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In the early 1900s, Walter Benjamin was utterly perplexed by the integration of photography into an artform. A widely respected essayist, the topic seeped into multiple of his works, leaving modernists and postmodernists with a plethora of views on the ways in which photography overshadows the works and the needs of artists. While 21st century creatives have not only accepted, but flourished in the photographic arts, they are presented with a new technological prowess; Artificial Intelligence (AI). The tool has quickly demonstrated remarkable capabilities across various fields, such as data science, automation, and numerical problem solving. However, its impact on the creative arts and language has resulted in considerable, and necessary debate. The balance between human creativity and unmatched computational power to create a fair contender of ‘artwork’ is being redefined, and it is time to determine to what extent AI produced work truly constitutes art.

AI benefits from the lack of rigidity that the community of artists carry with themselves. AI redefines this as any form of creative expression should be considered as art. This raises a new question, to what extent is the artwork from an AI system, one unable to feel any emotion, authentic? Furthermore, is it fair to assess the works of humans, who have a natural fallibility, against artificial creations with the ability to mitigate error all together? Researchers, artists, writers, and engineers alike are perplexed by these questions, and like Benjamin advocated for the need to reconsider the way in which technological intervention reinvented artwork then, it is time to reassess the way in which AI redefines art. This essay aims to assess the extent to which AI regulation may maintain authenticity in the world of the arts. Developing appropriate AI regulations that encourage innovation while safeguarding the authenticity of artistic creation necessitates a
careful examination of the intricate relationship between AI technology and human creativity. In addition, an understanding of the key factors that influence effective regulation in the artistic world will be required.

Chat Generative Pretrained Transformer, or Chat GPT, developed by Open AI, is an extraordinary example of an AI replacement for linguistic communication. The platform has taken the world by a storm, and has presented itself across a multitude of industries. But what is most impressive about the tool is its accessibility; virtually anybody, with access to the internet, can use it for free—and they are. The platform is able to write recipes, exercise plans, academic essays, and even short stories. Its great ability in doing so is what granted Microsoft’s multi-billion-dollar deal with Open AI, alongside Bain’s alliance with the company, both companies intending to use the platform for creative tasks, such as the development of marketing programs and improvement plans for existing online software (Maceda). With the right command, a user can truly maximise the platform’s potential to communicate. Understanding its power is essential to exemplifying the need to control it.

A technique, designed by Open AI, and called reinforcement learning from human feedback (RLHF) is utilised to ensure the platform knows how to appropriately, and in most cases, exceptionally respond to inputted data. The system is trained to recognize specific buzzwords and present adequate responses to them. It is a game; the human input functions as a guideline to provoke an answer, and impending feedback allows for the computer to understand whether the answer that has been produced was sufficient, or needs to be improved upon. It is an interesting technique that replicates much of the human thinking process. The reconsideration of a doubt posed in regards to a spoken sentence to produce another response is all a result of mankind’s own understanding of one another’s comprehensibility. That process is perfected by Chat GPT: everything that is said works in combination with any comments on the generated response to develop the most appropriate clarification.

Something about that is concerning. Because in human conversations, there is always scope for miscommunication; an attempted clarification may warrant further confusion. People who are able to successfully and succinctly convey information from one party to another go into consultant roles, advertising themselves as the ideal communicator—someone who can not only interpret but translate, whether that is in the literal sense of the term, or the reconstructive sense. But of course, as humans, there remains a scope for error; with the removal of the human, there is no possibility for error.
AI has transcended the need to be a successful communicator. Misconstrued input sentences, featuring a couple of trigger words can result in beautiful sentences. Here is an example of the same. The input sentence was, ‘write a short summary about a short story about a young girl’. Chat GPT created, ‘In a picturesque village, a young girl discovers a wounded bird, nurses it back to health, and together they bring joy and inspiration to the community through art and nature’ (Chat GPT). The program was then used to write an entire story, which was not only descriptive, but new. The computerised ability to successfully communicate is evidence for the great ways in which AI can be used for expression; as these platforms are further developed, they follow suit in being successful replacements for artists. Their greatness and artistic talent is only evidenced by Jason Allen’s first place award at the Colorado State Fair, 2022, for his painting, Théâtre D’opéra Spatial. It was created using Midjourney, an AI program that turns text descriptions into artwork (Kuta). Allen is, undoubtedly, a talented writer; it is his input that resulted in the creation of the beautiful, award-winning piece. He did not need to be an extraordinary artist, in fact, he had no need to exhibit any form of artistic talent. His win began an important discussion on what is regarded as artwork. But it is also time to re-evaluate the extent to which AI is integrated into society, and how that will impact being in itself. It is natural for humans to integrate modern technology into society. The pure massiveness of the AI user base makes it more desirable to new users, which very organically navigates routes for it to be present within all possible walks of life. It is interesting to consider this technological growth from the perspective of the reproduction of art. In Benjamin’s paper, entitled The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction—a title that, reading today in the world of AI, seems so naive to the ways in which technology has grown. He writes about technology’s ability to reproduce artworks without having to physically recreate a painting. With every reproduction, every photo taken, a piece of authenticity, the artist’s own efforts, the manual labour that was poured into the original creation is further and further away. Reproduction has been a catalyst in inviting worldly perspectives on artwork; any people, regardless of location, are able to experience the art due to the reproduced image. The viewer’s geographical distance from the original piece serves as the perfect metaphor for Benjamin’s disliking of reproduction as a whole. Benjamin captures this dilemma in his paper, Paris: The Capital of the 19th Century, he writes, ‘As the scope of communications increased, the informational importance of painting diminished.’ (Benjamin)
As explained prior, AI functions through the study of existing communications to reconstruct new, more effectively and appropriately communicated information. In a sense, all AI creations are not the result of a completely new thought, rather, they are the reassembling of misconstrued, possibly ineffectively presented thoughts to create something that represents the desire liaised by an inputted data. There is, inarguably, nothing authentic, new, or original about AI creations. They are not inspired, simply reassembled. Artists are inspired, often intentionally attempting to recreate work in a style of an existing work. The difference is, humans are naturally prone to maintaining control (Hahn). So, work that is inspired is tweaked by the new artist, something about it is slightly different, and that is what makes it that artist’s work, not just a reproduction of something existent.

The distance between the original and the reproduction is supremely magnified in the AI context, where the human is entirely subtracted from the equation. The difference is, through the use of AI software, anyone can claim to be an artist. Does the arts community need to maintain an exclusivity based on talent and ability? According to articles, social media posts, and online discussions from numerous artists, AI creation is ‘hurting’ the work of ‘real artists’ (Alba) by dismissing their talent and their skills. As priorly mentioned, this alludes to the question of what constitutes art. Does the medium, the origin of the creation of artwork, truly misconstrue its consideration as art in itself. While this difference, undoubtedly, can serve as an unfair advantage in an arts competition assessing artistic capability, such as the Colorado State Fair, and warrants a reconsideration of the rules and regulations of competitive programs, it does not dismiss AI creation as an artform as a whole. In D.N. Perkin’s article, entitled Art as Understanding, the omnipresence and cultural significance of art is contemplated. Moreover, he questions how talents like Shakespeare and Picasso gained their ‘non biological’ talent. What is most relevant, from his article, is his simple conclusion that it is impossible to avoid art. Art is therapy for some, occupation for others, and a hobby for most. It is a persuasive tool: it was and remains the ideal medium to create propaganda because art encourages people to feel. It is, wholeheartedly and genuinely, a feeling task. Hence, it is impossible to separate it from emotion. It is also for this reason that programs, like Midjourney, require an initial human thought to create their artworks; art is merely the expression of the most human trait of them all; feeling. If there is one conclusion that can be drawn in regards to the success of AI platforms with certainty, it is their ability to empower.
In 1935, Walter Benjamin wrote an essay entitled, ‘The First Theory of New Media’, in which he attempted to predict the way in which the integration of photographic works would change the artistic world. ‘Art has changed from being an art for and by the elites to art for and by the masses’. He writes of a potential for inclusivity, the final acknowledgement that art can be utilised as a means of expression by anyone who wishes to express themselves. In many ways, AI brings upon a similar opportunity; to make art for everyone. The ability to create becomes more than just a specialty; it is a possible option for many who shut themselves away from art due to fear of lack of potential. While the functioning of AI based on reproduction ensues a risk of lack of originality, it permits traditionally non-artists to provide their perspectives on themes and ideas for new creations. It is a way of inviting more artists to contribute to the creation of art, and something about that is exciting.

The birth of the novel is dated back to the 18th century, when other artists and readers alike were confused as to why there was any reason to stray away from the traditional poetic form. A parallel is drawn, repeatedly, almost cyclically; the introduction of any advanced technology to any industry invites re-evaluation and debate. But eventually, there is a natural adaptation resulting in growth around and with the new technology, incorporating it to use it solely as a tool to improve upon existing methods. Needless to say there are significant impacts of AI on the work of ‘true artists’ (Rosa), some which may even cause financial inhibitions to artists, in addition to potential systematic errors that can result in plagiarism, which invites an authoritative consideration for the imposition of regulations. Through mutual understanding, the artistic and technological worlds can collaborate to truly maximise the potential of AI, and empower those with the ability to use it. The world can be encouraged to value and participate in the artistic world, especially to inspire change.
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