

Review of: "Dietrich von Hildebrand's Reflection on Beauty and Aesthetics: A Theological Appraisal of AI-Generated Art"

Jim Davies¹

¹ Carleton University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Proposition A: For something to be considered art, it needs to be created by an artist who has dedicated skill.

Proposition B: For something to be considered art, it needs to be created by an artist who has put in effort.

Proposition C: For something to be considered art, it needs to be created by an artist who has years of training.

Proposition D: For something to be considered art, it needs to be created by an artist who has years of experience.

Proposition E: Art has the power to communicate spiritual matters.

Proposition F: Art has the power to elevate human beings to higher ideals.

These are all separate propositions that need to be independently argued for.

"This kind of "art", if we can call it that, is therefore the result of computation rather than creativity."

This statement assumes that human creativity is not computational. This is a very controversial thing to say. Most cognitive scientists who study creativity (including me) think that creativity is a computational process in the mind.

The Chamberlain et al. article is from 2017, before Dall-E and Midjourney. So to cite it as though it represents contemporary AI image generators is disingenuous. It seems implausible to me that people would find the output of Midjourney to look rigid and artificial.

New Rochelle is misspelled as New Richelle.

"Economics, he believed would swallow up authentic beauty, and there would be no classical beauty left. Decades later we see that his concerns were realized."

I don't believe that this is true, and it's irresponsible to simply assert it without argument or evidence. It would be hard to describe the modern art movement as replacing "beauty with superficial designs expressed in aerodynamics, giving shape to industrial utility."

"Considering AI-generated art, one needs to bare in mind that it is "computational creativity" which includes both art and science, and yet, the methods are purely scientific, they are neither artistic nor creative."

If you are presupposing your conclusion, then your reasoning is circular.

I think what Midjourney generates is artistic and creative. I'm a cognitive scientist professor and artist who specializes in the psychology of imagination. So if I disagree with this, it's worth addressing with an argument, not simply asserting.

"For this reason, von Hildebrand had little appreciation for the contemporary artists and artistic movements of his time..."

Okay, so we are supposed to use the criteria of someone who denies that all non-classical art is really art?

If we are concluding that AI generated imagery is not art using criteria that also implies that Picasso's work is not art, I think it loses a lot of credibility.

"AI is a misnomer because it is artificial intelligence,..."

This makes no sense. It's like saying that PRC is a misnomer because it is the People's Republic of China.

"An original painting will always be more valuable than computerized art produced by algorithms because it offers an "immersive experience." "

Well, there are computer generated paintings: <https://computerhistory.org/blog/harold-cohen-and-aaron-a-40-year-collaboration/>

Also, to determine that AI cannot create immersive experiences is an empirical issue. So where is the evidence that when people look at AI imagery they do not find it immersive? Because I would expect that, for any reasonable definition of immersive, there would be lots of AI imagery that would generate that response in viewers. I certainly have felt it looking at AI art.

"As Glaspey says, great art takes time. Lesser art (like AI-generated art) can be created quickly (and AI art almost immediately!),"

You should distinguish execution time from training time.

Regarding execution time, a great Chinese calligrapher can make a masterpiece in seconds, because they trained for 20 years to be able to. So it is not correct to say that a great amount of time is required in the execution of art that we determine later to be great. Also, what about improvisational music? It only takes as long to create it as it takes to listen to it. So would we say that the improvisational music of Coltrane is therefore not great?

Regarding training time, you might have more of a point. But note that contemporary AI image generators have trained on *millions* of images. Although this does not take years, it would take years for a human to study the same number of images. So are we faulting computer artists because they can learn faster than we can? That seems to be an irrelevant detail. If you disagree, argue why.

"Illicit" should be "elicit."

“it does not stay with us for long in our thoughts and reflection, as one might expect from complex works of art created by a human person (Glaspey 2021, 34).”

This requires empirical evidence.

Your conclusion should lay out the argument more clearly.

Ultimately this paper is about defending a definition of art and then applying that definition to AI imagery. Spell it out for us. What are the criteria, and what is the evidence/argument that AI does not meet it? Which ones does it meet and which ones does it not meet?

Also, your conclusion would be safer to say that AI imagery is not art according to von Hildebrand. Given that he would say Picasso can't create art, he has no credibility to me, but I could still agree with your conclusion if it were framed as I suggested.

Also, you should be mindful of saying it's not art and what the consequences of that might be. Suppose I illustrate my book with AI imagery, and an artist complains that I used AI to make the art, and that an artist was not paid. I could cite your paper and say no, I wasn't replacing an artist at all, because what I illustrated my book with isn't art. Or suppose there is an artist's union who complains that a company is using AI art instead of following the contract, and the company cites your paper, saying that they are not in violation of contract because they are not using AI to create art, just “imagery.”