Netnography -> Sci-fi and Scientific Illustration

Creativity and Art

Human VS AI Art

Looking at racial bias within AI generated images/content examined through generated baby in the Womb images

----------> The Search Trail ----------->

AI. Reddit Community page - examining for key themes across posts

Artificial Intelligence Gateway
r/ArtificialIntelligence

About Community

The goal of the r/ArtificialIntelligence is to provide a gateway to the many different facets of the Artificial Intelligence community, and to promote discussion relating to the ideas and concepts that we know of as AI. These could include philosophical and social questions, art and design, technical papers, machine learning, where to find resources and tools, how to develop AI/ML projects, AI in business, how AI is affecting our lives, what the future may hold, and many other topics. Welcome.

Created Feb 25, 2016

Lots of reddit pages opened to discuss AI content generation

New AI generated music video for the first AI Hardcore Techno DJ and producer with a track that was completely written by AI

Former Trump lawyer accidentally cited fake court cases generated by AI

Types of Generative AI

Google's launching a video making AI -- VideoPoet

How Generative AI is Transforming Industries

Many Image Generating AI Sites can't write text Correctly(as in signs held or posted on stuff), are there some that can?

Pornstars have thousands, even tens of thousands of photos. Why hasn't anyone created an AI to train on those and create new photos of famous porn stars?

From the SS above its possible to see pages being opened for discussion recently are on content creation by AI in the form of MUSIC, ART and VIDEO.

Comments within these pages were about art and creativity

From the SS above discussion on accuracy, questions on what art expression vs ai image generation is, and if ai is disrupting art.

More specifically AI Art vs Human Art.

Posted by u/Did4r___ 1 year ago

Who still cares about human art ?

98

Does pose a 'Threat'

With extremely respect for your occupation.. but when human see an art does not care how it was drawn, just care about his feeling, those images created by AI give me same feeling who human created.

Not for too long. That's why I said it would soon take a good part of the artistic jobs. just not yet.
Despite the fact that a big part of human art is also based on somebody else art and lacks originality. I see the human element value in art. But it will soon change. In my perception, it will be diminished. But maybe not. Maybe it will just change.

I got your point but I personally think the majority of people don't care about the technics behind a piece of art. Only about the feelings it triggers on them.
I believe AI will soon take good part of the few jobs still available for artists. Which is very unfortunate.
Aren't you concerned about that?

Indeterminable

Ironically all of this is a result of human artphotography as the base 'data' used to generate the images.

I thought the purpose of art is to express something that cannot be expressed, make people think, make them feel and move in a different way. This means that venturing and making art that can get tremendously popular later but for that contemporary time, it might be a unpopular opinion or truth that people might run away from. In short, courage to stand out or create a revolution.
Now AI can do well only with what most part of the training data looks like... & to generate a art that stands out or extremely meaningful, we have to spend rigorous efforts to tune .

Ironically all of this is a result of human artphotography as the base 'data' used to generate the images.

I thought the purpose of art is to express something that cannot be expressed, make people think, make them feel and move in a different way. This means that venturing and making art that can get tremendously popular later but for that contemporary time, it might be a unpopular opinion or truth that people might run away from. In short, courage to stand out or create a revolution.
Now AI can do well only with what most part of the training data looks like... & to generate a art that stands out or extremely meaningful, we have to spend rigorous efforts to tune .
So I think art is bad with human hands. It's art a word and I didn't have money for making good posters designs. Midjourney making cool, only then I think this will be helpful for me.

Does NOT pose a 'Threat'

Me, AI art wouldn't be here without human art. AI art is cool but will never replace a great human artist. I would love to be proven wrong, but that's just not going to happen.

I would say AI can replace some of the graphical designers in marketing and advertisement business.
Art is a human form of impression. It cannot be replaced.

As an artist (not professionally, but personally), I can tell you that art is not just about the end product. Making art is a deeply personal experience. Making art allows us to express our emotions and our humanity. I can look at an old painting, see the brushstrokes, and imagine what it was like for another person in the process of creating it. AI may be able to make beautiful and fantastic images, but the experience of creation is what makes human-made art so unique.

Came to say this too. While these tools are incredible in what they can achieve so far, without past works as inputs, they're create essentially nothing.
I do think things like stock art and photography and even some graphic design will be replaced eventually.
But some humans will always want the story behind the work. To know and connect to the artist as a person. To admire or hate or ponder. Machines may eventually become indistinguishable from us, given enough time, but I somehow doubt humanity will be around that long.

This is all based on art people have done. The machine learning models that created these images didn't just make them up. They where trained on images of millions of prices of art. Without new source material these models will never innovate.

AI art is a paradox. Art, by definition, is a way for humans to perceive reality from a different perspective. AI "art" is more a creation, a craft, but definitely not art. Until AI gets an enlightenment, a purpose, and achieves general AI, this stuff is just some cool mimicking shit

you are SOOO wrong about that, please don't project how YOU feel onto the rest of the population. AI art is a tool, not a replacement for ACTUAL artistic talent.
Even if AI faces in it's art were somehow not complete nightmare fuel, it would still lack nuanced thought and unique ideas, because it cannot come up with them on their own, and as you can see, it can only produce things with HEAVY abstract artistic license. nothing is precise, and again, faces are nightmare fuel.

I do! Actually playing around with Dalle-2 and Stable Diffusion made me appreciate human art even more.
Learned so many new artists by trying to setup specific prompts. Plus, human art has an intention, an idea behind it. And, without human art, no AI art!

Agreed. Art is supposed to be an human expression. What people is calling 'AI art' is in fact an automated Image generation, and by the way, it already existed even before computers. As much as we can appreciate an AI generated picture, it is no different from a randomly generated image, the only difference now is within the complexity of the algorithms used to make it.

As a wise man once said: Art is the one thing the AI won't be ever able to surpass humans. Do you know why? Because an AI that is programmed to give you the most of some feelings, will hijack your mind and sense's to do this, while an artist's work let you enter his/her mind and see the feelings, emotions, and sensations. AI is just a machine that expresses emotions through imagination, it is not just a pretty picture.

Humans and AI, if it could care. AI art, is simply the cultivation of human art.
But it will never care about anything, which kinds makes it souless.

Key Themes:
Art is about how it makes people think or feel and if AI can generate images that allow this then it is successful against the likes of human images

Key Themes:
AI is made up from human art and that the art generated can only be as good as the training data it is provided with

Key Themes:
Human expression and meaning behind the work
The AI is solely deriving is generation from its human library of work
The experience and creation behind human work is what forms art

r/ArtificialInteligence · Posted by u/bdsk 4 months ago

AI is giving me an existential crisis

83

Discussion

Does pose a 'Threat'

So the near future...if artists can do 1000x more, guess what it means? then 1000x less people can be artist for a living and now even if we increase demand, then it could be 500x less artists

What it mean? In the near term people + AI replace other people(even those who could use AI as well), in longer term AI can take on job alone.

Indeterminable

there is finite demand

There are 8 billion people on Earth. Only a few had access to art until recently, now you have 4 billion willing to participate. They have money to spend on it. Those people can type in prompts, but they are not educated in art or writing. They are willing to learn it and pay $$.

if people get big productivity boost, less people will be needed to satisfy that demand

Absolutely not. You had millions of people asking for digital art, now you have billions. Current artists and writers capable of doing AI and willing to teach those billions of people in ways of doing professional AI-assisted art/writing are in HUGE demand right now.

I disagree with you. I think your future specifically is very bright. Niche productions will be easier than ever to create, and entertainment is probably the only sector that is going to do better and better. Essentially you can become a producer on your own. That's something that other people, even with the aid of LLMs will not be able to do.

There is finite demand.
There are 8 billion people on Earth. Only a few had access to art until recently, now you have 4 billion willing to participate. They have money to spend on it. Those people can type in prompts, but they are not educated in art or writing. They are willing to learn it and pay $$.
if people get big productivity boost, less people will be needed to satisfy that demand
Absolutely not. You had millions of people asking for digital art, now you have billions. Current artists and writers capable of doing AI and willing to teach those billions of people in ways of doing professional AI-assisted art/writing are in HUGE demand right now.

I disagree with you. I think your future specifically is very bright. Niche productions will be easier than ever to create, and entertainment is probably the only sector that is going to do better and better. Essentially you can become a producer on your own. That's something that other people, even with the aid of LLMs will not be able to do.

Does NOT pose a 'Threat'

So far it's hard to make AI output a specific creative thing that you envision. It's good at generating a semi random image or text that is good quality, but it's hard to control because its regurgitating variations on training data. So I think there is still going to be a lot of room for human input and creation, or using AI as a tool in the toolbox.

AI is already generating extremely cool images and I'm sure everyone has seen them but never seems to have a wow factor as soon as you find out it's made by AI.
I'm not scared as long as the buyers have two eyes and a nose.

I mean, have you seeing AI Art ? Even when it's good looking you can often tell miles away that it is AI.
Without going in an endless debate of either it's art or not, average users of those techs are still inexperienced people. Models use person directives and try to do something matching it. The fact you can't put every emotion into words or that it's no use of telling an AI every single placement of elements in your image compared to learning how to draw yourself means creativity and expression will always be valued.
It takes an artist to know what colours and shapes he wants to use to express his ideas. An author to know if a story has a good pace and writting. Sure people can align 20 words describing the movie what they want, but AI will also output the most generic piece of media imaginable to fit those. The most it can do, and that tech always did, is automatise the simple tasks.
And in movie making (same as video-games, writting, etc.) what makes the difference between a good an average media are the details you don't want to automatise.

Hey, AI engineer here, happy to answer any questions but I'm going to be blunt here, while I am sure you are a good person, this post comes across as a elitist hypocritical rant. You likely (your industry definitely) didn't care when automation through robotics and machine learning killed others jobs, cashiers, stockers, taxi drivers, manufacturing etc. This isn't a new trend, and yet you want everyone to pause now because it is now affecting you.
Creativity is not restricted to those fortunate enough to attend fine arts schools and get a background in painting, animation etc. AI is simply lowering the barriers in translating what someone's imagination is into reality. Just as the camera killed portrait painting it invented surrealism and all kinds of new conceptual art. This too will happen with AI, art will change and be redefined. What will be challenged is the barrier of entry and the skills required to create and the skills required to monetise those skills.

Here's how I've been thinking about it :
•humans care about things that they know are made by other humans. A silly example but if you press the 'demo' key on a keyboard and it plays a perfect tune (obviously not AI, just pre-programmed) - it's nice but nobody is wowed by it..
..but if a human comes along and plays the exact same piece perfectly in front of you, everybody is wowed by it. The fact that a human did it matters.
Yes this is going to democratise access, much like YouTube's emergence did - suddenly every Jack and Sally could make video with a DSLR, hell a whole new industry of "Youtuber" content emerged and got massive. It took market share from the entertainment market but it didn't kill it, it just opened it up.
I'm watching all the Runway releases and they're cool but I'm also sick of the amount of generated content already. The true artists will use it with their craft to tell stories in a unique way that everyone else isn't, that's always the usp.
The next decade is going to be absolutely wild but humans look to other humans to navigate it and it matters what they do. ChatGPT could already write a million novels but has it destroyed storytelling?
No.

Key Themes:
AI can replace people and Jobs
Supply and Demand

Key Themes:
Training artists and writers to utilise AI and also become teachers of it
Reducing Barriers in the art market

Key Themes:
Accuracy and creativity limited through training data
AI lacks a wow factor that human work has on people
Market share will fluctuates between human and AI are

r/medicalillustration
u/kidcobraz · 224d

How do you think AI will impact Medical Illustration?

Does pose a 'Threat'

How do you think AI will impact Medical Illustration?
Hi guys, I'm a sophomore in college currently getting a degree in science illustration, and I'm a bit worried about my job prospects in the face of AI art. All my life I have loved science and visual design, and I love the practice of drawing, and I'm afraid (like many artists) of being replaced. It feels like an existential threat almost, as I've dedicated so much time since I was a child to achieving my dream of being a designer, and I've found so much meaning in the process... and I feel like AI is sucking the life out of that dream.

I'm a sophomore in college currently getting a degree in science illustration, and I'm a bit worried about my job prospects in the face of AI art. All my life I have loved science and visual design, and I love the practice of drawing, and I'm afraid (like many artists) of being replaced. It feels like an existential threat almost, as I've dedicated so much time since I was a child to achieving my dream of being a designer, and I've found so much meaning in the process... and I feel like AI is sucking the life out of that dream.

Indeterminable

I think it's important to know for anyone considering entering the field that even before AI came along, there always has been less "creative" art production involved with medical and scientific illustration than you may have thought, depending on what your initial impressions were.
A lot of our time as professionals is spent researching, project-managing, and revising the same image/piece many times over. Some people leave the field when they realize they aren't going to be sitting around drawing whatever they feel like. Some people burn out from the norm of constant revisions on every project. It's anything but leisure.

I think it's important to know for anyone considering entering the field that even before AI came along, there always has been less "creative" art production involved with medical and scientific illustration than you may have thought, depending on what your initial impressions were.
A lot of our time as professionals is spent researching, project-managing, and revising the same image/piece many times over. Some people leave the field when they realize they aren't going to be sitting around drawing whatever they feel like. Some people burn out from the norm of constant revisions on every project. It's anything but leisure.

Does NOT pose a 'Threat'

Here's the thing about "AI" as it's currently implemented: it's just a really complex mathematical process that takes a lot of examples and produces a similar example given similar inputs. That's it - a really tough mathematical process.
That means that it can't produce anything new or original. So the questions are:
Is there enough medical illustrations to sample to produce new ones that stand the chance of surviving a copyright challenge?
Do you think it's going to be cheaper to hire someone to explain to the mathematical process how to accurately draw an organ in whatever state the image requires or to hire an artist to draw it?
Illustration is about representing a precise idea, doubly so for medical illustration. In my opinion, a whole new approach would be required to develop AI art models that could turn medical language into useful images.

Here's the thing about "AI" as it's currently implemented: it's just a really complex mathematical process that takes a lot of examples and produces a similar example given similar inputs. That's it - a really tough mathematical process.
That means that it can't produce anything new or original. So the questions are:
Is there enough medical illustrations to sample to produce new ones that stand the chance of surviving a copyright challenge?
Do you think it's going to be cheaper to hire someone to explain to the mathematical process how to accurately draw an organ in whatever state the image requires or to hire an artist to draw it?
Illustration is about representing a precise idea, doubly so for medical illustration. In my opinion, a whole new approach would be required to develop AI art models that could turn medical language into useful images.

I am aiming to get my Masters in Medical Illustration. I have been faced with this question from others quite a bit.
I have a background in the sciences, with a BA in Biology.
In my own opinion, what you have to do as a medical illustrator can't be taken over by AI, at least right now. You will be illustrating complex medical, scientific, processes and ideas. You have to accurately illustrate this- and having a good understanding scientifically of what is happening.
AI may be able to generate ideas and images, but I don't think it is capable of illustrating complex processes which will require 100% efficacy. One little fault in conveying the scientific info in the illustration will make it incorrect.
Now, take into account that the field of Medical Illustration is already utilising AI. But it is not to take away the job, just make it easier for the illustrator. It is currently being used to fill in gaps to cut down time in creating animation, and being used to clean up final pieces.
In my opinion, an illustrator who understands the science and background will always be the best method to illustrate any medical or scientific work.

Key Themes:
AI can replace people and Jobs

Key Themes:
The process for scientific illustration is not all that it seems

Key Themes:
Accuracy and creativity limited through what training data is used
AI would require complete accuracy and with bias and uncontrollability this is hard

r/artificial
u/earthyterry49 · 286d

When will AI replace fiction writers?

Does pose a 'Threat'

It's one job of many across various industries. My current role probably won't be needed in 5 to 10 years. I just hope I'm in a more senior position by that stage...

AI is capable of creating stories and probably can do it very efficiently. It has the ability to access an infinite number of ideas, and resources easily and to create stories from them. I think people will continue to create their stories but may find it easier and more efficient to use some AI as a resource as well.

Don't speak too soon. This is just the beginning of A.I. much how humans get older and become wiser/aware AI is doing this same thing, except it is evolving rather than aging.

I agree. Although I think AI authored books could be very good given their creative latitude and their access to an infinite number of resources as well as their ability to process and assimilate information very efficiently.

I agree it's an amazing tool and people can decide how they want to use it. Personally I would write my book and then use AI to review it!

I see the initial value of AI in its access to so much information on so many topics, creating entirely new concepts, original ideas and solutions to currently unsolved problems.

Indeterminable / Mid Ground

At first it will be used as a tool by fiction writers to assist with outlines, plot development, and polishing. Eventually we will have models good enough that publishers will prefer to have AI churn out the formulaic types of novels; romance, space opera, short stories, and whatever else can be defined as formulaic. Eventually humans writers will only be published if they are exceptionally gifted and genre blending and only for as long as it takes to train AI writers on the style. There will be a growth of small publishers that ONLY publish human writers and they will have a fan-base especially because they are human.

a big thing that makes book interesting is that the author only has a limited scope himself, making the book inevitably be infused with him as an essence (more or less depending on the author)
of course ai can one day replicate that too, but just to say more information doesnt mean a better product

It's never going to happen fully with books. Not because AI won't be able to writing a good book, but because it's going to be just another book trying to win over people in what is already a really big pool with only few getting more recognition despite many others writing good books too.
With Hollywood it's a lot more possible. The scope is a lot smaller and the studios would love to have writers who can do countless rewrites in seconds to the specifics they give.

Does NOT pose a 'Threat'

I think people praise the writing too highly. Its absolutely mind blowing what it can achieve, especially with additional prompts to mould it. Ive messed around with it a fair bit - and a human still needs to 'fix it'. Its going to change the world for sure, and revolutionise how work is done, and even put many people out if jobs... but its not going to make human creatives obsolete.

Probably never tbh. An AI can certainly write a by-wrote Sci-Fi novel but it will lack themes, subtext, and story nuance.
Although AI assistance for writers to help them plan out their stories, edit text/grammar/syntax, and maybe suggest things to fill in the space here and there; it could be an incredible assistance tool.

Yeah, for example, it cant handle any real witty nuance.
It can dream up, say, a first-person story of an old retired war veteran retelling a tale of a past deed. But it cant handle something like; that war veteran telling a story of courage, but in reality his actions had terrible consequences (that he still remains unaware of) but, by reading between the lines, its implied he actually caused huge problems for his comrades.
It will always just tell you a story, and then say "but then I realised... I hurt everyone" it can't actually weave it into the telling. It takes a human mind to weave in that intricacy.
Whilst that might improve, I dont think it will ever be fully eliminated. The best creative outputs require creative minds that understand humanity on a human level with a human mind.
It can easily tell a story of cliches, a knight vs a dragon for example, and do very well. But introducing much clever nuance is difficult for it.

It won't replace authors at all. Even if AI becomes better at writing, that won't impede people from also writing. The same way that no matter how go AI art becomes, people will still be able to express themselves through art, and other people may feel encourage to pay for it.

I agree. The human experience is something we feel not think. Feelings can't be translated by AI...yet.

I think writers will use it for shortcuts and stimulus - but its never going to outright replace good creative writing. Maybe some trashier easy read stuff. But what it will do for writers planning whole sub plots and worlds and characters will be incredible.

Key Themes:
Draw very high volume of resources to make content from
AI is evolving and improving rapidly
AI can review, edit and carry out many tasks

Key Themes:
AI is a tool that is utilised
AI is still in the process of development

Key Themes:
AI still require correct human input and human error checking will always be necessary
AI defaults to training data, stories rampant with cliche and repetition
Expression and human value is necessary

Key Quotes

Does pose a 'Threat'

- When human's see art they do not care how it was drawn, only about there feelings — "when human see an art does not care how it was drawn, just care about his feeling."
- The value of the Human element in art will soon be diminished — "the human element value in art. But it will soon change. In my perception, it will be diminished."
- Most people don't care about the techniques, just the impact the art has on them — "I personally think the majority of people don't care about the technics behind a piece of art. Only about the feelings it triggers on them."
- Knowledge of your field means you specialise in controlling AI generated content in that area — "Essentially you can become a producer on your own."
- The role of an artist will change to become about the techniques of AI to make art. — "Current artists and writers capable of doing AI and willing to teach those billions of people in ways of doing professional AI-assisted art/writing are in HUGE demand right now."
- I've found so much meaning in the process but I feel like AI is sucking the life out of it and the invalidating the developmental learning process — "I've found so much meaning in the process... and I feel like AI is sucking the life out of that dream."
- AI has the ability to access an infinite number of ideas, and resources easily and to create stories from them. — "It has the ability to access an infinite number of ideas, and resources easily and to create stories from them."
- This is just the beginning of A.I. much how humans get older and become wiser. AI is doing this same thing, except it is evolving rather than aging. — "This is just the beginning of A.I. much how humans get older and become wiser/aware. AI is doing this same thing, except it is evolving rather than aging."
- AI has access to so much information on so many topics, enabling generation of entirely new concepts, original ideas and solutions to currently unsolved problems. — "Value of AI in its access to so much information on so many topics, creating entirely new concepts, original ideas and solutions to currently unsolved problems."
- I think people praise the writing too highly. Its absolutely mind blowing what it can achieve, especially with additional prompts to mould it. Ive messed around with it a fair bit - and a human still needs to 'fix it'. Its going to change the world for sure, and revolutionise how work is done, and even put many people out if jobs... but its not going to make human creatives obsolete. — "I think people praise the writing too highly. Its absolutely mind blowing what it can achieve, especially with additional prompts to mould it. Ive messed around with it a fair bit - and a human still needs to 'fix it'. Its going to change the world for sure, and revolutionise how work is done, and even put many people out if jobs... but its not going to make human creatives obsolete."
- Yeah, for example, it cant handle any real witty nuance. It can dream up, say, a first-person story of an old retired war veteran retelling a tale of a past deed. But it cant handle something like; that war veteran telling a story of courage, but in reality his actions had terrible consequences (that he still remains unaware of) but, by reading between the lines, its implied he actually caused huge problems for his comrades. It will always just tell you a story, and then say "but then I realised... I hurt everyone" it can't actually weave it into the telling. It takes a human mind to weave in that intricacy. Whilst that might improve, I dont think it will ever be fully eliminated. The best creative outputs require creative minds that understand humanity on a human level with a human mind. It can easily tell a story of cliches, a knight vs a dragon for example, and do very well. But introducing much clever nuance is difficult for it. — "Yeah, for example, it cant handle any real witty nuance. It can dream up, say, a first-person story of an old retired war veteran retelling a tale of a past deed. But it cant handle something like; that war veteran telling a story of courage, but in reality his actions had terrible consequences (that he still remains unaware of) but, by reading between the lines, its implied he actually caused huge problems for his comrades. It will always just tell you a story, and then say "but then I realised... I hurt everyone" it can't actually weave it into the telling. It takes a human mind to weave in that intricacy. Whilst that might improve, I dont think it will ever be fully eliminated. The best creative outputs require creative minds that understand humanity on a human level with a human mind. It can easily tell a story of cliches, a knight vs a dragon for example, and do very well. But introducing much clever nuance is difficult for it."
- It won't replace authors at all. Even if AI becomes better at writing, that won't impede people from also writing. The same way that no matter how go AI art becomes, people will still be able to express themselves through art, and other people may feel encourage to pay for it. — "It won't replace authors at all. Even if AI becomes better at writing, that won't impede people from also writing. The same way that no matter how go AI art becomes, people will still be able to express themselves through art, and other people may feel encourage to pay for it."
- I agree. The human experience is something we feel not think. Feelings can't be translated by AI...yet. — "I agree. The human experience is something we feel not think. Feelings can't be translated by AI..."
- I think writers will use it for shortcuts and stimulus - but its never going to outright replace good creative writing. Maybe some trashier easy read stuff. But what it will do for writers planning whole sub plots and worlds and characters will be incredible. — "I think writers will use it for shortcuts and stimulus - but its never going to outright replace good creative writing. Maybe some trashier easy read stuff."

Indeterminable/Middle

- AI with human tuning can use training data to generate stand out and meaningful pieces — "Now AI can do well only with what most part of the training data looks like... & to generate a art that stands out or extremely meaningful, we have to spend rigorous efforts to tune."
- Art is a human form of impression. It cannot be replaced. — "Art is a human form of impression. It cannot be replaced."
- AI may be able to make beautiful and fantastic images, but the experience of creation is what makes human-made art so unique. — "AI may be able to make beautiful and fantastic images, but the experience of creation is what makes human-made art so unique."
- Humans will always want the story behind the work. To know and connect to the artist as a person. — "Humans will always want the story behind the work. To know and connect to the artist as a person."
- Until AI gets an embodiment, a purpose, and achieves general AI, this stuff is just some cool mimicking — "Until AI gets an embodiment, a purpose, and achieves general AI, this stuff is just some cool mimicking."
- Cool images never seem to have a wow factor as soon as you find out it's made by AI. — "Cool images never seems to have a wow factor as soon as you find out it's made by AI."
- The fact that a human did it matters. — "It a human comes along and plays the exact same piece on a piano perfectly in front of you, everyone is a piece auto programmed everybody is wowed by it. The fact that a human did it matters."
- A whole new approach would be required to develop AI art models that could turn medical language into useful images. — "A whole new approach would be required to develop AI art models that could turn medical language into useful images."
- AI may be able to generate ideas and images, but I don't think it is capable of illustrating such complex processes which will require 100% efficacy. — "AI may be able to generate ideas and images, but I don't think it is capable of illustrating such complex processes which will require 100% efficacy."
- Human writer's will have a fan-base just because they are human. — "A growth of small publishers that ONLY publish human writers and they will have a fan-base especially because they are human."
- The author only has a limited scope himself, making the book inevitably be infused with him as an essence. — "The author only has a limited scope himself, making the book inevitably be infused with him as an essence."
- It takes a human mind to weave in that intricacy. — "It takes a human mind to weave in that intricacy."
- I agree. The human experience is something we feel not think. Feelings can't be translated by AI. — "I agree. The human experience is something we feel not think. Feelings can't be translated by AI."
- I think writers will use it for shortcuts and stimulus - but its never going to outright replace good creative writing. — "I think writers will use it for shortcuts and stimulus - but its never going to outright replace good creative writing."

Does NOT pose a 'Threat'

- Me, AI art wouldn't be here without human art. AI art is cool but will never replace a great human artist. I would love to be proven wrong, but that's just not going to happen.
- I would say AI can replace some of the graphical designers in marketing and advertisement business. Art is a human form of impression. It cannot be replaced.
- As an artist (not professionally, but personally), I can tell you that art is not just about the end product. Making art is a deeply personal experience. Making art allows us to express our emotions and our humanity. I can look at an old painting, see the brushstrokes, and imagine what it was like for another person in the process of creating it. AI may be able to make beautiful and fantastic images, but the experience of creation is what makes human-made art so unique.
- Came to say this too. While these tools are incredible in what they can achieve so far, without past works as inputs, they're create essentially nothing. I do think things like stock art and photography and even some graphic design will be replaced eventually. But some humans will always want the story behind the work. To know and connect to the artist as a person. To admire or hate or ponder. Machines may eventually become indistinguishable from us, given enough time, but I somehow doubt humanity will be around that long.
- This is all based on art people have done. The machine learning models that created these images didn't just make them up. They where trained on images of millions of prices of art. Without new source material these models will never innovate.
- AI art is a paradox. Art, by definition, is a way for humans to perceive reality from a different perspective. AI "art" is more a creation, a craft, but definitely not art. Until AI gets an enlightenment, a purpose, and achieves general AI, this stuff is just some cool mimicking shit
- you are SOOO wrong about that, please don't project how YOU feel onto the rest of the population. AI art is a tool, not a replacement for ACTUAL artistic talent. Even if AI faces in it's art were somehow not complete nightmare fuel, it would still lack nuanced thought and unique ideas, because it cannot come up with them on their own, and as you can see, it can only produce things with HEAVY abstract artistic license. nothing is precise, and again, faces are nightmare fuel.
- I do! Actually playing around with Dalle-2 and Stable Diffusion made me appreciate human art even more. Learned so many new artists by trying to setup specific prompts. Plus, human art has an intention, an idea behind it. And, without human art, no AI art!
- Agreed. Art is supposed to be an human expression. What people is calling 'AI art' is in fact an automated Image generation, and by the way, it already existed even before computers. As much as we can appreciate an AI generated picture, it is no different from a randomly generated image, the only difference now is within the complexity of the algorithms used to make it.
- As a wise man once said: Art is the one thing the AI won't be ever able to surpass humans. Do you know why? Because an AI that is programmed to give you the most of some feelings, will hijack your mind and sense's to do this, while an artist's work let you enter his/her mind and see the feelings, emotions, and sensations. AI is just a machine that expresses emotions through imagination, it is not just a pretty picture.
- Humans and AI, if it could care. AI art, is simply the cultivation of human art. But it will never care about anything, which kinds makes it soulless.
- So far it's hard to make AI output a specific creative thing that you envision. It's good at generating a semi random image or text that is good quality, but it's hard to control because its regurgitating variations on training data. So I think there is still going to be a lot of room for human input and creation, or using AI as a tool in the toolbox.
- AI is already generating extremely cool images and I'm sure everyone has seen them but never seems to have a wow factor as soon as you find out it's made by AI. I'm not scared as long as the buyers have two eyes and a nose.
- I mean, have you seeing AI Art ? Even when it's good looking you can often tell miles away that it is AI. Without going in an endless debate of either it's art or not, average users of those techs are still inexperienced people. Models use person directives and try to do something matching it. The fact you can't put every emotion into words or that it's no use of telling an AI every single placement of elements in your image compared to learning how to draw yourself means creativity and expression will always be valued. It takes an artist to know what colours and shapes he wants to use to express his ideas. An author to know if a story has a good pace and writting. Sure people can align 20 words describing the movie what they want, but AI will also output the most generic piece of media imaginable to fit those. The most it can do, and that tech always did, is automatise the simple tasks. And in movie making (same as video-games, writting, etc.) what makes the difference between a good an average media are the details you don't want to automatise.
- Hey, AI engineer here, happy to answer any questions but I'm going to be blunt here, while I am sure you are a good person, this post comes across as a elitist hypocritical rant. You likely (your industry definitely) didn't care when automation through robotics and machine learning killed others jobs, cashiers, stockers, taxi drivers, manufacturing etc. This isn't a new trend, and yet you want everyone to pause now because it is now affecting you. Creativity is not restricted to those fortunate enough to attend fine arts schools and get a background in painting, animation etc. AI is simply lowering the barriers in translating what someone's imagination is into reality. Just as the camera killed portrait painting it invented surrealism and all kinds of new conceptual art. This too will happen with AI, art will change and be redefined. What will be challenged is the barrier of entry and the skills required to create and the skills required to monetise those skills.
- Here's how I've been thinking about it : •humans care about things that they know are made by other humans. A silly example but if you press the 'demo' key on a keyboard and it plays a perfect tune (obviously not AI, just pre-programmed) - it's nice but nobody is wowed by it.. ..but if a human comes along and plays the exact same piece perfectly in front of you, everybody is wowed by it. The fact that a human did it matters. Yes this is going to democratise access, much like YouTube's emergence did - suddenly every Jack and Sally could make video with a DSLR, hell a whole new industry of "Youtuber" content emerged and got massive. It took market share from the entertainment market but it didn't kill it, it just opened it up. I'm watching all the Runway releases and they're cool but I'm also sick of the amount of generated content already. The true artists will use it with their craft to tell stories in a unique way that everyone else isn't, that's always the usp. The next decade is going to be absolutely wild but humans look to other humans to navigate it and it matters what they do. ChatGPT could already write a million novels but has it destroyed storytelling? No.