

Skip to main content

r/audiodrama Search in r/audiodrama

Log In

 r/audiodrama • 6 mo. ago

tater_tot28

Use of AI Generated Content

DISCUSSION

Recently I've seen a rise in ADs using Ai generated content to create their cover art and let me tell you, that's the easiest way to get me to not listen to your show. I would much rather the cover be simple or "bad" than for it to be obviously Ai generated, regardless of the actual quality of the show itself.

Ethical implications aside (and there are many), Ai generated content feels hollow, there is no warmth or heart to it so why should I assume that you show will be any different?

Curious how other people in the space are feeling about this.

Edit: My many ethical quandaries can be found [here](#). The point of this post is to serve as a temperature check regarding the subject within the community. No one has to agree with anyone, but keep it respectful. Refrain from calling out specific shows as examples.

 152 

231

Share

 Use-Paragon • Promoted

Users will never stop asking for more integrations, but integrations costs months of engineering (API research, building auth, error handling etc.). 29% of B2B SaaS engineering teams use an embedded iPaaS - to save 70% of the engineering, but should you? Read the detailed build vs. buy comparison.

Learn More

useparagon.com

3rd party APIs	Vendor Specific Research	API Abstractions via integration connectors
Integration Webhooks	Build & maintain webhook listeners	Managed webhook triggers
End-user UI	Fully customizable	Pre-built UI components (some offer headless)
Rate limits & error handling	Build your own rate limit middleware and retry	Built-in auto-retry (some have smart rate limiters)
Maintenance	Monitor breaking changes on 3rd party APIs	Managed by integration service for pre-built connectors
Debugging	Complex & inefficient	Highly observable workflow runs (some provide customer dashboards)

+ Add a comment

Sort by: Best Search Comments


 ARTISTICEXISTENCE • 6mo ago



I offer art for podcasts and it's been a ton of fun working with creators!

It has been upsetting to see a couple of times when I've put 30+hrs into a podcast cover for someone and ended up replaced by AI.

 40 

 Reply



[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#) 10   Reply ...  5 more replies**SINKHOLEpodcast** • 5mo ago

Reading these comments and seeing the defenses some people have put forward, I think I've realized the point that defenders of generative AI are missing:

You're allowed to be bad at things when you start doing them.

No one is gatekeeping creativity. No one is saying "You must be this skilled to ride." You're allowed to be a bit shit at something when you start doing it, but the desire to do it is what drives you to improve.



I'm not a very good traditional artist because, for the life of me, I just can't seem to motivate myself to keep trying. That's no one's fault but mine. I'm the reason I'm bad at art. It's not a matter of natural aptitude or time investment, it's a matter of willingness: you'll find people who just really love drawing doodling on napkins during their lunchbreaks at their shitty fast food job.

The problem isn't that you are lacking some fundamental capacity for creative output, it's that you aren't willing to be bad at it. You don't care enough about making art to make art. Even bad art is worthy. There will always be somebody who thinks your shitty just-getting-started art is kind of charming and sees the potential in what you're doing, whether it's drawing anime characters with wonky proportions or recording an audio drama about an alien vampire love triangle using your webcam microphone.

This is why people call generative AI art "soulless."

Because nobody cared enough to take the time to make it. Typing a sentence into a prompt bar doesn't count. I've said "I wish I could draw x scene with y details" hundreds of thousands of times in my life.

I didn't do it. That's why I'm still bad at drawing. From one person who sucks shit at something and refuses to get better at it to another: I regret to inform you that AI has not changed the fact that you refuse to learn that skill.

 29   Reply ...  5 more replies**VendettaViolent** • 6mo ago • Edited 6mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

artists who have had 'odd' art styles for years before AI existed getting fingers pointed at 'em.

It's become tough out there. I commission a lot of art for our show, I also have 20+ years under my belt as a photographer and a photo manipulator and do a lot of our graphic design myself for Red Fathom. I'm credited as a professional art director as well and have spent an unhealthy amount of time staring at AI images. You cannot, in fact, always tell. Especially if an artist is using AI in place of traditional stock. EDIT: At this point if you're using stock, even from a reputable site- there is probably AI in it even if they say there isn't. The market is saturated.

Which isn't a defense of it. Ideally I'd like to see AI find a path that assists artists in creation rather than trying to replace them. AI tools that empower artists by taking out tedious steps or refining existing tools to be better and more adaptive are incredible and are already changing so many things for the better. But that's just it. I want AI to do my taxes, not replace hard working artists. I want AI to help enlarge a digital image, not color it for me. I don't want it writing scripts, but I'd love it to do some first pass editing and making suggestions (that isn't total ass) before my script editor went over it. But we're not there yet and I hope the outrage that is happening pushes the industry towards more acceptable uses of the technology then towards trying to swap actual artists out with what is essentially our best attempt of getting tech to imitate the human experience.

Unfortunately, I fear it's going to get a lot worse before it gets better. So many of the battles in regards to our rights as artists were over 15+ years ago before we even knew what the fight was for. At this point we can only stand behind individual artists when we see their likeness and voices being stolen. Nobody should be able to steal someones voice and use it in perpetuity. There can't be a world where there is a 'Brom Bot' that makes art identical to Brom's style. Those are the only fights we have left at this point, and we need to do whatever we can to support unions that are trying to force ethical rules onto unethical companies.

↑ 17 ↓  Reply ...

⌋ + 2 more replies



NickDouglas • 5mo ago

Absolutely agree. If you trust AI to depict your characters, you don't care enough about your characters.

If you can't afford to pay an artist and you can't convince a friend, it's better to lay some type over a rights-free image ([The Verge has a list of resources](#)) or design something in Canva. Or ask around on audio drama Discords or search this subreddit for willing artists!

There are thousands and thousands of audio dramas. If you want anyone to listen to yours, you have to constantly demonstrate the effort and skill you put into every aspect.





↑ 8 ↓  Reply ...



fbeemcee • 6mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)  39  [Reply](#) **tater_tot28** OP • 6mo ago

AI voices (which are distinctly different from computer generated voices that are Clearly robotic, like text to speech) are completely unforgivable to me. It spits in the face of voice actors.

 47   [Reply](#)   4 more replies  3 more replies**MadMaverick033** • 6mo ago

AI bad, not going a show the time of day if it has any of it

 7   [Reply](#) **flirtydodo** • 6mo ago

Give me MS paint over AI any day of the week

 30   [Reply](#)   1 more reply**Simpvanus** • 6mo ago • Edited 5mo ago

I know that when I see AI advertisements used by an organization, it implies to me that they are happy to cut corners in ways that directly affect consumers. It's dramatic to say that I'm "affected" by advertising or branding or whatever, but advertising is money that they are spending on a potential customer, and they have already decided that that person isn't worth much.

In that respect, it doesn't bother me too much if it's an individual or very indie project. Definitely not in the same way. Like how I don't expect every AD to have their own personally recorded soundscaping. (I *like* the one tape recorder sound that everyone passes around; the Black Tapes casio jingle is my friend; etc, etc.) It kinda rankles with me personally because I don't have a high opinion of generative AI, but with indie work it just implies to me the small scale of the team or the tight budget of the project rather than All That up in the first line.

That being said... It does give me the ghost of a feeling that the creator is either unwilling, unable, or unaware of how to engage with the existing ecosystem that normally ties art with shows. I don't know enough about the production process for this to be a well-formed opinion, and would be interested to hear other takes on that possibility. But I feel like AI cover art is going to become an indicator for me that the creators are very new at their craft and perhaps not very involved in the community that they're trying to become a part of. At least because I've seen the opposite happen pretty frequently, where showrunners who *are* notably engaged with their fans and peers end up with art for their show.

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)**CognitiveBirch** • 6mo ago • Edited 6mo ago

Using AI when people are supposed to be creative only hurts art as a whole. When people use it in adjacent fields (AI music for videographers, AI image for writers, etc.) they convince themselves it only overcomes their lack of skills in said fields, but every time, we lower the bar for each other, we demean somebody else's craft, who in return will demean ours while we pretend it's okay because it's not us we hurt. Don't let poetry to robots. Don't abandon dreams to machines.

39 Reply ...

1 more reply

**OneDoorDungeons** • 6mo ago

I couldn't agree more, if they have an AI cover I instantly assume it is used at every level of the show and am beyond turned off by it. Which is sad because I have had a lot of really good sounding shows recco'd like Wireland Ranch that seem to use it in everything that production house does.

29 Reply ...

**[deleted]** • 6mo ago

Wireland Ranch did at one point use AI art. The showcard is still AI while we rework it for season 2. We've since had a major philosophical shift due to the damage generative AI does to artists across the board.

Since the beginning of the year we've eschewed AI artwork in the interest of actual artists wherever we can, and in every possible way. We work with an artist named Vara Zsolo for a lot of our newest stuff, and we're currently interviewing and hiring an artist for Wireland Ranch's artwork for season 2.

I agonized on whether to pull the previous use of AI, but I feel as if the damage was already done. The best thing we can do is commit our limited resources to paying artists for pieces going forward, and using stock imagery where we can. Part of that will be replacing the showcard wholly once we've secured an artist. We've already gone a different route for our upcoming limited run series The Dope Show.

I stand with the concern with the usage of AI, and have no interest in using it for our shows going forward. Like everyone else, we had to land on that decision for ourselves, and we understand that not everyone agrees with where we are or how we got there, but I speak for Gas Station Drugs when I say that's our stance as a company.

23 Reply ...

2 more replies

23 more replies

macabremezzo • 6mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

takes away any interest I have in a project.

↑ 23 ↓ Reply ...

⌋ (+) 2 more replies



SaintofSnark • 6mo ago

It shows me you don't value artists, so why would I value your art?

↑ 17 ↓ Reply ...

⌋ (+) 1 more reply



The_Last_Leviathan • 6mo ago

I'll just chime in as someone who uses AI to generate episode covers. The show artwork I did myself and in the beginning of our show I would sit down and try to create the episode covers from CC0 assets and similar things and it was very time consuming and often resulted in an "eh, I can't find anything better" level of episode cover that would frustrate the hell out of me.

I'd love to be able to pay someone to make custom episode covers and stuff for us, but it's just not feasible. As of right now, we're not making any money off of this and AI images are a crutch. Plain and simple. I am terrible at drawing and I don't have the time.

That said, I consider the artwork to be just a small portion of what our podcast is. We would never use any form of AI voice (it's all me, with occasional appearances from other people I know or just my voice in a lower pitch) or AI writing (all of our stories are penned by my husband, who loves writing), because that is what the podcast is about.

↑ 13 ↓ Reply ...

⌋ (+) 14 more replies



evoterra • 6mo ago

🏆 Top 1% Poster

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

As a curator, I require disclosure of it before I'll list the show in my directory of finished audio fiction. Here's the wording I'm using on the [submission form](#):

Generated content (AI, LLM, ML) disclosure

Whether or not you use generative software in your creation is between you and your gods. What's important to us is that usage of LLM, ML, or AI tools to generate *a material portion* of your audio **requires you to disclose said usage in the description of your show**.

- Generative software WAS NOT used for a material portion of this show.
- LLM/ML/AI tools generated much of my content, and I've clearly disclosed this fact in my show's description.

... and for the very few (like... two?) shows that check the 2nd box, I've made sure that their use of generated AI is in their show description. I suppose it's possible they could remove that message after I've listed the show. But I can't see why they'd do that. And if they did—maliciously—I'd likely never again list any of their shows in the directory again. (But, again, I don't think that's likely to happen.)

↑ 16 ↓ ○ Reply ...

⤵ (+) 4 more replies



Warlockdnd • 6mo ago

📬 Top 1% Commenter

Our cover cost \$45 for the art, it was absolutely worth it to pay an artist to do it. I know podcasting is a hobby to most, but I feel like it makes our show look way more professional.

↑ 16 ↓ ○ Reply ...

⤵ (+) 2 more replies



Hallelujah289 • 6mo ago

📬 Top 1% Poster

I agree it's a turn off especially if there's something weird about the design

↑ 9 ↓ ○ Reply ...



emily_inkpen • 5mo ago

AI can get in the bin.
End of.

↑ 8 ↓ ○ Reply ...



stardustgleams • 6mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

process; it's an immediate blacklist for me. I'll never listen and I'll never work with you.

↑ 6 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



sailsaucy • 6mo ago

It really isn't my place to criticize anyone for using AI. I am getting to enjoy their creation for free (barring mostly sparse ads) so I don't feel it's right for me to complain about what they have to do to produce their work.

I would also wonder if it weren't for the AI generated content, if that meant there would be no content at all because the person making it can't narrate it themselves or generate the art and can't afford to have it done professionally. Someone can be a great writer and an absolute awful speaker or illustrator.

And lets be honest... Many of us have heard some narrators that were far worse than most AI generated voices and still listened and (mostly) enjoyed it. Warmth and heart do very little when people keep mispronouncing words over and over again lol

⊖ ↑ 9 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



SadMathematician1837 • 6mo ago

AI is just a montage of stolen art, and up to recently stolen voices (though some companies are paying voice actors these days to license their voice).

↑ 6 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



valsavana • 6mo ago

I would also wonder if it weren't for the AI generated content, if that meant there would be no content at all because the person making it can't narrate it themselves or generate the art and can't afford to have it done professionally.

If the only way I could paint a painting is to break into someone's house and steal their paint, canvas, lighting, etc- I shouldn't be making that painting.

↑ 6 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

⊕ 6 more replies



tater_tot28 **OP** • 6mo ago

All the issues you mentioned can be solved without using AI and have been for decades.

↑ 5 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

⊕ 6 more replies



EnterprisingAss • 6mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)**tater_tot28** OP • 6mo ago

omg knifepoint horror mention

↑ 2 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

**JGhyperscythe** • 6mo ago

I have mixed feelings on AI. I'd never in a million years use it for writing or voices, or art that isn't strictly conceptualisations/ mockups for an actual man-made art piece I'd associate with anything I created. I do however use AI to help me with music and soundtrack on my own podcast. I'm upfront about it, and don't try to pass it off as anything other than what it is. Ultimately, I'm one college student doing funny voices in his basement who's doing this as a hobby and has no musical talent whatsoever. I don't have the money for professional ANYTHING and even if I did I don't have any more spare time than I'm already using to make a podcast. So on the one hand, as a creative, I'm not a big fan of AI, but on the other, it literally makes what I do possible.

⊖ ↑ 5 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

**tater_tot28** OP • 6mo ago • Edited 6mo ago

People were making art with no budget for centuries before generative ai existed. I say this in completely good faith, and as a fellow creative, what is keeping you from using the resources that already exist and instead relying on generative ai?

Is it the convenience? The quality? The quantity? And which of these justifies the use of it enough to you that you can set aside all the cons associated with technology?

I assure you, generative ai is not the only or even the best solution to your problem. i work full time, i'm a student, believe me, I understand how difficult doing this can be.

You make what you make possible!

↑ 3 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

⊕ 1 more reply

**DenimMudslide** • 6mo ago

In every case that I've been able to tell the difference, I didn't like it. If there was an in-fiction justification for the cover art to be AI generated, I would be quite ready to embrace that, though.

⊖ ↑ 4 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

**tater_tot28** OP • 6mo ago

Even in that case, real artists can create art that "looks" like AI. This was a huge issue for one of the marvels shows that semi-recently came out, their whole credit sequence was AI generated when they could have hired actual artists to create something comparable!

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)**SadMathematician1837** • 6mo ago

there is a justification - every time you post real art it is used to train AI, crawlers are going through everything, there is no protection.

However, every time you use AI art, there is nothing for the AI to learn.

↑ -2 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

⊕ 12 more replies

**Fintago** • 6mo ago

As much as I am able, I will not engage art and products that make use of generative AI. It is not completely possible so I give myself a little grace when I don't catch it immediately, but I refuse to pay money for stuff that utilizes it flat out.

↑ 4 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

**SadMathematician1837** • 6mo ago

Some AI voices are getting really, really good (don't think that those crappy scam ads show the real AI potential), but like you all, I don't want to see it used in place of humans. The problem with AI is much more than the quality of the voice, because human actor brings ideas about the character, adds layer and gives alternatives that a producer/podcaster working alone with AI would not come up with. Human creativity comes from people interacting, playing and working together. These why even great painters went out to paint in groups. A podcaster alone with AI can on replicate, not add.

I have used AI voices in my recent project but in order for AI voices to be acceptable, they need editing and take about as much time as working with a human(but it is more boring to listen to audio, and move graphs up and down than to explain to a human what you want and perhaps have a conversation and come up with an even better way). The human actors give alternatives and creativity and take the work to another places, the AI follows orders which is fine for the mundane stuff that the actors don't want to do.

Another point- humans need to be paid for their creativity and deserve to be paid well and AI is cheap. Using AI for parts of project but humans in the key positions might mean more projects are made, and more interesting work for actors because AI does the boring stuff. It might mean a small home podcaster can compete with studios. But the trick is not relying on AI, it's just a tool, the paint brush, and not the artist.

↑ 3 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

**entropyblues** • 6mo ago

Probably unsurprisingly we agree with you wholeheartedly!


⊖ ↑ 3 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#) 2   Reply ...**TheFleshHive** • 5mo ago

The thing is, my friend that you can spot bad AI. But it is getting real good real fast. So it will come a point in wich will become indistinguishable from the "real" thing. Its not going away. And i think it can be a valid tool for the democratization of art for people that have an idea in their head but don't have the talent/tome/monrt/resources to make it happen. So i think that we can't make a general judgment to it and can't get on a moral hill to demonize it all.

 3   Reply ...**tater_tot28** **OP** • 5mo ago

Actually I can, and I will. As much as people have a right to use it as a "tool" (which it isn't) to "democratize art" (which it doesn't), nothing anyone can make with ai justifies the harm it causes to the artistic community, the environment, nor the internet at large. so yes, this is my hill, and i will die on it. all i can do is invite others to join me in an effort to preserve artistic integrity and push for regulation/legislation on a technology that is already causing issues in the political space and putting the lives of real people (children included) in danger with mass produced deepfakes. Just because something is Happening doesn't mean we have to just take it laying down my friend.

 3   Reply ... 8 more replies**MadisonStandish** • 5mo ago

I will start by saying yes, I agree. Don't like AI art for all the reasons. However, I would like to throw this out there: Now that this is a hot topic, I am seeing people immediately jumping to judge others ASSUMING they've used AI art. In 2022 I went to the LA Podcast Movement convention and gleefully handed out stickers of my cover art. When I returned to the convention in 2024 and did the same, I had a much different reaction. People took the sticker and immediately demanded "Where did you get this artwork???" They wanted to "catch" me using AI. I was put on the defensive. Accused out the gate. Guilty until proven innocent. It was jarring and hurtful. One of my good friends is a graphic artist for home release DVD companies. He does professional movie art for a living. He generously volunteered to do my cover art in 2020 and my image is his design (credited on my website). So, again, while I agree that I don't care for using AI artwork, I do wish people wouldn't be so quick to vilify without all the facts. I see this as a warm community, and found those encounters extremely off-putting and abrasive.

 3   Reply ...**tater_tot28** **OP** • 5mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

are supporting, monetarily or otherwise. I'm sorry you had those encounters, people need to do their due diligence and I personally think it's better to just scroll past or block (confirmed) AI users rather than confronting them outright, which can lead to harassment.

↑ 4 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

+ 1 more reply



packhowl • 5mo ago

Have also experienced similar sentiments, compounded by a general ignorance about how images are created. I've personally paid thousands of dollars to artists, but also put thousands of hours into learning how to manually create and manipulate images without AI, both moving and static (p.s., it's my day job). It appears that to many, quality = AI by default; just as some people can't imagine how the pyramids were made, they can't imagine how images are made. So it must be AI. Will also say that having a close window into how corporations are discussing generative AI, it all feels a bit...futile in the big picture. But I'm all for looking for opportunities for human storytelling and promoting my work loudly as such. Generative AI is a big ethical problem, yes—but at the end of it somewhere we're still dealing with people.

↑ 2 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

+ 1 more reply



gervais_padernom • 5mo ago

Top 1% Commenter

I think that if you use AI in your project be it voices or artwork you should disclaim it up front.

Then the people who care can avoid it, and the people who don't can listen.

If you're a creator who wouldn't want to declare that you use AI, it says a lot about you.

↑ 3 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



thecambridgegeek • 6mo ago

Top 1% Commenter

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

The lowest effort of these is people spewing out hundreds or thousands of podcasts voiced by elevenlabs or similar, containing just the maximum three minutes chatgpt can produce.

Eg:

<https://www.audible.co.uk/search?searchAuthor=Quiet.Please>

I am willing to forgive AI art for covers to the extent that podcasts with that get included in the main database - my feeling is that people may be less informed in some ways than others, and visual skill doesn't automatically crossover with writing/audio skill.

However anything made with gen AI text to speech or writing gets shunted into a side area (where it seems like there is some amount of human intervention/intelligence/effort behind it - shows like the above get skipped entirely).

While I think we should try and convince people to get away from AI art, I think it may be difficult. I also think that maybe the aggressive approach we sometimes take is probably counterproductive, and I think we need to consider that maybe the best argument is that anything with an AI cover has to come with suspicions that the content is also AI, and I've not seen that appeal to anyone except those already fond of the technology.

2 [Reply](#) ...



tater_tot28 [OP](#) • 6mo ago

I think it's important to make it clear where the line is. If we "allow" for AI art to be used, that itself opens up for generative AI to be used in other elements of the process, as you mentioned. The reason why I am not willing to forgive AI art is because there are many affordable options. Many successful podcasts just have the Title of the show as the cover art and that's still better than something created with generative AI. I myself commissioned an artist for my show art because I wouldn't have been able to execute my own vision with the skills I have. People have been making shows for Years without generative AI and they are doing just fine.

My hope is that if people are being intentional with what content they are consuming, podcast creators will recognize that AI content won't get them what they are looking for in the space. This is absolutely not encouragement to harass people who are using Gen Ai, but instead for people to just behave in ethical consumption in their own habits!

10 [Reply](#) ...

2 more replies



VisitTheCosmiko • 6mo ago

[Top 1% Commenter](#)

Quiet.Please has... >2,000 audiobooks!? Geez dude. Is everything okay for them at home?

1 [Reply](#) ...

2 more replies

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

but hit a wall when it comes to cover art. Apologies in advance if this offends anyone, but I've commissioned many artists for various projects (podcasts and beyond) and struggled with both quality and matching vision with many artists and designers, and have frankly wasted a lot of time and money. I would love to find an artist to pay who I mesh with, but so far I've had little luck. The artwork on my 2 audio dramas is a mix of some cruddy work in Canva by myself and my partner and some paid artist work, and my 3 book covers I commissioned as well, but for my recent non-fiction project I definitely have dabbled with AI art after our designer took our money, delivered the most half-assed work I've ever seen, and almost delayed our launch by not meeting deadlines. I've definitely been burned both in the past and recently.

Admittedly, Canva is a LOT better than it used to be back when I was creating images for my audiodramas, and you can mix and match elements pretty easily to create images, so I'll probably go back to that. It is very difficult to have these lovely pictures in my head and extremely limited ability to create them myself AND a string of bad luck with commissioned artists and designers.

Not trying to say anyone is right or wrong, just sharing my experiences and some frustrations!

↑ 2 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



taalitos • 5mo ago

Agree with you 100%!

↑ 2 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



fjclaw • 5mo ago • Edited 5mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

industry, which is cool, but is definitely not representative of most people in the audience!

I would not ever stop to look at a podcast's cover art, and if I happened to look at it, I probably would not form a view (definitely not a confident one) about whether it was AI-generated. So no, that would absolutely never affect whether I listen to a show. As to AI writing or voices... again, I would not think about it unless it was really noticeable. If it's noticeable, it's probably kinda bad, so in practice I wouldn't listen to those either? But not for any boycott-type reason. Please don't go off in comments about why there are reasons to boycott AI, I have read the rest of the thread. I just want to point out that it's very likely this perspective - don't ever think about AI while listening, no strong views on it, might not like it if it became really noticeable - is the dominant one among people who listen to, but are in no way involved in making, audio dramas.

Beyond that, there is a lot of stuff being said in this thread that makes very little sense to me. About cover art, lots of people are saying it suggests laziness and that's not a good sign for the show itself. If you feel that way about your own show and you get satisfaction from learning every individual part of making a podcast, then good for you! But that doesn't mean it's a bad sign if another creator recognises something they're not good at, and finds another way to do it. There's nothing inherently more lazy about asking AI to make art than asking an artist to do it! Either way you are deciding not to do it yourself because you're not good at it and you don't want to, even though it's perfectly possible to put in some effort and make something passable. Quite a few comments here just read to me like a weird kind of DIY virtue gatekeeping, like your interest in making audio shows isn't valid unless you're also willing to put some hours into learning how to make passable cover art. Clearly it can be done, and for people who want to do it, that's cool - but why should it be a threshold? Why should we miss out on shows by people who are passionate about audio and fiction and not at all interested in learning how to use Canva? (And wouldn't all these arguments about 'laziness' have applied equally to someone making Canva cover art, instead of learning a more serious artistic tool?)

Or think about AI in a different context. If an engineer in an office job has spent dozens of hours on a technical report, but they're not great at expressing themselves so they get ChatGPT to help write the covering email sharing this with their bosses - would that make you doubt the reliability of their technical work? Because they're too 'lazy' to write a nuanced email, which requires skills they don't ever practice?

Lastly, I don't know much about visual art, but at least for generated text I think many of you are way overestimating how easy it is to identify. GPT is very good. It's identifiable when it's being used poorly because the text may wander or repeat, but if somebody is doing a bit of iteration and editing, you should absolutely not have confidence it'll be identifiable. I doubt that it's going to produce the best-written scripts around, but I have definitely heard some shows where the script would be improved or better done by AI. And that's fine! If those creators enjoy the writing then good luck to them. If they're more interested in coming up with ideas and characters, and they need some help with dialogue, I wouldn't have a problem with them using AI to get that help.

To clarify, though, I'm not saying anyone shouldn't boycott AI shows if you feel strongly about it. And if your position is "AI cover art is stealing and I'm not going to support someone who steals", fair enough, and that makes a lot more sense to me than "AI cover art is lazy".

↑ 2 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

For decades I've been using photoshop to create what now looks like AI art. I often use assets from the internet and adapt and transform them, often dramatically. More and more frequently, in my search for these assets I am finding them in AI art. I try to minimize my use of them, but these are clippings I am using to create a full image and sometimes the sample that most fits my needs are Ai created. It's complicated.

Ethically, I hate using AI generated anything. AI generation consumes energy I would rather be invested into humanity, but alas I am not going to decline an image that has already been generated when it fits my photoshop asset needs. I use to make found sculpture art from trash. I view this as similar.

I work modestly hard on the generic images for by show and I hope you don't judge my book too harshly by its covers.

  1  Reply ...



tater_tot28 OP • 6mo ago

It sounds like you don't actually have any ethical qualms then. By utilizing the assets, you are affirming that there is a market for that content in the first place, which leads to the further use and generation of said content, which as you say, has environmental impacts and ethical concerns.

Just because you aren't generating the content yourself doesn't mean that you aren't contributing to the overarching problem. This isn't like someone struggling to purchase ethically from the grocery store, this is the easiest choice in the world. Just don't use it.

 -2   Reply ...

 4 more replies



dgj212 • 6mo ago • Edited 6mo ago

same, hell, on youtube if I think you content is Algen'd I make it so I never see content from your channel ever again, I would rather see a cover art in color pencils(found an amazing vid on how to blend colors like that, trick is to color in three different directions: Up-down, left-right, diagonally). That way I know there was passion behind the work, rather than someone spamming ai.

 1   Reply ...



SadMathematician1837 • 5mo ago

While on the topic of AI verses human voice and art... I've been planning to put together a quiz to see if people can tell really well put together AI from human voices, (and art and video). If I put together a quiz and directed people to it, would anyone take it?

 1   Reply ...



After_Tap_2150 • 5mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)**superstarbootlegs** • 4mo ago

The only people who care about AI, are the ones feeling threatened by it. All any listener wants is decent product. The industry is trying to gate-keep that for their own agenda.

1 **Reply** **superstarbootlegs** • 4mo ago • Edited 4mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

reality of it. AI tools like RVC allow me to record my entire show in Reaper, then use RVC to convert all my voiced parts to actor voices and Comfyui and Flux for any artwork. This then gives me the production version quality, and I can figure out what works and what doesn't. I currently can't post those here or any distribution outlet and that is fine, I get that the money making industry is scared and I get why. That is who controls and gate-keeps creativity, not the creators, listeners and audience.

The things you complain about here, are seen every time new tech comes along.

I'd also point out that the outlets you are considering "geniune" like Youtube and Spotify do just as much damage to independant artists with their criminal royalty methods. I pulled my music and music videos from both for that reason. I think everything should go the open source route and let the market decide what it likes.

I see AI as fair game, and the future. I get most of you won't like it, but such is life, the next generation of listeners won't care.

I can make an entire show without the need for anyone else thanks to AI means creative outlet for me. I don't see that as a bad thing at all for a creative such as myself, but then I am not in it for the money.

Wait til Text to Video AI is out on open source. It will nuke Hollywood and script writers control of narratives. I can't wait for that either.

AI is actually giving freedom to artists and creatives. I completely use it in my creative process, as do many others I know, and it is phenomenally useful imo. It has set my imagination free. If you are all about money you are in the wrong industry. I am all about the creativity and AI enables that, it does not destroy it, the thing it destroys is the industry that has a stranglehold control over us.

If you were around when MP3 got going, it was the same story, and now look where we are with that. Everything is on mp3. AI will be the same so may as well accept it and work with it.

I've watched myself get put out of business three times in life with tech that arrived. I realised this is the nature of evolution and it is best to roll with it when it happens. Find your way with it, because fighting the inevitable is a waste of energy.

If anyone wants a listen to what AI can do on a home PC with not much effort, zero \$ software cost, and a half decent graphics card, feel free to DM me. I can't post links here, obviously. The entire world of story-telling is on the cusp of massive change, and I believe that is a good thing. Though I understand your pain, I have been through it enough times as an artist.

↑ 1 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



TheHeroOfNothing • 1mo ago

Such a serious topic and I agree with your view..it's just also funny cause my cover is a heart so I hope you check it out :D

↑ 1 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

the new photoshop. There's still plenty of ways to make the art yours.

0 [Reply](#) ...



tater_tot28 OP • 6mo ago

It is definitely not the new photoshop and I don't think AI should be enabled in an academic setting In Particular.

6 [Reply](#) ...



Top_Hat_Tomato • 6mo ago • Edited 6mo ago

I'm going to state my opinion on each one of these.

Ethical implications

Absolutely there are ethical implications, but there are plenty of AI uses in audiodramas that are *not* ethical issues. Eg, I have utilized voice cloning (which I presume is the issue you're discussing here) on a non-audiodrama short personal project with permission. Additionally there are common AI-powered denoisers which seem benign but are likely trained on massive amounts of content without people's consent (eg. Demucs, or Project Shasta/Adobe Podcast and their TOS likely allowing for utilization of your data).

What I'm saying here is that regarding ethics what matters most is **consent**.

Hollow feeling

If your issue with the utilization of AI products in audiodramas are that it feels "hollow" or it is bad, then I've got to say that I'm disappointed. If I watch a movie to find out that there was animal abuse involved - I don't suddenly go "oh but at least it was a good movie".

In my opinion it should start and end with "it was bad" instead of only "oh the technology was bad" because the second the technology *isn't* bad then you'll have lost on that point. Lastly, it is implying that if AI wasn't so bad then you'd have less of an issue with it.

*edit ope - seems I got immediately downvoted. Welp I was trying to have a conversation but I guess that's not gonna happen today.

I'd also like to understand how some types of scraping audiobooks without consent is okay for "AI tools that actually do assist in the audio editing process". Both are unethical without direct consent of those who created the content. If your issue is "the theft of people's data", then you'd accept consensual AI - but I doubt this to be the case.

0 [Reply](#) ...

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

As a musician, I have spent decades listening to and studying music. In the early stages, I regularly and intentionally emulated those I admired. I've also spent decades learning how to play various instruments and being trained by many teachers and musicians from various parts of the world along the way. Through emulation, I learned the foundations of creating art via these musicians, teachers, their curriculum/styles/skills, and utilized the building blocks provided to me. All of the musicians and music that has inspired me has helped shape me into the artist I am. The art I create is a culmination of all of these things I put together into something that is a reflection of who and what I am.

AI shares some similarities, albeit closer to the instrument than the artist. Musicians share the same instruments, chords, progressions, scales, words, theory, etc., but how we use it in conjunction with who/what we are shapes the art. AI does nothing without the actions/intervention of people. Can it be used to create derivative works? Not exact replicas, but absolutely can create derivative works with similarities if desired. Bad actors will be bad actors regardless of the art form.

People have complained about the use of electric guitars, drum machines, synthesizers, sequencers, MIDI, samples, loops, music construction kits, copy & paste, digital audio, autotune, quantization, and on and on. Where would you personally draw the line?

Go ahead and use the same instruments, the same chords, the same words, the same sounds, scales, time signatures, pitches, voices as everyone else has done before you. We all stand on the backs of giants and would be nothing without those rare visionaries that have pioneered new ways for all of us to find our own voice. How many of you that object to the use of AI are pioneers that create something genuinely unique, without the influence of others?

0  0   Reply ...



tater_tot28 OP • 6mo ago

A person learning from and even drawing inspiration from another is not comparable to what an AI does, which is stitch together stolen content based on it's non-zero understanding of what music is. To use an AI that generates music, as you say, it has to pull from something. It has no mind of its own, nor creativity and will just use what already exists.

If you as a musician were to just do **exactly** what someone else has done, you would also get sued for copyright infringement. There is a reason why these laws exist in the first place. The issue with AI is that it now has mass produced the ability to plagiarize without the user having to do anything at all.

"People have complained about the use of electric guitars, drum machines, synthesizers, sequencers, MIDI, samples, loops, music construction kits, copy & paste, digital audio, autotune, quantization, and on and on. Where would you personally draw the line?" People had to learn how to use these, These are Just like instruments but on a different format, people had to put in Effort into using these tools and making them sound good. I can't just plug in a phrase and have it shoot out Something. I would have to learn, and by learning, we are able to create something New, even if it is derivative of something else. Generative AI will never be able to do this and will forever rely on the hard work of other people in order to function. AI wouldn't exist without actual artists because then, what would "teach it"? People can create out of nothing. AI can not.

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)**[deleted]** • 6mo ago

Personally, I don't care if AI is used. AI has been replacing or accenting all kinds of stuff. It's part of moving forward. It happens to everyone. Happens to laborers. Technology advances and lends hands to many people. For a long time everyone thought it would not affect artists. But digital art replaced painters and so on. Now AI is something someone can use to generate a image.

If you are not ok with it. I understand. But normally, if AI can generate an image for free or for a few dollars, like a Logo and that Logo can pass through copyright and so on, I don't see the need to pay \$1500 to someone.

0 Reply ...

**tater_tot28** OP • 6mo ago

You will be hard pressed to find an artist that would charge nearly that much for something like cover art for a podcast. \$1,500 a less than what a paid for 12 characters worth of high quality concept art from an industry professional so if budget is your concern, there ARE always artists that can work in your budget. You just have to look.

Digital art has also Not replaced painters. They are entirely different mediums that require completely different skill sets.

See this post for why AI isn't so simple as "laborers being replaced by advancement." The consequences are happening Now.

https://www.reddit.com/r/audiodrama/comments/1ew9oga/comment/liyf2e8/?utm_source=share&utm_medium=web3x&utm_name=web3xcss&utm_term=1&utm_content=share_button

3 Reply ...

+ 4 more replies

**ResonanceCompany** • 6mo ago • Edited 6mo ago

Well despite what you want, I don't want bad background images for my projects and I don't have the time or skill to create what I imagine.

I think it's highly subjective to say ai feels hollow. When I hear such things I can't help but think of people who hated CGI when it first appeared in the hands of creators.

I work 144 hours a week, and yet ai has given me an avenue of creating the Darth Bane audio drama I've always wanted, with background images that suit it. All done with AI, and I'm very satisfied with the end results

It's a shame you cant let yourself enjoy content based on how it was made.

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

AI usage is, at its core, a moral and ethical issue. Many people work, many people don't have the technical ability to create what they envision in their minds, and yet they don't use AI because of the technology itself.

No one can force you to do anything, but I would challenge you to ask yourself why you are more comfortable using technology that has been proved to be trained on stolen content, proven to be detrimental to the environment, and from a subjective point of view, adds nothing of value to your work, than finding an alternative. I would say that it is more of a shame that you would allow your work to be tainted in this way, dissuading potential listeners who might otherwise be interested. But hey, that's up to you.

↑ 12 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

+ 15 more replies



Hallelujah289 • 6mo ago

Top 1% Poster

I will add on to your point that actually a lot of art can feel as hollow to look at as AI, even if entirely created by an artist.

↑ 6 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

+ 1 more reply



LastOfTheMoohanicans • 5mo ago

I'll be honest, I'm quite disinclined to check out the work of someone who starts an engagement with a podcast listener with "Well despite what you want"...

I mean, you are welcome to do as you wish, of course; but I am similarly welcome to not engage with your work and I don't know if that's a strategy many would consider a great starting point for having your work consumed and enjoyed. If you insist on doing only what you want with no scope for feedback or change, I can't imagine it being worth my time to check out your work.

↑ 6 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

+ 1 more reply



Elvarien2 • 5mo ago

Keep the witch hunting in the stories please. No need for your vile hate filled attitude outside of fiction.

↑ -1 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



tater_tot28 **OP** • 5mo ago

It's hate to have an opinion on the use of a product?

↑ 4 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

+ 4 more replies

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

Entitled hogwash. How dare you say something as asinine as "why would I assume your AUDIO SHOW is as low-effort as the PICTURE attached to it?" I don't know, maybe because the AUDIO SHOW is produced by people whose talents and passions are aural, not visual, and since you're presumably going to consume the AUDIO SHOW with your ears and not your eyes, maybe it doesn't horking matter how they made the jpeg you're self-righteously judging them for.

Internet audio drama has been a thing for decades now. Tons of shows people loved and still talk about to this day had "cover images" that were dashed-off typography or collages of public domain clip art, because it was fast and cheap and they just needed a little square thing you could click on or else they couldn't upload their show. Well guess what, microphones are better than they used to be, editing software and sound design tools are better, distribution systems are better, and the solutions available when "upload image here" with a friggin' you-can't-skip-this-step asterisk next to it ruins your month are also better by leaps and bounds. If you can afford to pay an artist, pay an artist, but if you're an independent whose life is hard enough without having to shell out more money than your AD will ever make you just to put a publicly-acceptable 2400x2400 title card in front of your probably hundreds of hours of hard work and lost sleep, **use the tools available**.

  -2  Reply ...



stardustgleams • 5mo ago

I'm gonna try and actually answer this question, though given your "entitled hogwash" comment, I doubt you actually want a good faith discussion.

Why would I assume your audio show is that low effort?

Because why wouldn't I? Because if the first thing I see, the cover art, is cutting corners, I have no reason to believe anything else was actually made with effort, creativity, and care.

Use of AI has such a reputation for laziness. My first impression personally would be that if you didn't care enough to edit a couple stock photos, the rest of the show will be just as low effort.

That's how I see it, personally. Without the moral or ethical aspects, which ARE still a factor, I always see AI as a clear indicator of a project being a cash grab.

Does that answer your question?

 4   Reply ...



tater_tot28 OP • 5mo ago • Edited 5mo ago

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

While your message is incredibly rude, and certainly not in good faith, it falls apart rather easily.

AI isn't a tool. You don't need to learn anything to use AI, it does all the work for you. It circumvents the paths to either a) do something yourself or b) hire someone to do it. There are guaranteed to be artists who can work with you and your budget, you just have to do the bare minimum and look.

And why should I assume that if you do use AI for your image (particularly if you don't disclose that you have) that you haven't also used generative AI in your writing process?

Regardless, I am allowed to "boycott" shows in my own consumerism due to their use of AI for the exact same reasons I might boycott any sort of company, indie or otherwise, for what I feel this is an ethical failing on their part 🙄. No one has been able to justify the use of AI from an ethical perspective beyond essentially saying "I couldn't be bothered to find another solution like everyone else."

↑ 4 ↓ [Reply](#) ...



Agreeable-Detail7696 • 6mo ago

KILL FM used AI for all their art and it really turned me off of listening to any of those creators.

⬇ -6 ↑ ↓ [Reply](#) ...



ARTISTICEXISTENCE • 6mo ago

I did the original cover art for KillFM. It was not AI. They did use AI radios in the original launch campaign though.

↑ 15 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

⬇ + 2 more replies



fernwilt • 6mo ago

Stop spreading misinfo plz and thanks

↑ 6 ↓ [Reply](#) ...

⬇ + 1 more reply



vive420 • 6mo ago

Cry harder. Generative AI is here to stay

⬇ -6 ↑ ↓ [Reply](#) ...



tater_tot28 [OP](#) • 6mo ago

The same was said about NFTs and we all know what happened to those 🙄

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)**Top_Hat_Tomato** • 6mo ago

How am I supposed to fit crying in my schedule after groveling for 3 hours and combing my hair for 2? I'd love to fit in crying but I don't think I'll have the time.

 5 **Reply** **[deleted]** • 6mo ago**5Karma4Farmer5** • 6mo ago

I love AI! I trained AI for almost 5 years, and I'm all in on it!

 -7 **Reply** **Aglavra** • 6mo ago • Edited 6mo ago**chuk_sum** • 6mo ago**ChagataiMan** • 6mo ago**r/CharacterAI** • 3 mo. ago

What's going in with the c.ai drama and can someone explain it to me?

8 upvotes · 1 comment

**r/audiodrama** • 3 yr. ago

A.I. + Audio Drama – What shows are using A.I. that you like? How do you feel about it as a tool or aspect of the creative process? (Credit: A.I.-rendered image of my audio drama;...

42 upvotes · 20 comments

**r/movies** • 1 yr. ago

Paul King's 'Wonka' Review Thread

682 upvotes · 364 comments

**r/victoria3** • 1 yr. ago

The definitive guide to why your buildings aren't hiring and how to fix them

389 upvotes · 84 comments

[Skip to main content](#)[Log In](#)

1 upvote

 r/audiodrama • 16 days ago


AI in Audiodrama

128 upvotes · 121 comments

 r/vfx • 3 mo. ago

Affleck on AI "I wouldn't want to be in the vfx business, they're in trouble."

222 upvotes · 225 comments

 r/bini_ph • 4 mo. ago

At what point do you fight fire with fire?

53 upvotes · 36 comments

 r/audiodrama • 11 days ago

RESULTS - r/audiodrama's favourite shows of 2024

110 upvotes · 35 comments

 r/Synduality • 7 days ago

Huge Payout

35 upvotes · 12 comments

 r/audiodrama • 1 yr. ago

10 Audio Dramas about A.I.! - Looking for a new show? Here are 10 shows with Artificial Intelligence as a main theme or character!

14 upvotes · 17 comments

 r/legaladviceofftopic • 6 mo. ago

Can you Copyright Photographs of AI generated content?

3 upvotes · 5 comments

 r/comicbooks • 6 mo. ago

Is Warren Ellis' upcoming audio drama using AI art?

356 upvotes · 171 comments



[Skip to main content](#)

[Log In](#)

48 upvotes · 32 comments

 r/DeadInternetTheory · 6 mo. ago

AI generated advertising

171 upvotes · 12 comments

 r/horror · 1 yr. ago


Willy's Wonderland > FNAF

438 upvotes · 99 comments

 r/audiodrama · 1 mo. ago

The Audio Drama Directory posted over 1,200 audio drama links in 2024! Here's an image of all them.

171 upvotes · 34 comments

 r/rant · 7 mo. ago

AI-Generated Video

2 upvotes

 r/gamedev · 2 yr. ago

How far are we from playing an AI-generated game?

90 comments

 r/learnmath · 6 mo. ago

AI-generated Math Content on YouTube

29 upvotes · 10 comments

 r/audiodrama · 25 days ago

What's an AD that really floored you? Something that didn't leave your mind for a long time after listening?

107 upvotes · 183 comments

 r/audiodrama · 26 days ago

Recommendations, please! (Horror, supernatural, urban fantasy, mystery, superhero, etc)



[Log In](#)

The Master and Margarita is amazing

142 upvotes · 31 comments



r/TheNSPDiscussion · 1 mo. ago

The NSP Doesn't feel scary any more

110 upvotes · 43 comments



r/spaceengine · 7 mo. ago

Overuse of AI

152 upvotes · 48 comments

Related discussions

Best Free AI Content Generator

Best AI Tools for Content Creation

Best AI Content Generator

Best AI Tools for Marketing

See more

