

Academic Abstracts Booklet

Hacking Visual Culture Conference: Intersections of art, creative practice, copyright, storytelling and technology.

UTS Law & Creative Practice Research Group (CPRG)

University of Technology, Sydney, Dec. 4-6, 2024.

<https://artechlaw.org/hacking-visual-culture/>

Copying Couture: The Authorised Reproduction of Parisian Haute Couture in Sydney, 1930s-1960s.

Alexandra Barter (Faculty of Design, UTS)

This paper is about the practice of importing and manufacturing copies of Parisian haute couture garments in Sydney between the 1930s and 1960s. While the impact of the 'French Fashion Parades' in the 1940s and particularly the House of Dior on postwar Australian fashion manufacturing has been documented, it is less well known that Australian-based couturiers and department store ateliers were making authorised reproductions and adaptations of Parisian models from at least the early 1930s. This research aims to explore some of the business relationships that existed between Australian manufacturers and French couturiers with a specific focus on Germaine Rocher's salon and department store David Jones in Sydney with renowned Parisian houses such as Jeanne Lanvin, Lucien Lelong, Madeleine Vionnet, Cristóbal Balenciaga and Pierre Balmain. The research will include a brief history of protecting couture design through copyright or other means in Paris from the 1920s then consider how licensing arrangements facilitated not just the dissemination of Parisian couture and consequent dominance of 'French' fashion design in the Australian mindset at the time, but also fostered local fashion manufacturing and ultimately promoted more equitable access to what was previously considered to be the exclusive realm of 'High Couture', accessible only to an elite few. Methods of transmitting technical information between Paris and Sydney will be discussed, such as the purchasing of paper patterns or toiles, and the adaptation of specific garments will be demonstrated, using examples from Australian collections, then contextualised by archival research. This paper will propose that the practice of copying and adapting haute couture from the 1930s ultimately laid the foundations for the postwar boom in Australian fashion manufacturing as well as consider the implications for contemporary manufacturing from the perspectives of sustainability and empowering the voices of both makers and consumers.

Slaves to the Machine? How artists are talking back to AI

Kathy Bowrey (Law & Justice, UNSW) and *Marie Hadley* (Law & Justice, UoN).

Lawsuits and media coverage have overwhelmingly focused on perceived threats posed by AI technologies to artist livelihood and professional identity as well as concerns for the future of our shared visual culture. Against a backdrop of uninspiring litigation and criticisms of the feasibility of proposed legislative solutions such as opting out and licensing of imagery included in AI databases, this paper looks at how artists and illustrators are manoeuvring, mobilising, and resisting AI co-option of their works.

Artists and illustrators are changing their practices to avoid and subvert the gaze of AI technologies. This includes withdrawing from Instagram and other megaplatforms where algorithmic-driven engagement is perceived as making artists a slave to the machine. We explore some of the business risks that come with strategic disengagement. We also examine the development and shift to new platforms such as Cara, where platform participation is linked to community centred verification of artistic integrity and professional credentials, and the use of new technologies to block and confuse AI scraping of online work. We articulate the case for a moral right of verification of authorship, so that the existing right of attribution remains relevant to contemporary artistic practice.

A unique feature of this paper is reliance on first-person artist You Tube posts where creators explain and clarify their ambitions; throwing a spotlight on the practicalities and potentialities of artist empowerment at the increasingly entwined intersection of art, law and technology.

Infinite Exclusivity: The Unsustainability of the Exclusive Right to Contemporary GAI Works and the Opportunity for New Sustainable Models
Zachary Cooper (Amsterdam Law & Technology Institute, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

As generative AI (GAI) tools render contemporary works increasingly fluid and interactive, the modalities by which we engage with creativity are undergoing a paradigm shift, fundamentally challenging exclusivity-dependant modes of rights protection. By directly engaging with pioneering current-state uses of GAI tools in art and music communities, the author, themselves an experimental artist regularly using GAI, presents a riposte to the mounting orthodoxy that we must determine a requisite level and nature of interaction with GAI tools to receive authorship over a work, exhibiting such an approach as un-auditable and unenforceable. The first part of this paper posits that an inability to distinguish AI-generated from non-AI-generated components demands a copyright framework equally applicable to all creative products, regardless of the amount of AI-generation used in their production. The prevailing uncertainty over ownership in GAI works due to debates over de minimis use of GAI serves to fundamentally undermine copyright harmonisation efforts worldwide, with the potential for vast differences in legislative interpretation and policy, destabilising creative markets. As miniscule costs of investment now allow massive amounts of output, GAI tools fatally undermine the foundational economic conception that a rational actor would not invest in creation without being granted a monopoly over the product of their creative labour. Thus, the second part of this paper argues that exclusive rights over AI-assisted works are expressly dysfunctional in stimulating innovation and a functioning market, either incentivising “creativity-mining” or allowing exploitation of the “independent creation” defense, especially in favour of larger artists against smaller artists. The final part of this paper questions whether paradigmatically shifted modalities of creative engagement, such as those inherent to fluid self-varying works, will render copyright increasingly irrelevant as a regulating force and market mediator. Lastly, it explores whether different incentive structures built around attribution and profit-sharing are required to more sustainably achieve copyright’s objectives

Rethinking Copyright and AI: Less Penny Dreadful, More Frankenstein

Chris Dent (Law School, Murdoch University)

The suggestion of the title is meant as a positive – when reconsidering copyright law, as a response to the rise of AI, we should look to the past. We should look to the early years of the nineteenth century and not to the mass-produced stories of the later decades. That century saw the beginning of the shift from IP rights as a reward for creative endeavours to the rights as mere incentive for those considering creation. The system of the time could not imagine the millions, perhaps billions, of copyrighted works produced every year; let alone the deployment of large-language models (LLMs). There is a greater understanding of creativity and the production of works now than was evident in the time of *Jeffreys v Boosey* (1854).

The underlying assumption is that the minimum bar, with respect to creativity, is set too low. An option, instead of raising the bar for all, would be to establish two levels within the system. The basic protection, which could include AI outputs, would accord with the “IP as exchange” model – they could be tradeable, and their unauthorised copying would give the rights-owner the (time-limited) capacity to sue for infringement. The majority of creators are employed (as journalists, academics, and business document writers); as such, the firm would retain the capacity to restrict copying. Further benefits could be awarded to creations that reflect artistry, rather than mere difference. It would, currently, require humanity, as they are outside the scope of LLMs. The factors that would be part of the assessment would be sourced from the literature on creativity – for example, the “exploratory”, “combinatorial” and “transformational” categories of Boden. It may be time for these ideas to be brought into the structure of copyright law.

A Fairer Humanities: A Case Study In Shifting Research Conventions In Art History

Kathryn Desplanque (Art History Faculty, UNC Chapel Hill)

FAIR data is findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable, and while these principles have been broadly applied across STEM, the Humanities have been reluctant to participate, even in the era of the Digital Humanities. In an attempt to encourage humanists to overcome our own institutional, disciplinary, and personal blocks to implementing FAIR principles, my presentation will present my book and digital project as a counter-example. I will explore barriers to the implementation of FAIR principles in art history, considering hurdles such as American tenure requirements, university press expectations, library copyright and image distribution rights, and conventions around collaborative research.

My first book project, *Inglorious Artists: Art-World Satire and the Emergence of a Capitalist Market for Art in Paris, 1750-1850* (in press with University of Delaware press) examines how visual artists used political cartooning as a vehicle to criticize the emergence of a free market for art during the emergence of global speculative financial capitalism. They did so by popularizing the trope of the starving artist. Working with NVivo, I developed controlled iconographic vocabulary to tag a corpus of 532 previously unpublished and unstudied images, and built my research largely through queries that compared my iconographic tags with their bibliographic metadata.

Finally, over the 2023-2024 school year, I served as Principal Investigator for an ongoing project entitled *Art/A*. Myself and a team of biologists and computer and library scientists archived my corpus of art-world satires and their metadata using the Carolina Digital Repository where they are publicly accessible and navigable via an Omeka S website where users can also query my metadata via an interactive Tableau page. In parallel, our team of computer scientists worked with Segment Anything and ChatGPT to explore if AI can support iconographic tagging for visual cultural corpora.

How Art Became Posthuman: Copyright, Ai, And Synthetic Media

Katrina Geddes (New York University School of Law, and Cornell Tech)

In response to the threats posed by new copy-reliant technologies, copyright law often expands in scope. Frequently this results in overzealous rights enforcement and the suppression of lawful user expression. Generative AI is shaping up to be no different. Owners of copyrighted training data have asked the courts to find AI outputs to be infringing in the absence of substantial similarity, and to prohibit unlicensed training despite its extraction of unprotectable metadata. Service providers automatically block or modify user prompts that retrieve copyrighted content even though fair use is a fact-specific inquiry.

These trends threaten to undermine the democratic and egalitarian potential of generative AI. Generative AI has the capacity to democratize cultural production by distributing powerful and accessible tools to previously excluded creator communities. Ordinary individuals can now create sophisticated synthetic media by modifying, remixing, and transforming cultural works without any artistic training or skills. This radically expands the range of individuals who can engage in aesthetic practice, irrespective of the legal status or exchange value of the resulting output.

To date, however, the democratic and egalitarian character of generative AI has been relatively under-theorized. Lawmakers are focused on averting two possible outcomes: the extinction of human artists, or the flight of technological capital to low-IP jurisdictions. As copyright owners and technology firms dominate public discourse, relatively little attention is paid to the expressive interests of users. This Article remedies that neglect by directing scholarly attention to the democratizing effects of generative AI. It suggests that jurists should not rush to pacify owners of copyrighted training data by enjoining generative models, or pressuring service providers to adopt unnecessary use restrictions. Instead, Congress should embrace the democratic and egalitarian potential of generative AI by protecting users from the chilling effects of infringement liability. This Article canvasses a range of options directed towards this objective, including a non-commercial use provision, a compulsory licensing regime for commercial generations, a DMCA-style safe harbor for service providers, and a presumption of user authorship of AI generations.

Technologies of feelings at the intersections of creative leadership, diversity, and innovation: An examination of digitised museum objects and meaning making

Sheree Gregory (Institute for Culture and Society, Western Sydney University)

Black feminist studies scholar Bettina Judd (2023) analyses the intersections of black feminist theorising, creative processes, and knowledge production of women artists—_how they take up glimpses of power, how creativity makes its way through feeling, and what we can know from the work left behind. She argues for the recognition of a more emotional aesthetic (of emotions that yet have no name) in creative processes and black cultural knowledge produced, as one of *feelin* or newly felt in the impulse to create, which is often self-revelatory, explorative, needing to feel. Following bell hooks, it is *felt change* that is integral for long term social change. Similarly, Claude Brown uses the phrase *soul language* to connect feeling and meaning making.

In this paper I draw on these conceptual framings to better understand the way inequality, diversity and innovation are interconnected in the creative industries, and represented in digitised museum objects. I discuss Judd's *feelin* as juxtaposed to the robotic, yet present in executive emotional leadership. I then draw on an Industry Fellowship project partnered with The Powerhouse, to ask: how are women in leadership in the creative industries represented in the Collections (and under-represented)? How are diversity and innovation interconnected in an equitable future of work?

In my analysis I pick up on Judd's feminist thinking toward a methodology of anger, which are critical contours of gender and race politics that centre women artists' feeling, creative processes, and knowledge production— not by disregarding the internal life, but by engaging in it to critique the structures and (Western) modes of knowledge that shape us. I conclude by reflecting on the relationship between creativity and technology, including whether A.I can be truly creative when considered by creative practitioners, and technologies of feeling at the intersections of gender, diversity, creative leadership, and innovation.

Liminal Space – public art, public spaces, and digital interventions

Marie Hadley (School of Law and Justice, University of Newcastle) and *Sarah Hook* (School of Law at Western Sydney University)

Imagine you are walking around Sydney when you see a public art installation or a statue of a historical figure. Holding your phone up to it appears a superimposed critique, protest, or playful interaction. You may even be able to add your own unique take. Augmented reality is a provocative space to explore the connection between the physical, non-physical, and art. This intersection creates new questions over adaptation, parody, copying, and the moral rights of artists and those that seek to subvert art. In objective reality and augmented reality complex connections between the artist and the audience exist. In this presentation we will take the audience through an experiment with art and augmented reality. We will layer an artwork with visual changes to explore the point at which the law seeks to intervene. We look at public art and query the meaning of public space. Is this vandalism or appropriation art? Can augmented reality help provide nuance to art that is controversial such as colonial statues? Can digital graffiti have the same impact as the physical act? We will explore whether copyright and moral rights create a barrier to public engagement in public spaces. Drawing from our earlier work on graffiti on colonial statues we extend the conversation to the digital sphere to interrogate whether art in public spaces requires more legal flexibility than a private gallery and whether we need to adopt a more tolerant stance on adaptation and engagement with art.

Automation, media-making and (our) methodological obligations: Machine logic and its human atrophies as occupational risk

Suneel Jethani (School of Communication, UTS)

Throughout history the practice of media-making has relied on cognitive heuristics and technical automation. The way we do things is always changing and it is, usually, a matter of concern and debate. Speaking at the Annual Conference of the Interior Design Educators Council in 1979, Futurist, Hadley Smith argued that design professionals have a moral obligation to understand the nature and necessity of the technologies that were transforming the work of creative practitioners. For Smith, this entailed reflection on the personal and professional assumptions one makes about technological capacities and limits.

My paper picks up on this line of thinking and considers it in contemporary terms. Despite a history that extends back to the 1950s, artificially intelligent systems capable of producing new textual, audio, visual and conceptual content in response to prompts inputted by a user, are thought of as new and unprecedented. But since the 1980s there have been debates over distinguishing between a conventional computer-aided approach and the epistemo-aesthetic break that computer-mediated automation brings to the trajectory of technology's shaping of media-making. In the fields of creative, curatorial and archival production, automation presents both enabling affordances and unpredictable consequences.

I discuss these affordances as a relation between humans and technologies where complex formations of risk (and trust) are made and unmade. The paper develops a theoretical lens on enfeeblement risk, a category of risk arising when creative control is voluntarily ceded to automated systems, outsourcing not only technical elements of practice but also key epistemological elements that drive creative thought, problem solving and personal flair. When considered as a risk faced by creative practitioners, enfeeblement implies a weakening of human capabilities to develop ideas, use tools, solve problems and express diverse ideas authentically. The paper concludes with a discussion of the situatedness and subjectivity of this nascent form of creative labour.

Disgenerative AI: At Play in the Fields of Artifice and Imagination

Sonia K. Katyal (Law School, University of California at Berkeley)

How dull it is to have people defining you.— Octavia E. Butler

Four years ago, artist Trevor Paglen and scholar Kate Crawford collaborated on a groundbreaking show at the Fondazione Prada called *Training Humans*. The show was billed as an exposition of the images that were being used to train artificial intelligence systems. As Kate Crawford explained in a publication accompanying the exhibition, “[w]e wanted to engage with the materiality of AI, and to take those everyday images seriously as a part of a rapidly evolving machinic visual culture. That required us to open up the black boxes and look at how these ‘engines of seeing’ currently operate.”

Now, four years later, we are being asked to reckon with the emergence of systems that are even more powerful than the ones that Paglen and Crawford confronted. Since the onset of generative AI, we have seen an explosion of creativity – programs like Midjourney and Dall- E, among others, have enabled a set of creative tools that would have been unimaginable just a few years ago.

But at the same time, its far too simplistic to suggest that visual artists have uncritically adopted the brushstrokes of generative AI. At the same time that many visual artists have taken up these tools, a number of other artists have harnessed their own creative energies to raise profound questions about the limitations and implications of generative AI. For every project that adopts these tools for the purposes of generative creation, there are also others that adopt these tools for a very different purpose: generative critique.

In this paper, I outline a new approach to AI, what I call a theory of ‘disgenerative AI,’ drawing on the intermingling of critique and creativity, critical theories of ‘disidentification’ and the work of contemporary artists like Joel Sherwood Spring, Zach Blas, Mimi Onuoha, and others. As I argue, in prying apart the presumption that more tools for creativity automatically benefits the public, these artists have also forced us to confront our deepest presumptions about the tools and incentives necessary for creativity to flourish. As Carsten Junker has explained in a careful reading of Legacy Russell’s work *Glitch Feminism*, there is significant value in artistic acts that generate “ruptures” between “the recognized and the recognizable,” “refusing established conventions to create new worlds that blur these binaries. It is about manifesting and creating slippages, dissolving the boundaries between digital art, physical performance, and activist worldmaking.”

In this essay, I offer five forms of disgenerative AI – these processes are by no means exhaustive or separate from each other, but taken together, they comprise a number of different ways that artists have chosen to engage with AI – through generating indirect and direct critiques of the technologies of AI and the world that they generate. At times the work can be viewed as critical of AI directly; and at other times, AI can be used as a process to critique the structures of the world at large.

Preserving the Herbert Mayer Collection of Carrolup Artwork through digitisation – Reproductions in gallery and ICIP

Lisa Liebetrau (John Curtin Gallery, Curtin University)

The Herbert Mayer Collection of Carrolup Artworks were repatriated to Curtin University from Colgate University in Hamilton, New York in 2013 after they were re-discovered in 2005 at Picker Art Gallery. These artworks were created in late 1940 by Aboriginal children ages 5 – 14 years old using friable media such as wax crayon, gouache, burnt charcoal and classroom chalk. The digitisation project commenced in 2022 to create preservation copies of the 122 artworks for the purpose of greater accessibility and exhibition use. The process involved specialists photographing the artwork to generate high resolution files that could be printed to preserve the originals due to their fragility.

In this paper I will consider the complexities of using reproductions in a gallery context while assessing Copyright and Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property (ICIP) concerns. For artworks created by the Carrolup child artists, this process is complex given that most of the original artists are no longer living and some artworks are identified as 'orphan' works. Engaging with the surviving Noongar families, especially those who continue to deal with the past and present impacts of the Stolen Generation, often means that these discussions can be traumatic for descendants of the Carrolup artists.

Aboriginal family structures are governed by a different set of relationship systems in comparison to the nuclear family model. The ongoing effect of intergenerational trauma continues to persist which raises complications for museums and galleries when attempting to ascertain the appropriate copyright holder, agent, or custodian. Trauma especially, can create emotional conflict amongst Aboriginal families around kinship responsibilities and obligations when discussing copyright custodianship. For a bridge to be created between Indigenous and Western knowledge, protecting ICIP law and collaborating with the community it concerns is the future of intercultural exchange in a gallery context.

What's human about copying?

Fiona Macmillan (University of Roma Tre)

The processes creativity, we have told our students an infinitesimal number of times, are built on the transformation and re-elaboration of what exists as part of the cultural canons. In this sense, it inevitably involves some type of copying. As a demonstration of my claim that re-elaboration and transformation are essential to the creative process, my title is inspired by Abraham Drassinower's excellent book "What's wrong with copying?" (Harvard 2015), which considers when copying should be considered a breach of another author's rights. In this presentation, in keeping (I hope) with Drassinower's work, I will re-open the question of copying - not only as an essential part of the creative process but also a fundamental requirement for the infringement of copyright. I will argue that the needs of capital accumulation forcing the convergence of the copyright law of powerful states of the Global North has obscured the concept of copying not only as the basis of infringement, but also as the pre-condition of creativity. Instead, any type of similarity is assumed to be an infringement and the "problem" of ensuring that the sort of copying that is essential to creativity is not unduly limited is dealt with by an ever-lengthening list of exceptions and defences. (This phenomenon is particularly evident, for example, in the 2019 EU Directive on Copyright in the Single Digital Market, which seems to be attempting to replicate the effect of US the US "fair use" doctrine.) The death knell of flexible and nuanced concept of copying, which should lie at the heart of the copyright system, is signalled by current attempts to bring the activities of generative artificial intelligence systems within the ambit of copyright regulation. Artificial intelligence systems do not copy works, they scrape data off them. They unmake works of human creativity, emptying and de-contextualising them so that they only have meaning as a collection of data. Copying a work, as opposed to using its data, is something that only humans can do, and it is the loss of the concept of copying represents the loss of the "human" in the copyright system. We are now at the tipping point, where the protection of investment over human creativity has the capacity to remove what little is left of human creativity in the copyright system. Politically, the argument - currently gaining much ground - that the activities of so-called generative artificial intelligence systems cannot be part of the copyright system, gives us the perfect opportunity to start the process of pulling back from a system that for more than a century has been focused on the protection of corporate investment at the expense of the rights and obligations that should flow from human creativity.

Generative AI and Copyright: Exception, Compensation or Both?

Rita Matulionyte

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence (“AI”) has increased existing concerns and raised new issues both for AI developers and copyright holders. These include possible copyright infringement when protected subject matter is used in the training of AI (including generative AI) modules, absence of viable licensing models, and a lack of transparency around the use of works in AI training. This presentation, first, discusses the possible meanings of copying, or reproduction, in Generative AI context. Second, it examines how the competing interests of AI developers and right holders could be balanced, and suggests a novel approach for differentiating between the uses of copyright-protected content in AI context that should require at least remuneration (if not authorisation) for right holders, and uses that should not require such remuneration. In addition, the article calls for transparency around the use of works in AI training, which is indispensable for the efficient exercise and enforcement of rights.

What can Dürer teach us about AI?

Frantzeska Papadopoulou Skarp (Department of Law, Stockholm University)

The starting point of this presentation is to investigate what happens in the nature and structure of rights of authors and artists when groundbreaking technological developments revolutionize the way works are created, managed and disseminated but also the way these are used to boost further creativity. Being part of the AI era and still feeling perplexed by its application and the effects this has and is expected to have in the future, the presentation attempts to open a communication line with late 15th century and dive in the work and strategic choices of German artist Albrecht Dürer. In a time when prints allow mass production of artworks, providing commercial opportunities for artists but also faced by the real threat of plagiarism, Dürer chooses to invest in his brand and enforce his exclusive right on it when necessary. When imperial privileges could only offer a limited scope of protection and the law did not provide a general protection for works of art, Dürer manages to restrict competition and create an exclusive space for himself and his workshop. In this respect it is particularly interesting to look into the meaning of brands and signatures and the roles these have played in the evolution of approaches on authorship. The choice of the signature/brand, its placement on the artwork and the way this is to protect the author by potential counterfeiters become interesting indicators of authorship, remuneration and attribution.

The presentation adopts an interdisciplinary perspective looking into history of art, with a critical focus on the work of Vasari, as well as economic history of art markets, law and theory. It will in particular use, Barthe's theory on the materiality of works and interconnectivity in authorship.

Anarchival Collage: Understanding the opportunities and problems of remixing cultural archives through creative practice research.

Zoë Sadokierski (UTS Design) and *Katie Dean*

In this paper we discuss our critical collage practice, in which we think-through-making to surface opportunities and problems associated with the digital archives of cultural institutions.

Digitisation and open-access sharing of images from gallery, library, archive and museum (GLAM) collections has resulted in historical images flooding digital platforms such as stock libraries, social media and cultural institutions' websites. Creative Commons (CC) licenses make it possible to download, share and print many of these images onto everything from coffee cups and iphone covers to websites and commercially published books without seeking permission or paying a fee. In addition to sharing and printing archival images, many artists and designers are 'remixing' them into new assemblages, for personal and commercial purposes. However, using and sharing archival material without attribution uproots the images from the context of their production and original distribution. Any indication that this material was produced by people with cultural bias, in particular historical circumstances, is lost in the ether.

Through our ongoing critical collage practices, we aim to prompt discussion around the way images are constructed and shared. In this paper we discuss a project in which we collaborate with historians to create illustrated plates for a book titled *Natural Things in Early Modern Worlds*, using archival material supplied by these scholars. The plates, each a product of fruitful conversations incorporating multiple perspectives, are designed to be "discursive tools" which challenge our expectations about natural history illustrations in scholarly texts.

A wonderful aspect of the design process was experiencing different ways to "come at" the visual material, expanding our perspective as designers with the expertise and perspectives of historians and cultural ecologists. The remixed images were a product of remixed knowledge sharing.

The documentarian as guide in the realm of creative AI

Julia Scott-Stevenson (Chancellor's Postdoctoral Research Fellow, UTS)

This presentation will explore developments in documentary film that have occurred through both the use and interrogation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies. Documentarians have a long history of experimentation with media forms, from the development of handycams and sync sound, through to the emergence of interactive documentary (i-docs) in the mid-late 00s, and then into the growth of immersive forms (virtual and augmented reality) as well as AI based work. Alongside this strong practice of technological experimentation, the documentary field has in parallel undergone considerable self-reflection across ethical practice, seen for instance in the late 20th century examination of ethnographic and anthropological filmmaking through an equity lens. As such, the documentary field has developed a set of rigorous practices around creatively and ethically interrogating the real, and thus can play an important role in driving conversations around the use of AI in screen works.

By delving into some case study examples of documentary films or media works that have experimented with AI, this presentation will pose some critical questions for the development of generative media. How can we work with these new tools to build trust, rather than to erase it? How might we develop best-practices that support practical approaches to working with AI?

Framing generative AI as a creative tool in a suite can offer a useful approach, bringing it within the remit of ongoing ethical discussions. Co-creation may also offer a useful lens for considering AI and content creation, and leads to questions of how we might develop a pathway towards ethical co-creation. Finally, developments in generative technologies are also increasing the potential for projects that are responsive to audiences, which in turn raises new questions around the development of filter bubbles and aesthetic bubbles.