

Skye O'Hearn-Smith
Self-reflection

Right now, I think of generative AI as a tool that makes things by learning patterns from huge amounts of existing work. It does not think or imagine the way people do, but it can produce images, text, music, and video that look convincing because it has seen so many examples before. That is both what makes it impressive and what makes it kind of strange to wrap our heads around. It is remixing what already exists rather than creating something from lived experience. In creative fields, I see generative AI mostly as a shortcut and a support system. Designers can use it to generate quick mockups, explore visual styles, or get unstuck at the beginning of a project. Writers can use it to brainstorm ideas or rough drafts. Musicians can use it to experiment with sounds or structures they might not normally try. In these cases, the AI is not really the artist. It is more like a sketchbook that talks back. However, AI also raises real issues. It seems that often these systems are trained on creative work without clear consent, which feels unfair to artists who spent years developing their style. There is also the risk that people start relying on AI too much and stop practicing the more challenging aspects of creative work, and their critical thinking skills go down the drain. If everything becomes faster and easier, some of the depth might get lost. I see generative AI as something that can be useful but also limiting. It works best when it supports human creativity rather than replacing it. The value still comes from the choices people make, not from the tool itself.