the ability to recognize, analyze, and reshape the stories embedded in our technologies.

.

Narrative literacy treats ethical reflection not as a procedural step but as a creative act, as a process of storytelling that makes moral assumptions visible. It asks not only what a system does, but what kind of world it assumes and reproduces.

This perspective reframes ethics as foresight: a discipline of imagination rather than regulation. Foresight, as used in critical futures studies, is less about prediction and more about possibility, meaning the cultivation of multiple, plural futures instead of the linear inevitability promised by the "AI revolution." By applying this lens to machine learning, we can begin to imagine systems that embody humility rather than hubris, adaptability rather than domination.

Cultural anthropology, media studies, and speculative design already provide methods for this shift. Participatory storytelling workshops, speculative prototyping, and community-driven data narratives invite diverse publics to co-author the technological futures that affect them. These practices resist the centralization of narrative authority in corporate labs and government agencies, where "the future" is often a managed product rather than a shared horizon. Paul Dourish and Genevieve Bell observed, the myths of ubiquitous computing were not accidental; they were design tools that shaped entire industries. Today, those myths persist in the rhetoric of "smart" everything. To unlearn them requires creating alternative imaginaries, grounded in justice, ecology, and interdependence.

Such a reframing also exposes a deeper ethical dimension: the temporal politics of AI. Machine learning compresses time, converting the open-ended flow of human experience into patterns of prediction. This temporal flattening has moral consequences. It privileges efficiency over reflection, speed over care, and optimization over uncertainty. To design ethically in this context means to resist the cult of acceleration, to reintroduce time for judgment, empathy, and dissent. Ethics, in this sense, becomes a form of temporal resistance. Moreover, the global diffusion of AI technologies demands what might be called cultural interoperability: the recognition that ethical reasoning is not universal but contextual. What counts as fairness, transparency, or harm varies across societies, languages, and epistemologies. A single global code of AI ethics risks replicating the same imperial logic it seeks to prevent. Instead, ethical governance should resemble an ecology rather than a hierarchy, one that values local knowledge, indigenous epistemologies, and situated expertise as vital to technological decision-making.

In this light, AI becomes not only a technical infrastructure but also a moral common: a shared terrain where the values of a civilization are negotiated through code, data, and discourse. To safeguard that commons, we must cultivate both ethical imagination and cultural humility, qualities that cannot be programmed but must be practiced. The humanities, far from being peripheral to this task, provide the interpretive tools and critical reflexivity necessary to sustain those practices.

Finally, the question is not whether AI can be ethical, but whether we, as its creators and custodians, can sustain an ethical relationship to our own imagination. The stories we tell about intelligence, whether divine, artificial, or collective, shape the boundaries of what we believe possible. In that sense, ethics begins not in the laboratory but in the imagination: in the stories we are willing to challenge, rewrite, and share.

## 6. Conclusion - Toward Narrative Foresight

Every age builds its technologies from the materials of its imagination. Ours happens to imagine through machines. Yet even the most advanced algorithm is still a cultural artifact, a mirror polished with data, reflecting not only what we know but what we fear, desire, and refuse to confront. Artificial intelligence, in this light, is not the alien intelligence it is often portrayed to be; it is a concentrated form of human storytelling, reassembled into pattern recognition. What it learns from us is not merely correlation but conviction.

Throughout this paper, I have argued that American AI is not simply trained on information; it is trained on imagination. The narratives that surround it, from cinematic apocalypses to Silicon Valley manifestos, form an invisible curriculum for how AI is designed, deployed, and justified. These stories teach machines, and their makers, how to act under pressure: how to define crisis, how to allocate trust, and how to measure survival. To understand the ethics of AI, then, is to understand the stories through which a culture rehearses its anxieties and aspirations.

Seen this way, the task before us is not to banish fiction from technology but to recognize its power and responsibility. Fiction has always been a form of prototyping, a way of asking what if long before we could build the answer. The problem arises when we mistake fiction for fate. The apocalyptic tales of runaway AI or the techno-utopian promises of digital salvation are not inevitable outcomes; they are cultural choices. Each reflects a selective reading of history, emphasizing mastery over humility, disruption over continuity. By exposing these narrative biases, we open the possibility for more plural and participatory futures.

We are now at a time where narrative foresight becomes essential. Foresight, as an ethical and methodological stance, invites us to imagine futures critically rather than catastrophically. It acknowledges that the future is not a singular destination to be predicted, but a landscape of potentialities to be explored. Within AI development, narrative foresight means designing systems that are aware of their own metaphors, machines that do not simply calculate outcomes but reveal the assumptions behind them. It means embedding reflective storytelling into the design process itself: asking who benefits, who decides, and whose realities are being simulated or erased. Such a reframing is more than theoretical. It offers a practical ethics of imagination. By treating stories as infrastructure, we can build technologies that are resilient precisely because they are self-aware. Systems designed through narrative foresight would not strive for perfect control but for adaptive dialogue, recognizing uncertainty as a feature rather than a flaw. They would see transparency not as an afterthought but as an act of interpretation, an ongoing translation between human intention and machine behavior.

In this sense, the humanities become indispensable to the future of AI. Literature, anthropology, and critical theory provide not only critique but calibration. They help us hear the tonal shifts in our collective imagination. They remind us that technology is a moral language, one that encodes relationships between humans, environments, and time itself. Without these interpretive practices, our machines risk amplifying the loudest stories rather than the most just.

To speak of "ethical AI" is therefore to speak of ethical storytelling: the responsibility to shape the cultural conditions under which intelligence, human or artificial, can flourish responsibly. That does not mean sanitizing imagination or policing creativity; it means recognizing that our inventions inherit our myths. If we want AI that serves plural futures, we must first cultivate a plural imagination. As the world faces escalating crises, from climate breakdown to political fragmentation, the temptation to automate decision-making will only grow. However, the measure of our intelligence, human or artificial, will not be found in prediction but in reflection. The more powerful our technologies become, the more they require the slow, interpretive wisdom of culture. Before we can trust our machines to think for us, we must learn to think about the stories we have already told them. The future of AI will not be written solely in code. The Future of AI will be narrated, revised, and reimagined. Moreover,

.

in that ongoing act of collective authorship lies our best hope: that intelligence, in any form, remains a conversation rather than a command.

## References

Broussard, M. (2018). *Artificial unintelligence: How computers misunderstand the world*. MIT Press.

Dourish, P., & Bell, G. (2011). *Divining a digital future: Mess and mythology in ubiquitous computing*. MIT Press.

Jasanoff, S., & Kim, S.-H. (Eds.). (2015). *Dreamscapes of modernity: Sociotechnical imaginaries and the fabrication of power*. University of Chicago Press.

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.

Winner, L. (1980). Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus, 109*(1), 121–136.

## Bio-note

**Lars R. "Jones" Vadjina** is an interdisciplinary researcher and innovation strategist exploring the intersection of artificial intelligence, ethics, and space policy. He holds a BA in American Studies, an MBA, and advanced training in computer science, and is currently completing his thesis on AI and ethics. His research focuses on how speculative narratives and emerging technologies shape cultural and legal imaginaries of the future, from planetary governance to algorithmic responsibility. He has presented at conferences such as Spacecom, the Lunar Development Conference, the "Digital Dilemmas" symposium, and Narrative'25. His work draws on science fiction not only as a cultural product but as a critical lens through which to anticipate crisis, simulate governance, and interrogate the values embedded in technological systems.

**Email Id**: lars.vadjina@student.uni-tuebingen.de