Journal of Dharma 50, 4 (October–December 2025), 511–524

EVOLVING CREATIVITY DYNAMICS AND RETHINKING ART IN THE ERA OF GENERATIVE AI

SANKET S REVANKAR & SANJYOT D. PAI VERNEKAR ♦

Abstract: The rise of AI systems has shifted art making from manual execution to prompt-based orchestration, raising new questions about authorship, agency, originality, labour, and ethical responsibility. Using a comparative framework that engages Kant, Heidegger, Benjamin, McLuhan and Floridi, the authors argue that generative AI lacks the intentionality, genius and purposiveness required for creativity in the strong philosophical sense. Nevertheless, it can participate in a distributed, relational mode of co-creativity in which the human user remains the primary source of intention and judgment. The article makes three contributions: it distinguishes apparent from genuine creativity in AI art; it explains how AI reshapes labour, temporality, materiality and authorship through prompt-creativity and creative parasitism; and it offers an ethical critique, emphasizing human agency, dataset transparency, and fair compensation within the evolving infosphere.

♦ Sanket S Revankar holds a M.A. with a Gold medal in Philosophy from Goa University. He is currently a Junior Research Fellow at School of Sanskrit, Philosophy & Indic studies, Goa University pursuing his PhD in Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and has three years of teaching experience as an Assistant Professor.
Email: sanketrevankar28@gmail.com | ORCID ID: 0009-0003-6628-5993

♦ Sanjyot D. Pai Vernekar is a Professor of Philosophy at Goa University with over 34 years of service and currently serves as the Dean of the School of Sanskrit, Philosophy & Indic Studies, Goa University. She holds a PhD in Medical Ethics and has guided several PhD scholars and has various research publications to her credit.
Email: sanjyot@unigoa.ac.in| ORCID ID: 0000-0002-3475-4105

Keywords: *Co-creativity, Computational creativity, Creative parasitism, Generative artificial intelligence, Prompt-creativity.*

1. Introduction

The niche of artistic production has significantly changed due to the exponential rise of Generative AI models such as ChatGPT and Midjourney. AI systems can generate paintings, poems, music and films with minimal technical skill from users, producing outputs that appear creative and evoke aesthetic responses. Creativity was widely perceived as an exclusively human capacity involving intention, imagination and aesthetic judgement. This capacity to generate art which appears creative, being able to evoke surprise, usefulness and novelty makes contemporary AI systems creative in Boden's sense. This development raises a fundamental question: How does generative AI transform artistic creation? The normative concept of creativity was intertwined with physical implementation of artistic techniques. This paper argues that Generative AI transforms creativity from embodied artistic production to distributed conceptual authorship.

2. Methodological Approach

This article examines the transformation of artistic agency, redistribution of creative labour and ethical implications of AI-mediated art, using comparative hermeneutics and critical synthesis to assess whether generative AI can be genuinely creative. Works on computational creativity were first examined to establish the creativity debate followed by a normative analysis through Kantian concepts of genius, purposiveness and subjective universality. Heidegger's concept of *enframing* was used to interpret AI creativity as a mode of technological *enframing*. Further AI creativity was situated within the theories of Walter Benjamin, Marshall McLuhan and Luciano Floridi. In particular, the research explores how Kantian aesthetics contrasts with models of creativity proposed by contemporary scholars like Moruzzi and Vinchon. The methodology also employs a conceptual examination of co-creativity and prompt-creativity. In general, this work follows a critical-interpretive design combining

conceptual clarification (defining creativity), normative evaluation (assessing AI against Kantian standards) and comparative analysis (situating AI creativity within broader media, technological and ethical frameworks). This enables an examination of whether AI generated outputs constitute genuine creativity or remain structurally derivative simulations.

3. Computational Creativity: Theoretical Background

Philosophical debates on artificial creativity can be traced to the nineteenth century. Debates concerning artificial creativity have been shaped by several influential theoretical perspectives. Ada Lovelace famously argued that machines cannot originate anything new as they merely follow programmed instructions. This scepticism, often known as the "Lovelace Objection," continues to influence the current debate on machine creativity (Natale et al.). Alan Turing challenged this assumption by suggesting that machines could produce surprising outputs through complex computational processes. Later work in computational creativity further developed the idea that machines may demonstrate forms of creativity through generative problem-solving processes (Muggleton).

Margaret Boden's influential definition describes creativity as the production of ideas that are new, surprising, and valuable. Genuine creativity involves novelty, value, and surprise. Under this framework, computational systems such as AI could be deemed creative if their outputs meet these conditions. AI systems appear creative when the focus of evaluation is purely on their output. Nevertheless, a counterargument exists: True creativity requires attributes like intentionality, agency and experiential learning, which have historically been linked to human cognitive processes. The debate over creativity has led to two main viewpoints: The product-oriented perspective defines creativity by output. The process-oriented perspective links creativity to internal cognition. Generative AI systems can produce novel and aesthetically compelling content. This "product-oriented" view of creativity faces criticism. A complete understanding of creativity, from a philosophical standpoint, must inherently consider the issues of intentionality and autonomy. Kant viewed creativity as

fundamentally tied to rational agency and the ability to make purposive judgements. In his *Critique of Judgment*, Immanuel Kant defines artistic creativity as stemming from "genius", which he describes as the innate ability through which "nature gives the rule to art". From this perspective, authentic artistic creation requires intentional expression, imagination, and the power to produce aesthetic concepts that defy mere mechanical formulation.

Kantian creativity is subject-centred and not creator-centred. The origin of artwork is irrelevant to his aesthetic judgement. AI fulfils novelty and value in AI-generated artwork. Since a viewer can experience harmony, purposiveness and aesthetic pleasure regardless of the creator, collective authorship of the artwork does not challenge Kant's theory of aesthetic judgement. In his opinion, artistic creation arises from genius. Winter argues that AI art exposes a gap between rule-based generation and Kantian free play of faculties. While AI can produce formally coherent works, it lacks the spontaneity Kant associates with genius. AI is rule-based and externally programmed, not internally grounded. Wang highlights that AI lacks the subjective universality in which Kantian aesthetics is grounded. Algorithms cannot feel purposiveness; they only compute it.

Algorithmic systems don't fully satisfy Kantian purposiveness, only appear to. AI outputs can exhibit formal purposiveness- coherence, harmony, and stylistic unity. Human observers can experience as-if purposiveness, projecting meaning into outputs. Kantian purposiveness requires reflective judgment, free play of imagination and understanding along with subjective feeling. As algorithmic systems lack all three, they do not experience purposiveness. They can instantiate purposiveness structurally, but not ground it transcendentally in Kant's sense. Generative AI systems fundamentally question the philosophical definition of creativity. This is because their outputs stem from algorithmic pattern recognition rather than the autonomous intentionality central to human artistic genius, as defined by Kant. While these generative models can produce artefacts that are aesthetically novel or surprising, they lack the self-conscious

purposiveness that Kant deems essential for genuine artistry. When viewed from a Kantian lens, AI-generated content may have aesthetic appeal but cannot be considered genuinely creative in the human sense.

When AI systems are used as tools in creative processes directed by a human, the human remains the primary agent and author. In this scenario, generative AI acts like an instrument, an extension of the creator's imagination. This is important because it upholds human autonomy and authorship in AI created artwork. A Kantian perspective favours a co-creative model where AI is the enabling tool, and the human maintains intentional control over the artistic process. Recent research underscores the relational quality of creativity within AI-mediated environments. Caterina Moruzzi, for instance, posits that human-AI co-creativity is best viewed through the lens of distributed agency between the user and the system. This view suggests that the creative outcome is the product of this interaction rather than being the sole output of either the machine or the person involved.

Florent Vinchon advocated for a collaborative framework where artificial intelligence acts as a co-creative partner to human creativity, not a competitor. The research highlighted the synergistic relationship: humans offer contextual understanding, intentionality, and aesthetic judgement, while AI systems explore patterns on a large scale and generate the outcome. Prompt-creativity involves strategic prompting, continuous refinement and careful aesthetic selection. This view expands existent theories of co-creativity emphasizing prompt-creativity as a unique and growing form of AI-driven creative practice.

4. AI art and the Philosophy of Technology

In *The Question concerning Technology*, Martin Heidegger argued that technology is not merely a set of tools but a mode of revealing (*aletheia*). It is a way in which reality discloses itself to human beings. Heidegger differentiates modern technology from ancient techne. For him, ancient *technē* was a form of artistic bringing-forth (*poiesis*) similar to artistic creation. Modern technology on the other hand is dominated by *enframing*, where *enframing* is a

mode of revealing. The world appears as a standing reserve wherein resources are ordered, stored, and optimized. AI systems generate outputs by training on massive datasets, identifying and recombining patterns. In Heideggerian perspective, co-creativity can be interpreted as *enframing* at work. Artistic traditions, styles and cultural expressions become data resources, making art and artists a dataset and creativity a pattern recombination. Modern AI systems are market-driven. In this sense, art becomes content generation and not world disclosure. Since AI art production relies on the works of artists for training, and prompts for generation, human imagination becomes the input data while making creativity a resource. Humans risk becoming standing-reserve.

Walter Benjamin analysed how technologies such as film and photography transform the nature, value, and experience of art. Traditional artworks possess aura. By aura, he meant the uniqueness of an artwork along with its connection to tradition, ritual and originality. Aura is destroyed through mechanical reproduction. Art enters a stage of hyper-reproducibility where art becomes infinitely replicable, easily modifiable, without any fixed authorship. This makes art fluid and unstable. Mechanical reproduction weakens the authority of the original artist but has emancipatory potential to make art accessible to the masses. AI represents an extreme form of democratisation of artistic production. However, this democratisation is ambivalent because it raises questions about artistic labour, originality and ownership of styles. AI-generated art participates in this mode as it is produced instantly, highly scalable and rapidly available through digital platforms.

According to Marshall McLuhan, media could be viewed as the extensions of human being. AI-generated art is, thus, a new medium that reshapes creativity itself. Media technologies become extensions of human faculties. He distinguished between hot media (high definition, low audience participation) and cool media (low definition, high audience participation). AI-generated art is a cool medium operating through social media and online creative communities. The results evolve through iterative interaction, and the audience often modify or regenerate images.

Hence AI art involves participatory creativity, where meaning emerges through interaction between human and machine. Each new medium restructures the entire media environment. AI generated art does not exist in isolation. It interacts with digital platforms, social media and online creative communities. AI contributes to a new media ecology, where creativity becomes algorithmically mediated, platform driven and globally distributed.

Luciano Floridi has given the concept of the Infosphere in his theory of Information Ethics. In his works such as the *Ethics of Information* and *The Philosophy of Information*, he argued that contemporary digital technologies have created a new ontological environment called the 'Infosphere'. AI generated artworks are informational objects apart from being aesthetic artefacts. The artworks produced by AI become entities within the infosphere contributing to the overall informational environment. AI models are trained on a vast collection of artworks created by human artists. If these works are used without consent, it represents informational exploitation. This damages the informational ecosystem by unfairly appropriating creative contributions. If AI systems produce large quantities of derivative images, the infosphere becomes saturated with low quality or repetitive informational artefacts increasing informational entropy.

Floridi emphasizes the concept of distributed agency in digital environments. In AI art production, creative agency is distributed across human users, programmers, datasets and AI systems. AI systems are artificial agents operating within the infosphere. However, they are not moral agents as they lack intentionality and responsibility. Therefore, ethical accountability remains with designers, developers, users and institutions deploying AI tools. AI creativity requires responsible stewardship of informational systems. Floridi proposes the principle of ontological equality, suggesting that informational entities deserve moral consideration in so far as they contribute to the infosphere. AI art contributes new informational structures to this environment. However, ethical evaluation must ensure that such creations enrich cultural diversity, respect information sources and maintain informational integrity. Floridi's ethics focuses on

the flourishing of the infosphere. Hence AI art should be evaluated according to whether it promotes fair use of informational resources, protects artists' informational rights and contributes to meaningful informational content. Ethically responsible AI art systems would therefore require transparent datasets and fair compensation for artists to maintain a healthy informational ecology.

5. Co-Creativity and the Transformation of Artistic Labour

AI systems are data-driven tools that function as an extension of the artist's creative mind, rather than an independent creative entity. Artists are able to focus their efforts on brainstorming, refining prompts and visually assessing the output. Prompt-creativity is emerging as a transformative artistic skill, a form of meta-creativity. This shift means that creative expression is now primarily focused on supervising generative systems. Successfully designing a prompt requires precise instructions, demanding a clear articulation of ideas, artistic direction and nuanced context. The relation between human imagination and digital materials is, thus, reshaping authorship. Traditional artistic creation required lengthy experimental processes, the development of skills and direct physical engagement with materials; AI systems are now capable of producing intricate visual compositions almost instantaneously.

The significant reduction in the time required for creative work, enabled by generative AI, deeply impacts aesthetic value. Historically, the worth of art was closely tied to the labour, skill, and commitment necessary for its creation. As generative AI models drastically shorten the production time for artefacts, the perceived uniqueness and rarity of artworks diminish over time. AI similarly reduces the physical materials needed for creating art. Traditional art supplies such as canvas, paint, and brushes are replaced by digital, interactive tools. While this shift makes art creation more accessible, it prompts questions about the evolving connection between artists and the instruments they use. Moreover, AI has provided more individuals with access to artistic creation, enabling democratization. It has reshaped the sense of identity as creators (Khutsishvili, 152). Yet this apparent

democratization of AI-driven technologies remains inconsistent. Access is dependent on adequate IT infrastructure, digital literacy and financial means to subscribe to AI tools. As a result, while AI has the potential to broaden participation, it may simultaneously deepen existing disparities between communities that are technologically privileged and those that are marginalized.

6. Redistribution of Creative Power and Originality

The widespread adoption of Generative AI introduces new power dynamics within creative industries. The developer of AI models relies on vast datasets, which frequently incorporate copyrighted artwork created by human artists. The use of these datasets without proper consent or compensation for the owners raises ethical concerns regarding intellectual property rights and value of creative labour. This phenomenon can be termed as creative parasitism, where AI systems extract value from artists' creative works without providing proper recognition or fair compensation. AI corporations are increasing their dominance over the very infrastructure used for generative artistic production. This trend signifies a clear transfer of creative authority, moving it away from independent, autonomous creators and towards digital platforms, system developers and capitalists.

The core debate in modern aesthetics concerns the originality of art produced by AI. Generative AI systems create art by identifying patterns within vast datasets and then recombining these patterns into new forms. This process makes AI creativity fundamentally derivative. Upon closer examination, human creativity doesn't escape from this similar reliance on integrating existing concepts and inspirations. From this perspective, the real difference between human and machine creativity may not be the level of influence from pre-existing ideas, but rather the sheer speed and scale at which AI can synthesize and remix them. Hence, generative AI produces art that involves joint authorship. This introduces new ethical concerns like plagiarism, copyright and artistic ownership.

As AI increasingly integrates into creative processes, traditional notions of authorship are becoming more flexible and

subject to reinterpretation. Artistic outputs generated through AI systems often involve contributions from multiple actors including the human prompter, the AI model, the dataset of prior artworks and the developers of the AI system. This distributed process complicates conventional ideas of individual artistic authorship. Instead, AI-generated artefacts may be better understood as networked creations emerging from complex socio-technical systems having joint-authorship.

7. Ethical Challenges

The potential homogenization of artistic style indicates a grave concern. These include copyright violations in training datasets, erosion of traditional artistic professions and misuse of AI for deepfakes and misinformation. Generative AI-produced art relies on patterns within the artworks in its datasets. AI tools often deliver aesthetically safe, statistically optimized content in homogenized art styles. Such convergence in Generative AI produced artwork carries a significant danger of aesthetic stagnation and cultural monotony. This can profoundly change how aesthetics are perceived by the general public. It requires a reassessment of what constitutes artistic value within human society. When machines can efficiently mass-produce aesthetically desirable art, the traditional value rooted in human skill, effort, and time is significantly diminished. There is a need to develop AI tools that actively promote visual novelty and stylistic diversity rather than solely exploiting known aesthetic biases within the artwork in their datasets and popular styles available online.

New regulatory frameworks are essential to address challenges related to dataset transparency, intellectual property rights, and ethical AI development. It is crucial to align technological advancements with core principles of fairness, accountability and respect for human agency. Ethical issues surrounding copyright and compensation emerge when generative models are trained on creative datasets without informed consent. Robust regulatory frameworks are essential to ensure equitable economic benefits and fair credit attribution for creative professionals whose work trains generative systems.

They must mandate ethical dataset practices. Human-AI co-creativity must be viewed not just as a technological breakthrough, but as a socio-technical system. This transformation necessitates careful institutional oversight to guarantee the potential gains of prompt-creativity are shared among creative communities and stakeholders.

8. Conclusion

Prompt-creativity and creative parasitism become a framework to scrutinize emerging ethical dilemmas associated with AI-mediated art and computational creativity. Within prompt-creativity, the creative process is vested in aesthetic direction and articulation. AI creativity is an interplay between human intention and algorithmic processes. Human-AI co-creation is a key characteristic of the modern artistic environment. The rise of Generative AI also carries important implications for art education and cultural institutions. Historically, formal artistic training focused on mastering manual techniques and craft. As AI systems progress in automating aspects of creative work, there needs to be equal progress in the evolution of art education. New pedagogies should focus on conceptual thinking and developing informed and thoughtful engagement with AI tools.

Future artists will require a blend of traditional artistic skills and new competencies like proficiency in prompt design, algorithmic literacy and AI ethics. In fact, AI can also enhance art education by offering tools to analyse patterns in art collections giving new hope that computational creativity can support teaching art. Creativity in the future will not be confined to purely human or purely machine efforts. Instead, the modes of co-creativity will elevate human tasks to a higher level while computational capabilities enhance human expression. Thus, engaging with AI becomes crucial for an artist. The shift towards AI involvement in creative processes necessitates careful ethical governance. Therefore, the central challenge is not the debate on AI inclusion but how to effectively protect human agency, artistic integrity, and ethical accountability within AI-driven creative systems.

REFERENCES

Attumkal, Mathew. "Digital Darwinism: The Survival Game of AI and Algorithms." *Journal of Dharma*, *49*/03 (2024): 315-320.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." In H. Arendt (Ed.), Illuminations. Schocken Books, 1969: 217-251.

Boden, Margaret A. "Creativity and Artificial Intelligence." *Artificial Intelligence* 103/1-2 (1998): 347-356.

Checkonthayil, Binoy. "Artificial Intelligence and the Human Mind: Psychological Insights and Implications." *Journal of Dharma*, *49*/03 (2024). 393-408.

Dartnall, Terry. *Artificial Intelligence and Creativity: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Springer Netherlands, 1994.

Erden, Yasemin J. "Could a Created Being Ever Be Creative? Some Philosophical Remarks on Creativity and AI Development." Minds and Machines 20 (2010): 349-62. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-010-9202-2

Floridi, Luciano. *The Ethics of Information*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Floridi, Luciano. *The Philosophy of Information*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Gaut, Berys. "Creativity and Art: Three Roads to Surprise." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 52/1 (2012): 116-119.

Grilli, Luca and Mattia Pedota. "Creativity and Artificial Intelligence: A Multilevel Perspective." *Creativity and Innovation Management* 33/2 (2024): 234-47.

Epstein, Ziv, Hertzmann Aaron, Herman Laura, Mahari Robert, Frank Morgan, Groh Matthew, Shroeder Hope, Smith Amy, Akhten Memo, Fjeld Jessica, Farid Hany, Leach Neil, Pentland Alex and Olga Russakovsky. "Art and the Science of Generative AI." *Science*, 380/6650 (2023): 1110-1111.

Guo, Yiwen. "The Ethical Dimensions of Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Philosophical and Literary Fusion of Technology and Human Guidance." *Journal of Dharma*, *49*/03 (2024): 377-392.

Heidegger, Martin. "The Question Concerning Technology." In

The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays. Harper & Row, 1977: 3-35.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of the Power of Judgement*. Edited by Paul Guyer. Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Khutsishvili, Kristina. "AI Creativity and Human Enhancement: The Identity Link." *Artificial Intelligence, Co-Creation and Creativity*. Routledge, 2025: 147-158.

Kirkpatrick, Keith. "Can AI Demonstrate Creativity?" *Communications of the ACM*, 66/2 (2023): 21-23.

Lee, Hye-Kyung. "Rethinking Creativity: Creative Industries, AI and Everyday Creativity." *Media, Culture & Society* 44/3 (2022): 601-12.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. MIT Press, 1994.

Moruzzi, Caterina. "Artificial Intelligence and Creativity." *Philosophy Compass* 20/3 (2025): 1-8.

Moruzzi, Caterina and Solange Margarido. "Customizing the Balance Between User and System Agency in Human-AI Co-creative Processes." *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Computational Creativity (ICCC'24)*, Jonköping, 2024: 108-117.

Muggleton, Stephen. "Alan Turing and the Development of Artificial Intelligence." *AI Communications: The European Journal on Artificial Intelligence* 27/1(2014): 3-10.

Natale, Simone. and Leah Henrickson. "The Lovelace Effect: Perceptions of Creativity in Machines." *New Media & Society*, 26/4 (2024): 1909-1926.

Newell, Allen., J. Clifford Shaw and Herbert A. Simon. et al. "The Processes of Creative Thinking." *Contemporary Approaches to Creative Thinking, A Symposium held at the University of Colorado*, Atherton Press, 1962: 63-119.

Peeters, Marieke M. M., Jurriaan Van Diggelen, Karel Van Den Bosch, Adelbert Bronkhorst, Mark A. Neerincx, Jan Maarten Schraagen and Stephan Raaijmakers. "Hybrid Collective Intelligence in a Human-AI Society." *AI & Society*, 2021: 217-238.

Sundararajan, Louise. "Mind, Machine and Creativity: An Artist's Perspective." *The Journal of Creative Behaviour* 48/2

(2014): 136-151.

Qiao, Xiahong. "Redefining Creativity: The Effects of Artificial Intelligence on Human Musical Innovation". *Journal of Dharma*, 49/3, 2024: 321-336.

Urmeneta, Alex and Margarida Romero. "AI as a Creative Partner: A PRISMA Review of AI's Role in Supporting Creativity in Education." *Frontiers in Education*, 2025: 1-9. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1602151

Vinchon, Florent, Lubart Todd, Bartolotta Sabrina, Gironnay Valentin, Botella Marion, Bourgeois-Bougrine Samira, Burkhardt Jean-Marie, Bonnardel Nathalie, Glaveanu Giovanni, Hanson Michael, Ivcevic Zorana, Karwaowski Maciej, Kaufman James, Okada Takeshi, Reiter-Palmon Roni and Andrea Gaggioli." Artificial Intelligence & Creativity: A Manifesto for Collaboration." *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 57/4 (2023): 472-84. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.597.

Wang, Songlin. "Aesthetical Ethics and the Subjectivity of AI Aesthetics." *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Articles*, Notes and Reviews, 38/4 (2025): 613–621.

Winter, Dorothea. "Aesthetic Aspects of Digital Humanism: An Aesthetic-Philosophical Analysis of Whether AI can Create Art." *Introduction to Digital Humanism*: *A Textbook*. Springer, 2024: 211-224.

Wu, Zhuohao., Danwen Ji, Kaiwen Yu, Xianxu Zeng, Dingming Wu and Mohammad Shidujaman. "AI Creativity and the Human-AI Co-creation Model." *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer Cham, 2021: 171-190.

Zhou, Eric and Dokyun Lee. "Generative Artificial Intelligence, Human Creativity and Art." *PNAS Nexus*, 3/3 (2024): DOI: 10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae052