The Irreplicable Human Disorder: On the Aesthetic Value of AI Art

"You must have chaos within you to give birth to a dancing star," Nietzche expressed, words he had written in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. To create beauty, one must hold and willingly embrace the disorder within themselves. The birth of artificial intelligence (AI), and its new ability to produce art has sparked speculation about whether its creations hold aesthetic value comparable to that of human work, or even have it at all. For a piece to have aesthetic value, the piece must not only invoke pleasure or displeasure but also hold significance, substance, and the ability to elicit thought when experienced by the audience. Despite the importance of this technology and its subsequent breakthroughs, viewing AI art as holding any substance will inevitably kill creativity, leeching the absurdity of our humanity out of the world. Throughout this paper, I will argue that AI art is unable to birth a dancing star and examine the importance of disorder, creativity, and soul within art, along with inspecting why AI art cannot, and will not ever, successfully simulate the human spirit and produce works with aesthetic value.

Artificial intelligence is defined as a machine or program's ability to execute tasks that, if performed by a human, would require intelligence and effort, with some examples including translation, speech recognition, and, in this case, creating art. However, distinguishing art created by humans contrary to AI requires a clear understanding of what constitutes art. Art is a concept that I define as applying elements, such as creativity, emotion, and contextual and cultural expression, into a form or medium, such as, but not limited to, paintings, music, dance, or writing. AI-generated art, while capable of producing works within these mediums, lacks the essential awareness and knowledge required to imbue its creations with meaning or cultural significance. This raises the question of whether AI can generate proper art or even create something with aesthetic value. While AI-generated art has the capability to emulate human

work, it pales in comparison when it comes to the depth and cultural significance that true art should possess. It is important to ask ourselves whether we should consider AI-generated art as "art" at all, or if it is merely an imitation that lacks the true beauty and aesthetic value that lures us to art.

Despite the constant attempts to create artwork by AI that can replicate the beauty of humanity's work, AI is still unable to simulate the imaginativeness of humans. Many seek to replicate human-level creativity through AI with machine learning in an endeavour known as "computational creativity". I argue against the possibility of this, though, as this simulated intelligence is built upon human intelligence, and learns through consumption and analysis of human-made data. For example, Midjourney, a popular AI art website, makes art by taking the user's requested prompt and researching through hundreds of thousands of human-created art pieces that are considered valuable. After its research, it creates an amalgamation of these references to create something new. With each image it generates, the better it gets at creating something that holds technical beauty. Analyzing the process of the creation of AI art reveals its mindlessness, along with its fixed program that is untouched by spontaneity or disorder. Artificial intelligence, despite its technical prowess, cannot simulate a human soul, in which the secret to creativity lies. Without experiences, feelings, and relationships instead of circuitry and electricity for fuel, AI's ability to create art with significance is invalidated.

Regardless of the effort humanity invests in AI, and how meticulously it perfects its art-creating program to factor in context, trends, and emotions, it will never be able to truly replicate humanity's imaginativeness and originality, as it will always be taught by and programmed by humans, simply staying a mere imitation of its creator. As Ada Lovelace, the world's first computer programmer, said, "[A computer] can do whatever we know how to order it to

perform. It can follow analysis; but it has no power of anticipating any analytical relations or truths. Its province is to assist us to making available what we are already acquainted with." Though the AI can complete and create artwork by being fed previous art and information about the current world, it has no understanding of what it is doing and simply outputs the results it was programmed to produce. There is no chaos, thought, joy, or feeling within its creation process, voiding it of all creativity, originality, and worth.

Furthermore, aesthetic value in art is closely tied to its interpretive richness and contextual significance embedded within the works. Human artists draw upon personal experiences, cultural influences, and subjective interpretations to imbue their creations with significance. In contrast, AI lacks consciousness, subjective experience, and the ability to generate art from genuine emotion or personal narrative. Art's purpose is not merely to display technical proficiency or for its visual appeal; art serves to capture the essence of human experience, working as a universal language capable of provoking emotional responses that transcend superficial aesthetics. Moreover, the intentionality behind art creation is the basis for determining its aesthetic value. Human artists create with purpose, intent, and a desire to communicate with their audience. AI lacks authentic intentionality, with its creations driven by algorithms, programs, and data fed to it by humans rather than personal expression or the desire to engage with its viewers.

While AI can effortlessly create detailed, vivid, and visually appealing pieces, it fails to recreate the uniquely human sentiments and eccentricity. Most famously, the "Black Square" by Kazmir Malevich was a painting created to make an art piece based on absolutely nothing. Despite not being visually interesting, its aesthetic value is held within its meaning and ability to be universally understood. Malevich, instead of following the opinion that art is meant to mirror

reality, sought to create a piece that completely abandoned reality and stood transcendental. As written in Malevich's Suprematist Manifesto, *The Non-Objective World*, in which the cornerstones were the rejection of realism, Malevich explained his art movement, saying, "I mean the supremacy of pure feeling in creative art. To the Suprematist the visual phenomena of the objective world are, in themselves, meaningless; the significant thing is feeling." As Malevich said, the beauty of art lies within its creativity and feeling, rather than the technical aspect. The lack of artistry and feeling negates its value, draining it of pure feeling and the supremacy Malevich vouched for.

No matter how closely AI machines can replicate human artworks, feigning understanding and emotions, the absence of intention and authenticity within its works will always ensure human-made creations stand supreme. As opposed to humans, AI has no understanding of their work, only simply mimicking and creating a disgorgement of human-made art. Moreover, AI lacks any sense of feeling and emotion, stripping away the characteristics most essential to human art. Ultimately, the lack of spontaneity, experience, and thought behind its work prevents AI from being able to create art that holds any aesthetic value. While its prowess in the technical realm of art may improve in the future, the artificial mind will never truly replicate the chaos it is to be a human.

References

Kazimir Severinovich Malevich. *The Non-Objective World: The Manifesto of Suprematism*. Mineola, N.Y., Dover Publications, 2003.

McCarthy, Liz. "About Ada Lovelace." *Bodleian Libraries*, 25 Jan. 2015, blogs.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/adalovelace/about-ada-lovelace/.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. 1883. S.L., Simon & Brown, 2018.

Tolstaya, Tatyana. "The Square." *The New Yorker*, 2017,

www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/the-square.