

I'd like to emphasize how, after conceptual art and the 20th century artistic period, not seeing a work of art as the fruit of its author seems nonsensical. Attempting to measure human intervention, aside from the initial choice, is wrong. Did Duchamp do "enough work" on his "Fountain"? What about Warhol's Brillo Boxes, which, as is known, were created by another artist (who wasn't offended, quite the contrary)? And this doesn't even touch on the fact that developing a prompt isn't that simple. Beyond post-production, it requires constant testing and tweaks, trying to harmonize with a tool that doesn't guarantee deterministic outcomes. Prompts are essentially short phrases, but it makes no sense to entertain those who argue "it's too easy." Writing "I light up with immensity" is simple, but not everyone has the ability to conceive such poetry as the Italian poet Ungaretti did. In essence, as the designer Bruno Munari said, "when someone says: I can do that too, it means they can reproduce it, otherwise, they would've done it before."



When discussing copyright, it becomes clear that the underlying rationale for these rules is more economic than ontological. Art is always a collective endeavor. Had Picasso been born five hundred years earlier, he might have become a painter, but certainly not the one we know because he wouldn't have had access to the artistic and technological revolutions that followed. Not only can Picasso not take credit for past discoveries, but he also can't claim sole credit for many contemporary to him, that helped shape his aesthetic – which is as much his as anyone else's. If we were to remove from Guernica everything that can't be credited solely to the Master's creative flair:

the invention of materials and techniques used, the language through which they were learned, the artworks that influenced its creation, the people and events that sparked certain ideas, the cultural context built by others, the war, and so on – there would be very little left of the painting.

If the agreements are purely economic, then an increasingly strict copyright will make these tools even more elitist and controlled by the few. Considering that developing these technologies requires billions of images or texts, it's unthinkable to pay even one euro each, as it would make the already substantial initial investment impossible. The data



would then be paid next to nothing, with only those who already possess them in massive quantities benefiting. If the use of data isn't considered fair, it would decrease the variety of companies that produce these technologies, perhaps even erasing the open-source ones, the only truly public ones. Would making these technologies even more elitist and monopolistic be the best way forward, or would it place too much power in the hands of very few?

For example, in my artistic process, I literally test hundreds of prompts, tweaking every single letter and word until I achieve the desired result, which is then reiterated hundreds of times to capture the best image. Prompting is a "conversation," not just the mundane crafting of a fitting sentence, as evidenced by the anticipated (and expected) failure of the prompt market. Anthropomorphizing these technologies is always a misstep; AIs are in no

way human. However, I couldn't put it better than this: one must have empathy for the machine. When I paint or photograph a flower, I am essential to the outcome but not sufficient. Did I construct and invent the camera or the painting technique I use? Would my stylistic choices have been the same had I been born a thousand years ago, or in a different place, or with a different upbringing? Did I decide how flowers should look, having seen these particular flowers and not others, that red should look exactly so, that pigments and light should affect our brains in this way? How much of my sensitivity comes from experiences over



which I had no control? Ultimately, I can't even claim my deepest sensitivity as entirely my own, for how it developed in a certain way, within a certain body, with certain capabilities and not others, within a brain with its unique predispositions and limitations... none of this is my own doing. We all share a grain of both the credit and the blame for the world. We might accept or reject what we happen to do and be, based on standards we didn't set. But artworks, actions, individuality, and humanity are more discoveries than inventions. A choice, the only true necessary human intervention in art.



*Francesco D'Isa, born in Florence, Italy, in 1980, is a philosopher and visual artist who has exhibited his work in galleries and contemporary art centers worldwide. He made his debut with the graphic novel "I." (published by Nottetempo in 2011) and has since authored essays and novels for Hoepli, effequ, Tunué, and Newton Compton. His most recent novel, "La stanza di Therese," was published by Tunué in 2017. In 2022, he released his philosophical essay "L'assurda evidenza" through Edizioni Tlon. He's contributed philosophical pieces to a range of publications, not limited to Philosophy Now (UK), The Philosophical Salon (USA), Los Angeles Review of Books (USA), and various Italian outlets like Il Tascabile, Kobo, L'Indiscreto, Philosophy Kitchen, Voyages, The Italian Review, and Il Post. In addition to his creative endeavors, D'Isa serves as the Editorial Director of L'Indiscreto*

*Apart from Warhol's work, the other pieces are mine, created with AI.*