THE CREATIVE PARADOX OF AI: ENABLER OR DISRUPTOR OF HUMAN IMAGINATION?

Eduard C. GROSS[1]

Abstract: *The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in communication and its effects on the market for creative jobs are covered in this article. While AI-generated pictures offer numerous advantages, such as efficiency and flexibility, the article emphasizes that they can have ethical consequences, such as deceit, stereotyping, illicit data usage, and intellectual property infringement. The essay goes into further detail on the problems of copyright, artistic credit, and imitation when using AI to create artworks. The dispute over whether robots can actually produce works of art or can only imitate human creativity is also discussed in the essay, raising concerns about the very nature of creativity. The paper concludes by highlighting the significance of analyzing the ethical implications of emerging technology.*

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Creative industry; Copyright; AI in arts; Ethical implications*

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence has become a buzzword, often used by politicians, influencers, artists and other professionals. Overuse of this terminology makes constructive dialogue impossible. In addition to this, AI is also becoming popular on social media due to the fact that various institutions and media outlets have chosen to use this technology in the communicative context. Generated images come with a number of benefits, such as efficiency, adaptability of content to different contexts and visual appeal. However, it is not only the positive effects of using this technology that one can discuss. The use of AI can be problematic and comes with ethical implications of manipulation, stereotyping, illegal use of data and intellectual property infringement. In this context, this essay aims to bring up some instances where institutions or media outlets have used AI in the communication process, as well as to discuss the latest technological advances.

The use of Artificial Intelligence for the generation of artworks has been intensely discussed recently. At the same time, Artificial Intelligence is a subject where it is impossible to avoid ethical severe debate, especially when it comes to something that seems inherently human, creativity. Artworks that start from a simple text prompt fascinate internet users. Often the posts that appear on Instagram are accompanied by a

[1] *Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca*, eduard.gross@ubbcluj.ro, corresponding author

disclaimer announcing that the artworks are generated using an AI-based program, either by using the hashtags #midjourney, #aigenerated, or #dalle2 or by simply mentioning it in the photo description. In some cases, authors do not mention this fact, misleading people about authorship. There are still a lot of gray areas when it comes to this field, such as copyright issues, imitation, and creative attribution. This paper will focus on the issue of imitation and will attempt to investigate how well the DALL-E 2 program can imitate the work of famous painters. The idea behind this work comes from Hageback and Hedblom (2022) postulated belief that in the future, artificial intelligence will eliminate second-tier artists who do not come up with an innovative and creative process in their creation but only rely on copying other artists. This essay aims to investigate the ability of the DALL-E 2 software to reproduce art according to known painting styles, and to what extent users are able to detect styles and creators. Naturally, this ability has become appealing to small business owners, people who employ humans and conduct any promotional activity on social media.

This technology will reform the labor market when it comes to creative work, therefore it is necessary to investigate how the technology is already being used. This essay will review some instances where publications have used Artificial Intelligence in their communication strategies to see how it has been received and used. Furthermore, the employment of AI in creative work raises challenges about the very essence of creativity. Can machines actually create works of art, or are they merely mimicking human creativity? Some claim that the artist's purpose is to convey a distinct point of view, a personal touch that no computer can reproduce. Others argue that AI-generated artwork can be just as unique and creative as human-created artwork, calling into question our assumptions of what constitutes "artistic creativity."

As the usage of artificial intelligence (AI) in the creative sector grows, it is critical to evaluate the ethical implications of new technologies. Who owns the copyright of AI-generated artwork, for example? How can we avoid the generation of fake news or propaganda using AI-generated content? These are critical concerns that must be carefully considered and debated.

1.1. Can AI produce art, or is it an extension of the human mind?

Artificial Intelligence has become a growing topic in every major industry, from self-driving cars to healthcare. The year 2022 was a huge year for innovation in the arts when the impossible was achieved, namely, turning text into a photograph, painting or any other form of visually represented art. But this development did not happen suddenly, it had been an ongoing work. An early moment when Artificial Intelligence made waves in the art field was October 2018, when for the first time a portrait generated by a machine learning program was sold at an auction house at a price of $432,500 shocking the art world (Jones, 2018). The portrait depicts *Edmond de Belamy*, looking like a Renaissance painting. The Guardian's short article criticizes the aesthetics, while also criticizing the lack of expressiveness and emotion emulated by the character generated by the program trained with images from the great masters of painting. In addition, the author criticizes the approach of computer-generated art, noting that to

produce art, a robot should be an autonomous mind (Jones, 2018). Fast-forward 4 years of development and the technology behind the famous artwork is available to any enthusiast with programs like DALL-E 2 and *MidJourney* even offering free trial periods. This is where several questions, advantages, and disadvantages come into play regarding these technologies; are they the path to making artistic expression accessible to the public or just another way to make money? The argument about the lack of autonomy of Artificial Intelligence is, however, a simplistic one because it refers strictly to the impossibility of the AI to work without a command. Artificial Intelligence, therefore, cannot decide without a human command to generate a painting, but for this matter what is more important is how it solves this task once it receives it.

In their paper on AI-generated art, Epstein et al. (2020) investigate the perceptions of people towards the role of AI in creating such art. The study finds that people have different perceptions about the extent to which AI is used in creating art, and these perceptions can be influenced by how the AI is described. The study also reveals that different degrees of anthropomorphism, or assigning human-like qualities to the AI, impact the responsibility attributed to surrounding humans in different ways. Anthropomorphizing the AI system increases the responsibility of technologists but mitigates the responsibility of artists. Thus, the language and framing used to discuss AI art impact the responsibility allocated to individuals involved in its creation. It is significant for artists, computer scientists, and the media to be mindful of their language while discussing AI art, and for the public to be discerning in the narratives they consume. In the case of *Edmond de Belamy*, people attributed the most credit and responsibility to the artist, followed by the curator, the technologist, and finally the crowd. Even the crowd was deemed worthy of some responsibility and credit, indicating that every contributor plays a role in creating AI art. Robbie Barrat, the programmer who created the GitHub repository that Obvious used to create *Edmond de Belamy*, was also considered deserving of credit for his contribution (Epstein et al., 2020).

2. Fashion industry meets Artificial Intelligence

As mentioned in the beginning of this essay, the creative industry is currently undergoing a paradigm shift. Among the first to benefit from the accessibility of artificial intelligence were those involved in the fashion industry. This part of the essay will present several instances in which artificial intelligence has been used for marketing purposes in the fashion industry. A prime example is Cosmopolitan magazine, that in June 2022 published an article on their website explaining how they created their first cover using only artificial intelligence.

In the article, Liu (2022) examines the development of DALL-E 2, an advanced AI program that generates images from textual descriptions. Building on the original DALL-E, DALL-E 2 produces highly detailed and complex images with increased accuracy. The article provides insight into the mechanics of DALL-E 2 and showcases examples of its output, including a fire hydrant dog and a panda-shaped topiary. The authors posit that DALL-E 2 has potential applications in fields such as advertising and video game design,

while also contributing to our understanding of the capabilities and limitations of AI. Furthermore, the article addresses ethical considerations related to AI-generated images, highlighting concerns about their potential misuse for deceptive or harmful purposes.

The authors stress the importance of responsible AI use and its potential to benefit society as a whole (Liu, 2022). In an academic paper, McCormack et al. (2023) bring up an important issue: is writing a text prompt creative? This question comes in the context that the cover actually created by the Cosmopolitans was done by an entire team including designers and cumulating to a total of 24 hours of work. As McCormack et al. (2023) emphasize, all the hype around artificial intelligence shows a tendency to overestimate the role of AI systems and underestimate the role of human artists, while also leading to controversy over authorship.

As in 2023 matters had become increasingly complicated, AI models are becoming progressively human-like. An industry cannot be immune to change. With people criticizing the renunciation of

Fig. 1. *To avoid any copyright claims, we used the same prompt as Cosmopolitan, but in a different software (Midjourney v.5).*

humans at the expense of machines, such changes need to be somehow justified. Levi Strauss & Co, one of the largest fashion companies, has announced that it will use AI-generated designs. According to Schneider (2023) in an article published on *PetaPixel*, Levi's justifies this change under the pretext of diversity, in order to better represent a wider spectrum of races, genders and body types. The advertising materials will be used for online, print and physical stores. As the article continues, they promise that the decision is part of their ongoing effort to promote diversity and inclusion, and that the decision will not be detrimental to any category (Schneider, 2023).

In conclusion, the fashion industry has been quick to adopt and experiment with artificial intelligence in various aspects of its operations, from marketing to design. While the use of AI has its benefits, such as increased efficiency and diversity, it also raises important ethical questions and controversies around authorship and the role of human creativity. As AI models continue to advance and become more human-like, it is essential for the fashion industry to approach their use with responsibility and transparency, in order to ensure that the benefits of AI are balanced with the preservation of human creativity and values.

3. Concluding Thoughts and Further Research Recommendations

In conclusion, software like DALL-E 2 and MidJourney provide the option of making art from straightforward text prompts, boosting the application of artificial intelligence in the creation of artworks. Despite the fact that this technology offers many benefits, like efficiency and the capacity to adapt material to various situations, it also creates ethical concerns, including manipulation, stereotyping, the unauthorized use of data, and intellectual property infringement. The DALL-E 2 program's capacity to mimic the artwork of well-known artists and the extent to which users can recognize styles and creators have both been examined in this study.

The ethical implications of new developments, including who owns the copyright of AI-generated artwork as well as how to prevent the development of disinformation or propaganda using AI-generated content, need to be carefully considered as the use of artificial intelligence in the creative industry increases. To overcome the limitations of this article, further study is required. In particular, it would be helpful to look into how the public feels about AI-generated art and how this impacts the art market. In addition, it's important to evaluate how AI is going to impact the creative industry labor market and the professional paths of future designers, artists, and other creative workers. Moreover, it is crucial to evaluate the reliability and accuracy of AI-generated material, as well as the likelihood to propagate prejudices and biases. Finally, it is critical to take into consideration the moral implications of AI in the larger social environment, as well as its effect on cultural and ethical standards.

On the one side, it is the responsibility of the developers to restrict the use and training of the datasets in such manner as to restrict the construction of misinformation and misleading advertisements. On the other hand, the user must learn how to craft honest content and develop responsibility for their own creations. In addition, there should be clear guidelines for the creation and dissemination of AI-generated material. Additional attention should also be paid to the fair representation of minorities of any kind, so that algorithms do not propagate existing biases and stereotypes (an issue that is more in the area of advertising).

References

Epstein, Z., Levine, S., Rand, D. G., & Rahwan, I. (2020). Who gets credit for AI-generated art? *IScience*, 23(9), 101515. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2020.101515

Hageback, N., & Hedblom, D. (2021). AI for Arts. CRC Press.

Jones, J. (2018, October 26). A portrait created by Ai just sold for $432,000. but is it really art? *The Guardian*. Retrieved April 4, 2023, from https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/shortcuts/2018/oct/26/call-that-art-can-a-computer-be-a-painter

Liu, G. (2022, June 27). Dall-E 2 made its first magazine cover. *Cosmopolitan*. Retrieved April 13, 2023, from https://www.cosmopolitan.com/lifestyle/a40314356/dall-e-2-artificial-intelligence-cover/

McCormack, J., Cruz Gambardella, C., Rajcic, N., Krol, S. J., Llano, M. T., & Yang, M. (2023). Is writing prompts really making art? *Artificial Intelligence in Music, Sound, Art and Design,* 196–211. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-29956-8_13

Schneider, J. (2023, March 27). Levi's to use AI-generated models to 'increase diversity'. *PetaPixel.* Retrieved April 15, 2023, from https://petapixel.com/2023/03/24/levis-to-use-ai-generated-models-to-increase-diversity/