Art carries the essence of its creators lifes

A comment on Brandon Sanderson on AI Art in his talk We Are The Art.

I agree that the value of art you create is the change it causes within you, but I don't think that its value is that you *admire it*.

Art is a crystallization of your path towards it. It lets others experience the essence of your life, of years of learning, in a much shorter span of time.

That's how it benefits society.

And that's why AI Art often is hollow: regardless of its polish, it represents far less learning.

And *one more thing* in which I think Brandon Sanderson is wrong in his talk:

Art isn't useless.

Art is code that leverages our shared culture to **run on the human brain and change our culture** – the beliefs and values that drive society. And art **builds the foundation for more art**.

> But while art is not useless, it is at its best, when it is not **used** as a tool or for producing something else. Paradoxically art is most useful if it is created only for its own sake.

AI art can come from our culture, but it does not grow with the changes it causes. It needs intermediary non-AI art to change.

If AI cannot ingest newly created non-AI art, it is stale.

Dead and hollow.

Developing prompts can actually give it more meaning, like a director can cast actors to match a vision, but form creates its own meaning.

Form created by human actors changes with their experiences.

Form created by AI does not.

It is a dead end.

The only way to make AI art grow is to use less and less AI over time and infuse creations with more and more human-made art.

But that human-made art has a hard time getting seen among AI-decorated art.