Artistic Ownership in an Age of Intelligent Machines

Dimitri Bertsekas

May 2026

1 Introduction

This is a postscript to my essay "Academia, Art, and Life," which introduced a simple distinction among three forms of work and expression: The *technician*, who pursues a goal defined by someone else and follows a process that is also given. The *craftsman*, who is given a goal but has more freedom in how to achieve it. The *artist*, who defines both the goal and the process to achieve it. In other words, the artist has ownership of what is to be done and how it is to be done.

This framework was useful before the recent progress of artificial intelligence, and it may be even more useful now. AI changes the structure of work by making many forms of execution cheap, fast, and widely available. It can perform routine technical tasks, approximate parts of craftsmanship, and even suggest directions that once seemed to belong to the artist.

The danger is not only that machines may replace human labor. The deeper danger is that people may surrender the formation of purpose itself. They may remain active as users, editors, and selectors, while the center of creative control quietly moves elsewhere. A person may appear to be working creatively, yet gradually become dependent on suggestions, styles, and directions supplied by a machine.

The central issue is therefore ownership: of the goal, of the process, and of the final judgment. AI can help a person explore, test, revise, summarize, compute, and produce. But it must not be allowed to define what is worth doing. The question is not whether to use AI. The question is how to use it without becoming absorbed by it.

2 Technician, Craftsman, and Artist Under AI

AI alters the distribution of human roles. It does not eliminate the need for human contribution, but it changes where that contribution is most valuable.

The technician is most directly affected. A technician executes predefined goals using prescribed methods. Many such tasks can now be automated: for-

matting a document, summarizing a report, translating routine material, generating standard code, preparing simple illustrations, answering common questions, or following a fixed analytic procedure. This trend is not new. Machines have always replaced some forms of routine labor. What is new is the breadth of intellectual and creative tasks that can now be handled in this way.

The craftsman is also affected, and perhaps more deeply. The craftsman does not merely follow instructions. The craftsman chooses methods, adapts procedures, solves intermediate problems, and brings judgment to execution. AI systems increasingly perform parts of this role. They generate alternatives, compare styles, propose structures, debug code, suggest arguments, produce sketches, refine drafts, and adapt output to a chosen purpose. What once required a trained hand can often be approximated by a prompt.

This does not mean that craftsmanship disappears. True craftsmanship still requires understanding, taste, responsibility, and experience. But some of its visible products can now be reproduced without the long discipline that traditionally produced them. A person with little training can generate a polished paragraph, a plausible painting, a melody, a lesson plan, or a working program. The surface of craftsmanship becomes widely available.

The artist is less directly replaced, because the artist's role is not merely to execute or refine a method. The artist defines the goal and the process. The artist decides what matters. The artist chooses the problem, the subject, the form, the point of view, and the standards of success.

Yet even the artist is not untouched. AI can suggest goals as well as processes. It can propose themes for a novel, titles for a painting, mathematical conjectures, research directions, business ideas, and philosophical arguments. It can simulate the early stages of creative exploration. It can offer a large menu of possible directions before the artist has had time to form one.

This is useful, but also dangerous. The artist may begin by using AI as an assistant and end by treating it as a source of purpose. In that case, the artist has not been replaced from outside. The artist has abdicated from within.

3 Mastery in the Age of AI

In earlier settings, mastery was closely tied to technical proficiency. A master painter knew how to draw, mix colors, compose a scene, and handle materials. A master musician knew harmony, phrasing, timing, and the physical discipline of the instrument. A master mathematician knew techniques of proof, computation, and abstraction. A master engineer knew models, approximations, materials, and design principles.

These forms of proficiency still matter. Indeed, one of the most common misunderstandings about AI is that because execution becomes easier, technical understanding becomes less important. The opposite is closer to the truth. When machines can produce fluent and plausible output, the ability to judge that output becomes more important.

A person who cannot write well may not recognize when AI writing is shallow. A person who does not understand mathematics in depth may not detect a false proof. A person without musical training may not hear that a generated composition is generic. A person without engineering judgment may accept a proposed design that works only in appearance.

In the age of AI, mastery shifts from execution alone to the direction, evaluation, and integration of execution. Technical proficiency includes at least four abilities.

First, it requires the ability to formulate meaningful problems. Many people can ask AI to produce answers. Fewer can ask questions that matter. In research, this means identifying a problem that is not merely fashionable but structurally important. In art, it means choosing a subject that carries personal and human significance. In teaching, it means seeing what a student really needs to understand, rather than merely producing more instructional material.

Second, it requires the ability to evaluate alternatives. AI can generate ten versions of a paragraph, twenty designs for a cover, or several approaches to a proof. But abundance is not quality. The artist must know which version has force, which is merely polished, which is derivative, and which should be rejected.

Third, it requires integration. AI may produce pieces: a draft, an image, a summary, a simulation, a melody, a proof outline. But the artist must place these pieces within a coherent whole. A book is not a sequence of polished paragraphs. A painting is not a collection of visual effects. A theory is not a pile of plausible lemmas. A life is not a list of efficient outputs.

Fourth, it requires fidelity to purpose. The artist must keep asking: What am I trying to do? Why does this matter? Does this tool serve the work, or is it pulling the work toward convenience, fashion, or imitation? AI can make immature work look mature. It can remove roughness before the underlying idea has developed. It can provide the appearance of refinement without the discipline that gives refinement meaning. The artist must therefore learn to distinguish between polish and depth.

4 The Traps of AI Dependence

AI introduces new channels for creativity and inspiration. It can act as a source of variation, a conversational partner, and a catalyst for exploration. It can help a writer test structures, a painter examine compositions, a composer generate variations, a scientist survey related ideas, a teacher design examples, and a programmer compare implementations.

These uses are legitimate. Artists have always used external aids: notebooks, sketches, models, assistants, instruments, cameras, libraries, archives, conversations, and earlier works of art. AI belongs in this family of aids, but it is more powerful and more intrusive. It does not merely store material or execute commands. It speaks back. It proposes. It imitates judgment. It gives the user the feeling of creative momentum.

That feeling can be helpful. It can also become addictive. A person may begin to turn to AI whenever there is uncertainty, difficulty, or silence. But uncertainty, difficulty, and silence are not merely obstacles to creativity. They are often part of the process by which the artist discovers what he or she actually thinks.

The trap is not simply that AI may produce inferior work. Often it produces useful work. The deeper trap is that AI may weaken the human capacities on which serious art depends.

One trap is *borrowed direction.* The artist no longer asks, "What do I want to say?" but instead asks, "What are some good ideas?" This seems harmless, but over time it shifts the origin of the work. The artist becomes a chooser among suggestions rather than a discoverer of purpose.

A second trap is *premature fluency.* AI can produce polished language or finished-looking images very early in the process. This may prevent the artist from struggling with rough material. But roughness is often where originality begins. A clumsy sentence may contain a real thought. A crude sketch may contain a strong composition. A fragment of melody may carry more life than a fully arranged but generic piece.

A third trap is *reduced attention.* When AI can instantly generate alternatives, the artist may spend less time looking carefully. But art often begins with attention: attention to a face, a landscape, a mathematical pattern, a social situation, a contradiction, a memory, or a feeling that has not yet found form.

A fourth trap is *loss of personal connection.* Photography illustrates this point well. A personal photograph is not valuable only because of its composition or technical quality. Often it matters because the photographer was present, noticed something, chose a frame, and preserved a moment that would otherwise disappear. AI can generate a more dramatic sunset, a cleaner street scene, or a more flattering portrait, but it cannot replace the link between the image and the lived experience from which it came. The value of such a photograph lies partly in the fact that it was seen, chosen, and kept by a particular person.

A fifth trap is *imitation disguised as originality.* AI is excellent at style. It can produce something in the manner of a famous painter, writer, composer, or intellectual tradition. This may be useful for study, but it can also tempt the artist to confuse style with vision. To sound like someone is not the same as seeing what that person saw.

A sixth trap is *atrophy.* Skills that are not practiced decline. A writer who never drafts unaided may lose the ability to form sentences from thought. A student who always asks AI for explanations may lose the habit of wrestling with a problem. A designer who always begins with generated images may lose confidence in drawing. A researcher who always asks AI for related work may lose the ability to search, read, and synthesize independently. For the artist, the central danger is not replacement, but weakening.

5 Disciplined Use: Practical Rules for the Artist

The solution is not to reject AI. That would be unrealistic and, in many cases, unnecessary. The better solution is to impose discipline on its use. The artist must decide which parts of the work should remain human-led, which parts may be assisted, and which parts may be delegated.

A useful discipline has three stages: before using AI, while using AI, and after using AI.

5.1 Before Using AI

It is often useful for the artist to begin without AI. This does not mean completing the whole work unaided. It means protecting the first movement of thought. A writer might draft the thesis, central examples, and first rough outline by hand before consulting AI. A painter might make several sketches from direct observation before generating visual references. A composer might develop the core melodic idea at the piano before asking for variations. A mathematician might attempt a proof, identify the obstruction, and only then ask for help exploring possible approaches. This preserves ownership of direction. AI can then assist the work rather than originate it.

A second discipline is to define the problem before asking for help. Before consulting AI, one should write down the goal in one's own words. What is the work trying to do? What is its intended effect? What standard should it satisfy? What must not be compromised? For a novelist, this might mean: "This chapter must show the son's resentment toward his father without making either character a villain." For a painter: "This image must convey late-afternoon loneliness, not merely an attractive landscape." For a researcher: "This section must explain why the assumption is natural, not merely technically convenient." Once the goal is clear, AI can be asked for alternatives, objections, examples, or revisions. But the human-defined goal remains the anchor.

A third practice is to keep a private notebook of direct observations. Artists need sources that are not mediated by AI. The notebook may include overheard sentences, memories, sketches, questions, fragments of dreams, descriptions of places, technical puzzles, emotional reactions, or failures. A photographer might note how people stand at a bus stop in winter. A teacher might record where students consistently misunderstand a concept. A mathematician might write down a pattern that appears in several examples but has no theorem yet. A physician might note the difference between a patient's symptoms and the formal language of the chart. This material gives the artist something AI cannot supply: a personal archive of attention.

Finally, unaided skill must still be practiced regularly. A writer should sometimes write complete pages without assistance. A programmer should sometimes solve problems without autocomplete. A musician should practice scales, improvisation, and listening without generated accompaniment. A visual artist should draw from life. A mathematician should work through proofs without immediately asking for hints. A teacher should explain a concept aloud without

notes. This is not nostalgia. It is maintenance of the instrument.

5.2 While Using AI

The artist should use AI to challenge, not merely to assist. Instead of asking only for improvement, one should ask for criticism: What is the weakest assumption in this argument? What is missing from this essay? Where does this painting become predictable? What would a skeptical reader object to? Which parts of this draft sound generic? Used in this way, AI becomes an examiner or second reader. The artist remains the judge, but the tool supplies pressure.

The artist should also preserve stages of roughness. AI makes early polish easy, but early polish can freeze weak ideas. A practical order is useful: first, rough human generation; second, human selection and clarification; third, AI-assisted expansion or variation; fourth, human restructuring; fifth, AI-assisted editing; final, human acceptance or rejection. If AI enters too early with polished output, the work may become shaped by its fluency. If it enters after the artist has established the core, it can be genuinely helpful.

The artist should impose constraints that come from the work, not from the tool. AI tends toward plausible generality unless constrained. A historian might require that every claim be tied to a primary source. A novelist might require that no scene be included unless it changes the relation between characters. A painter might restrict the palette to match a remembered place. A composer might build the piece from a small motif. A researcher might require that each theorem serve the central argument. Constraints create form. They also protect against generic output.

The artist should return repeatedly to the world. AI operates through representations. Art requires friction with reality. A painter should look at actual light. A writer should listen to actual speech. A scientist should examine actual data and not only summaries. A teacher should watch students struggle. A musician should hear how sound behaves in a room. An engineer should test designs under real conditions. Direct experience supplies anomalies, textures, and pressures that generalized systems often smooth away.

5.3 After Using AI

The artist must take responsibility for the final work. If the work is published, performed, taught, displayed, or used, the person presenting it must own it. This means checking facts, verifying references, testing code, reading cited sources, examining assumptions, and deciding whether the work says what one means. A scholar should not include an AI-generated reference without verifying it. A lawyer should not submit AI-generated cases without checking them. A physician should not rely on AI output without clinical judgment. An artist should not present AI-generated imagery as personally seen experience unless that is honestly the nature of the project. Responsibility is part of artistry. Without responsibility, the artist becomes a distributor of output.

The final defense against overreliance on AI is taste. Taste is not mere preference. It is educated judgment. It is the ability to sense what is strong, false, excessive, thin, derivative, sentimental, elegant, necessary, or alive. Taste develops through practice, comparison, failure, study, and exposure to great work. AI can imitate taste, but it cannot give a person taste in a deep sense. A person develops taste by making choices and living with their consequences.

For this reason, artists should study masters, not merely styles. A writer should not only ask how Tolstoy writes, but what Tolstoy sees. A scientist should not only imitate Feynman's clarity, but understand his physical intuition and independence of mind. A painter should not only imitate Van Gogh's brushwork, but understand the intensity of perception behind it. A mathematician should not only reproduce elegant proofs, but learn what makes a problem worth attacking. Taste is the internal compass that allows the artist to use AI without being led by it.

6 Academia, Education, and the Danger of Faster Bureaucracy

AI also raises broader questions for education and academic life. If routine intellectual tasks are increasingly automated, education cannot be organized mainly around training students to perform such tasks. It must place greater emphasis on judgment, problem formulation, interpretation, communication, verification, and responsible use of tools.

Students should learn how to use AI, but also how to think without it. They should learn when AI is helpful, when it is unreliable, and when it prevents learning. They should be asked not only to produce answers, but to explain choices, critique outputs, verify claims, and connect ideas to experience.

In mathematics and engineering, this may mean requiring students to attempt problems unaided before using computational or AI tools. In writing, it may mean asking for drafts, reflections, and oral explanations of choices. In design, it may mean combining generated prototypes with hand sketches and user observations. In research training, it may mean emphasizing the formation of questions, not merely the production of literature reviews.

Academia may benefit from AI in many ways. It can improve instruction, support individualized learning, accelerate programming and data analysis, assist with editing, broaden access to knowledge, and reduce some administrative burdens. But it may also intensify pressures toward speed, standardization, and measurable output.

The danger for universities is not simply that students will use AI to avoid work. The deeper danger is that institutions will use AI to produce more of the same: more reports, more proposals, more course materials, more assessments, more metrics, and more visible output. AI may make the academic machine faster without making it wiser. If this happens, academic life will become more technician-like even while its tools become more sophisticated.

To preserve academia as a space where artistry can develop, institutions must protect several conditions: autonomy in defining research directions; tolerance for ambiguity and long-term inquiry; respect for slow understanding; evaluation that recognizes depth, not only volume; teaching that values judgment, not only information transfer; and research cultures that reward originality rather than fashionable productivity.

These conditions are not guaranteed. They depend on institutional choices. AI can either support academic artistry or accelerate academic bureaucracy. The difference will depend on whether universities treat AI as a tool for deeper inquiry or merely as a device for producing more output.

The same issue appears in the broader economy. As AI improves, competence in many areas may become less scarce. Writing, design, programming, translation, tutoring, legal drafting, and routine analysis may all become cheaper. This does not mean that human work becomes meaningless. But it may separate creative participation from creative livelihood. More people may write, compose, design, program, and teach with the aid of machines, while fewer may be able to support themselves by doing competent versions of these activities.

In such a world, trust, originality, judgment, reputation, and access to audiences may become more decisive. Society may also need to reconsider how it supports activities that are valuable but not easily measured or monetized: caregiving, teaching, art, local community work, scholarship, environmental restoration, mentorship, and public service. People need more than consumption. They need agency, discipline, contribution, and meaningful activity. The artistic attitude may therefore become important beyond the arts. It is a model of human agency in a world of powerful tools.

7 Concluding Remarks

Our three-role framework of technician, craftsman, and artist remains useful, but AI changes the conditions under which these roles are practiced. It automates much technical execution, imitates parts of craftsmanship, and tempts the artist to surrender direction.

The proper response is neither rejection nor passive adoption. It is disciplined use. The artist must define the problem before asking for help, preserve roughness long enough for real thought to emerge, return repeatedly to direct experience, maintain unaided skills, use AI as critic and instrument, and accept responsibility for the final work.

In a world where competent output is widely available, the distinction of artistic work changes. It can no longer rest mainly on polish, fluency, or technical finish. These qualities will be increasingly easy to manufacture. The deeper distinction will lie in clarity of purpose, coherence of direction, depth of engagement, and quality of judgment.

The last question is especially important. Artistry depends not only on production but also on refusal. The artist refuses easy effects, false emotion,

fashionable language, empty complexity, premature closure, and borrowed purpose. AI makes it easier to produce. Therefore it becomes more important to know what not to produce.

The central idea of Academia, Art, and Life remains intact: meaningful work depends on ownership of purpose and process. What has changed is that such ownership may become harder to preserve. AI can assist the artist, but it can also tempt the artist to surrender the capacities that make art possible.

In a world where fluent output is cheap, judgment becomes rare. In a world where capability is abundant, direction becomes precious. The artist's task does not disappear. It becomes harder, more demanding, and more necessary.