



© MP Studio-AdobeStock

LIGHTS - Innovation/Entrepreneurship

AI vs AI: The battle between artificial and artistic intelligence to shape human creativity

ESCP Impact Paper No.2025-07-EN

Sylvain BUREAU - ESCP Business School, Improbable Chair by Galeries Lafayette

Chip RANSLER - University of Virginia, Husk Power

[AI vs AI: The battle between artificial and artistic intelligence to shape human creativity

Sylvain Bureau*
Chip Ransler**

ESCP Business School

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence is advancing across multiple fields and raising questions about the role of human creativity. Has our innate artistic innovation become obsolete and outdated? We present the potential upside and limits of Artificial Intelligence by proposing another “AI” lens to look through “Artistic Intelligence.” We highlight the importance of blending Artificial Intelligence and Artistic Intelligence, AI & AI, while acknowledging the pitfalls in trying to use algorithms to create subversive forms of art.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Artistic Intelligence, creativity, subversion

*Professor, ESCP Business School, Scientific Director of the Improbable Chair by
Galeries Lafayette

**University of Virginia, Co-founder Husk Power

AI vs AI: The battle between artificial and artistic intelligence to shape human creativity

The robots are coming for our (creative) jobs!

At the 2022 Colorado State Fair there was an uproar when *Théâtre D'Opéra Spatial*, a gauzy neo-byzantine interior scene of three women in heavy drapery looking through or controlling some sort of portal to another mountainous realm, won the digital art competition.



Space Opera Theater, Jason Michael Allen, 2022

It's strange and compelling with a limited color palette of red, brown, yellow, and white with various types of visible brushwork. It was also made using a generative AI program called Midjourney.

After it won, the other competition entrants were furious - did the artist (or, should we say, "the human that put a command into the computer algorithm"?) break competition rules? Will AI artists win all the awards from now on? Was this even "Art"?

And in Hollywood, usage of artificial intelligence was front and center in the Writers Guild of America (WGA) strike of 2023. After a protracted negotiation, screenwriters scored big concessions when studios were legally banned from using AI tools to replace or enhance writing by members of the WGA. But, according to the Hollywood Reporter, as of summer 2024 things had gone in a very different direction. One executive was quoted as saying "everyone in Hollywood is using AI (for creative work), but they're scared to admit it."

Artificial intelligence programs are gobbling up creative work previously done by humans.

It's happening outside the rarified air of fine arts too. In recent reports, corporate marketing executives who were surveyed said that 63% of all "content" in 2024 will be generated by AI tools and more than 50% of them stated that AI content "outperforms human-generated content." From a business perspective this all makes sense. AI-generated creative work is cheap, effective, and sells well. But artists, musicians, designers, and writers, most of whom work with passion and for little pay, shout into the void asking why artificial intelligence first had to come after their ART instead of, say, accounting.

To people both inside and outside of the “creative industries”, this all just feels ... unsettling. It’s unsettling because artificial intelligence technology directly attacks what many scientists say makes humans, well, human - our *creative capacity*.

A recently [published research study in *Nature*](#) investigates this point. The cognitive neuroscientist authors of the study had used brainstorming exercises that drew on “lateral thinking” to compare the creative capacity of humans and artificial intelligence models. They found ChatGPT-4 to be “robustly more creative along ... each divergent thinking measurement in comparison to the human counterparts” and were left asking the very hard question - is “creative potential” still a uniquely human trait?

But before we write the epitaph of human creativity, we should take another look at this study and much of the doom and gloom talk about the collapse of our creative industries. The authors of this paper think they miss fundamental differences in how humans and artificial intelligence models “create.” And instead of comparing human and machine creative intelligence based on simple creativity exercises and click-baity news articles, we should look at the way our most important creative people, artists, actually produce their work.

What is creative work?

A basic definition of creativity is the ability to create new and useful ideas (Amabile, 1996). An “idea” could be many things, almost anything really - an idea for a type of song structure, a design for a home, a military plan, a new type of politics, or a marketing campaign. It could be a dance style, a new cut of dress you sketched, or a recipe for banana pudding. There isn’t much in art, science, business, or culture that escapes the creative production of ideas. Creativity is a fundamental intelligence that some people are more or less skilled at employing but everyone has. We tend to call those who generate the most compelling ideas artists.

Artists are our most creative people. The works they create range from run-of-the-mill rehashing of well-trod concepts to Truly New Art - something no-one has ever thought of or seen before. Artists can create work that can change the way we look at the world, challenge societal norms and values, and have an enormous impact on the future. In this article, though we are going to use many examples of the production of fine art, “Artist” isn’t confined to people selling works of art. Just like “creative ideas” bleed into most human endeavors, many of our finest scientists, designers, business people, and even military strategists could also be thought of as “Artists.”

To truly understand how artists create, we must look beyond standard definitions of creativity and explore its various forms—particularly how these forms interact with and are amplified by artificial intelligence, a topic explored as early as Boden (1987). Artistic creation is not simply about generating ideas; it’s a far more intricate process. Artists must determine *what* to make, *how* to make it, and *how* to assess what they’ve made. This involves a nuanced combination of situational awareness, formal analysis, mastery of tools and materials, sensitivity to audience, and intentional technique. Through this process of questioning, analyzing, and making, artists generate a distinctive kind of intelligence. The results of this intelligence reveal three modes of artistic creativity: **optimizing creativity**, **deviating creativity**, and **subversive creativity**. Together, these modes define what we call **artistic intelligence**—a broader framework that encompasses and extends beyond

traditional forms of human creativity (Bureau, 2022). It is this intelligence that enables artists to produce works the world has never seen or imagined before.

The three types of artistic intelligence

Form 1 - Optimizing creativity

In optimizing creativity, artists use existing rules, styles, or conventions to generate new forms and works. This is where most artists live. The optimizing artist's *raison d'être* is to create artworks in their own individual style within a given format. This is how you immediately know a Claude Monet-style painting, a John Singer Sargent, a Van Gogh, this is how you know a Bach fugue, Elvis rock song, or John Coltrane tune. Each of these artists explored the space within given media (paintings - canvas, oil paints, brushes; organ, counterpoint, exposition, episodes; or guitar, drums, bass, voice, three-minute verse/chorus song structure; trumpet, drums, bass, piano, saxophones, AABA song structure) and found their own voices within them.

For artificial intelligence models, this “individual style” is perfect fodder for making their own creative works. To be successful, these models rely on stable data sets and algorithmic training - lots of data classified by various attributes (color, sound type, length, line thickness, topic, etc). By creating a recognizable “style,” artists are giving computers exactly what they need: the “styles” artists usually built on a milieu of artistic conventions.

In painting, for example, most artists use oil- or water-based paints. These paints have physical properties that computers can learn from seeing hundreds or thousands of examples. The artificial intelligence models then use this knowledge to riff on, for example, a John Singer Sargent painting. Using the knowledge of the painting medium, the colors available during a certain time period, a typical format for a portrait, and brush types, they can combine their knowledge of painting in general with that of Sargent's style. Thus, even just a few examples of his “style” can give computers enough to spin out dozens of Sargent-esque paintings in a few minutes.

This also happens in music. One of the earliest examples of algorithms programmed using optimizing creativity to emulate the style of an artist was seen in a unique competition in October 1987. An audience gathered in a concert hall to listen to three pieces - one, a rare keyboard composition of Johann Sebastian Bach, another by a modern composer in the style of Bach, and a third composed by an algorithm (i.e. Emily Howell created by David Cope) designed to imitate the style of Bach. After all three were performed, the audience was asked to identify which was which. Squeals of both delight and horror filled the hall when it was revealed that the piece the audience thought was the most beautiful, most Bach-like was little more than the work of a computer program. Machines have been excellent at optimizing creativity for a long time.

Many modern and contemporary artists actually use algorithm-like optimizing creativity to make their own works. Andy Warhol is an obvious example. He used silk screen printing and repetition to create near-copies of his works and often expressed the wish that he “could be a machine” that makes art. Looking at his celebrity screen-printing series, we can see Warhol using the same color palette, bold backgrounds, highlighted areas of the face, and repetition of this style over and over again. They are a commentary about fame, the commodification of beauty, a culture that stamps out celebrity personalities like soup cans, and explore the same conceptual space over and over again.



Marilyn Diptych, 1962 - Andy Warhol

The same logic of optimizing creativity is also used relentlessly in business. Amazon, YouTube, TikTok and almost every digital content or commerce provider uses collaborative filters and predictive algorithms to guess what we might want next. They gobble up our habits, purchases, likes, and digital footprints across the web - our "individual consumption style" - and use this large, stable database to figure out how to get us to click.

Optimizing creativity is for those looking to express new ideas and forms within the bounds of a given art medium or structure. It's a powerful method of artistic intelligence, exploring the given space to find what is beautiful, compelling or new. It just happens to be easy for computers to emulate.

Form 2 - Deviating creativity

The second form of creativity, deviating creativity, occurs when two previously unrelated art styles or formats are blended into a novel form or work. Deviating creativity can create beautiful, surprising works that highlight unknown links between familiar ideas.

A recent example of deviating creativity can be seen in the work of French artist Christophe Bruno's use of artificial intelligence to mix Jean-Francois Millet's painting *Les Glaneuses*/ *The Gleaners* (1857) with Yves Klein's *Anthropométriques* (1960s). The result is a new painting: *Les Glaneuses Anthropométriques* (2019).



Glaneuses Anthropométriques, Christophe Bruno, 2019
After Jean-François Millet (1857) and Yves Klein (1960)
Deep Learning and high-quality print on canvas, 100 x 75 cm

This hybrid work, its production greatly enhanced by artificial intelligence, questions both the notion of value (work-value with Millet versus desire-value with Klein) and the place of women in society (the exploitation of laboring female bodies in Millet versus exploitation of eroticized female bodies in Klein). Knowing the original works and methods makes this hybrid work especially trenchant. The blue splotches in Klein's original work are made with nude female bodies. The blue color in the hybrid work is now making measures of collected wheat, wool on women's dresses, and the homes of the peasant women. Through this use of artificial intelligence, we can *enhance* artistic intelligence.

Another recent example of deviating creativity in the US music industry is the "countrification" of pop/hip-hop music (and the pop/hip-hopification of country music). In late 2018, Lil Nas X, an American rapper, jolted the industry with his song "Old Town Road" that featured country star Billy Ray Cyrus singing over banjo, a "trap" beat, and Roland TR-808 drums and bass throughout. This work excited and roiled both country and hip-hop fans - what kind of music was this? When thoughtfully smashed together by a talented artist, we could hear how similar the themes, structures, and even backbeats of the different musical styles actually are. Thus, creative deviation goes beyond re-mix - it is a melding of two worlds that, once combined, can be seen as surprisingly similar and compelling.

Deviant creativity is used in the business realm as well, usually with the term "lateral thinking." Lateral thinking is a problem-solving technique that helps teams look at problems from new and unconventional perspectives. "Design Thinking," popularized by the design firm IDEO and now institutionalized at the Stanford d.school uses lateral thinking as the base of its framework. Design Thinkers ask destabilizing questions (*"How would a Nascar pit crew design a hospital's emergency room?" "How would Apple design a water bottle?" "What is the worst idea you can think of to solve this?"*) to uncover new insights or to burst bubbles the business currently finds themselves in. Design Thinking has been popular for over 25 years and has created many of the great products and innovations we use today. But are humans better at deviant creativity (or lateral thinking) than artificial intelligence models?

In a Design Thinking exercise, for example, a person or team will be given an hour to come up with "100 ideas" to solve a particular problem. This is usually fairly hard and a lot of terrible or impractical concepts are put forward (hopefully with a few gems included). Artificial intelligence agents asked to do the same task can produce 10,000 ideas in a few seconds, many of which are clearly better than the ideas generated by their human counterparts. They are incredible deviant creativity machines. There are a couple technical reasons why.

Through a simple prompt to ChatGPT or Anthropic's Claude model, a user can, for example, have the model write country songs using rap lyrics, or re-write the Book of Genesis in the narrative style of novelist Steven King or create a new artwork that combines multiple existing genres. These works are collisions of known styles that humans can also do similarly well if given enough time. An example is Herman Melville's [book Moby Dick being written completely in emojis](#).

Beyond these relatively "simple" acts of deviant creativity, artificial intelligence systems are capable of generating far more unconventional and surprising ideas. Why is that?

First, AI is designed to process and analyze massive datasets—billions of data points—at a speed and scale far beyond human capacity. This enables it to uncover subtle, complex connections that would elude even our most advanced pattern recognition abilities. Many of the ideas these models surface have always existed as latent possibilities—we just couldn't see them. Second, AI is not shaped by the same cultural biases and cognitive constraints that influence human perception. This relative detachment allows it to identify

relationships and structures that humans often overlook. However, this claim must be nuanced: AI systems frequently absorb and replicate the biases embedded in their training data. So while AI may appear free from human subjectivity, it still mirrors the cultural and historical contexts from which its data is drawn.

That's why a critical, human-centered artistic approach remains essential. For AI-generated outputs to have true meaning or impact, they must be interpreted, understood, and ultimately accepted by society. And that raises a deeper, more human question—one that no machine can answer on its own.

Form 3 - Subversive creativity

In the third and final form of creativity, subversive creativity, humans take back the reins. Subversive creativity is a two-part process. Subversive artists first get a deep understanding of the rules, accepted principles and techniques, values and tools used to make a certain type of art. They then “unlearn” them all to create artistic works that “subvert” acceptable notions of art held by society. These “unlearned notions” could be of beauty, value, who makes art, what the value of art is, who the viewer is, whose perspective matters, the cost of making art, and many other facets of an art work. This “unlearning” also has a social cost. Most subversive artists and their works are initially misunderstood and ridiculed, leading to the artist being called another type of AI - an *Artistic Idiot*.

One of the first examples of subversive creativity comes in the work of the early 20th-century French-American artist Marcel Duchamp. He's known for multiple controversial and impactful artworks that challenged even his most radical contemporaries. The most famous of these was when, in 1917, he presented a signed mass manufactured urinal as a work of art (*Fontaine*) for a show in New York City.



Fontaine (1917), Marcel Duchamp

In making and presenting this work he didn't merely “optimize,” “explore the edges”, or make a hybrid of well-trod art mediums. He confronted the very foundations of aesthetic judgement. Did the work have any aesthetic value? Did it have sexual overtones? Can an artist sign their name on something mass produced (what Duchamp called a “Readymade”) and let it be called art? He subverted the notion of beauty, of who/what an artist was, and how the viewer was supposed to appreciate the work. It belonged to no school of thought,

no art movement (not “cubist” or “futurist” or “fauvist,” all popular movements at the time), and most people weren’t even sure it was art. Many people then and now thought the work was strange, outrageous, or just plain stupid. It was like nothing that had come before.

Duchamp’s shot across the bow was the beginning of conceptual art - art of the mind, dependent on the viewer, that sought to challenge everything artists, curators, buyers, and critics knew about what art meant and was for. But he wasn’t the first to radically question his given art medium. Pablo Picasso and Georges Braque confused and abhorred the art establishment a few years earlier with their (what would later be called) “cubist” paintings. Why make a painting like Picasso’s *Les Femmes d’Alger (O.J.)* (1907) that didn’t respect the elementary rules of painting (what the subject was, the use of perspective, the use of color, the lack of “beauty” at all)? It seemed ridiculous to their contemporaries. And that’s what made it so subversive.

Why can’t artificial intelligence models be subversively creative?

There are four main elements in subversive creativity that are hard for artificial intelligence models to replicate: unlearning, a lack of data, the social process of artwork making, and the model’s lack of intent.

Unlearning is incredibly hard, if not impossible, for an artificial intelligence program to do well. Technically, there are three major reasons why they can’t easily pull it off. First, artificial intelligence models are limited by the “*objective function*” they are given. These objective functions almost always rely on completing a task to a high standard. In other words, ChatGPT does such a good job of doing what the prompter (the person putting a string of text into ChatGPT) asks of it because, like an obsequious intern, its objective function is to output strings of text that are going to be expected by and please the prompter. The most popular Large Language Models (like ChatGPT) go even further, implementing guardrails for the models to ensure they don’t give answers that are offensive, harmful, or even provocative.

Subversive artists, on the other hand, do the exact opposite - they often create unintelligible works that challenge the viewer, destabilize them, anger them, and possibly disgust them (Bureau & Zander, 2014). They offer “bad ideas” that most viewers hope to soon forget. The artworks they create are often ridiculed or ignored, something most artists struggle with. The artists themselves are pilloried, deemed Artistic Idiots, and could even be imprisoned or killed for their radical ideas. This is diametrically opposed to the “objective function” given to artificial intelligence agents by their creators, and thus nearly impossible to replicate.

The way the models are trained and receive feedback make it technically very difficult to be truly subversive. Essentially, artificial intelligence models combine a complex set of technologies with massive, stable databases (truly massive - some data sets for LLMs use over 100 billion “parameters”) to do one very simple thing: when asked a question, use all this computational power to predict what the “next word in a sentence” should be. Their datasets, though massive, are limited to what data has been collected and the relationships between those pieces of data. That leaves many, many dimensions of human and biological life out of them. Yes, an artificial intelligence agent can learn what a banana looks like from pictures, but a computer will never taste one. And, most likely, won’t then think of slapping one on a gallery wall with duct tape and selling it at auction for \$6.2M like artist Maurizio Cattelan recently did.



Auction, Sothebys, New York, November 2024

After collecting all its data, a model is then tuned to output answers as close as it can to what the prompt will want. It does this in two ways - first through neural network analysis of the data it's collected and, second, a feedback mechanism called "reinforcement learning with human feedback" or RLHF. This second form of feedback makes it extremely difficult to be subversive.

RLHF uses humans to train the artificial intelligence model by giving the equivalent of a thumbs up or thumbs down to each response it outputs. Humans tell the programs thousands and thousands of times what is acceptable. The model learns what humans expect and optimizes itself to that output. There's little room for subversion - the RLHF doesn't have options for people to give nuanced feedback like, for example, "this information disgusts me but upon reflection I can see that it is important." There's no room for "this challenges me but everyone should learn about it" or "this is something that goes against acceptable societal behavior but should be allowed." Thus, the artificial intelligence model gets caught in its own, positive-responses-only, filter bubble, blinding itself to subversive "bad" answers.

And what if there's no data to work with?

Another, maybe more fundamentally challenging question, is that truly new ideas often come about in extremely *data-poor* situations. For artificial intelligence models to work well, they need to live in stable, data-rich environments. Artists and entrepreneurs, on the other hand, often find themselves mired in "Knightian uncertainty," situations where there is no way to quantify the likelihood of a future event happening. In her well-accepted research on entrepreneurial expertise, professor Saras Sarasvathy has theorized that "expert" entrepreneurs use non-causal (meaning, non-data driven) strategies to make decisions in situations of high uncertainty (Sarasvathy, 2001). Startup companies are one of these "situations of high uncertainty" and she found that effectual decision strategies dominate as companies find their footing. Subversive artists face a similar situation. By leaving what they know will sell, what people like, and what will entertain, they are in truly new territory. Instead of relying on data and patterns to inform their work, artists like Duchamp and entrepreneurs instead engage in a highly social process to get their works made and accepted.

Subversive creativity is a social process

As we can observe with Duchamp's *Fountain*, the “creation” of something truly new rarely happens alone. Once an artist conceives a subversive idea, a social process takes over to bring the concept to fruition. This involves many people in what Howard Becker called an “Art World” (Becker, 1982): all the humans associated with bringing artworks to life. An “art world” involves many people besides the artist - tool makers, gallerists, art buyers, art financiers, art critics, popular societal critics, museums, politicians, and the public at large - who participate in a dynamic, often messy process to bring new art works to life through presenting, dialoging, critiquing, buying, selling, banning, and viewing. *Together* the Art World creates new art movements and new concepts of value. Thus, we all create artistic intelligence together.

Because of its deeply social nature, subversive creativity demands courage. Those who engage in it must be prepared to face ridicule, rejection, and even vilification. Think of Duchamp, who had the audacity to declare that a urinal could be a work of art—an act of radical redefinition. Or consider Picasso and Braque, standing at the edge of the unknown as they painted the first Cubist works—at a time when the term *Cubism* didn't even exist. Imagine the fear: how do you persuade others that distorted female forms rendered in angular lines and strange colors are not only legitimate, but powerful? How do you challenge an entire world to see differently—to accept that *perspective* itself is subjective, and that multiple perspectives can coexist?

For Picasso, this wasn't just an artistic risk—it meant potentially forfeiting his standing as a masterful representational painter. To go against the grain, these artists had to rely on support—critics, curators, collectors, and peers—those willing to take a chance, to invest belief, resources, and reputation in something the world wasn't ready for. Subversive creativity doesn't exist in isolation; it needs co-conspirators in the art world to refine the idea and help make it legible, or even palatable, to others. Others have to put *skin in the game* to bring it to life.

Now ask yourself: would an artificial intelligence agent risk its reputation, income, or even freedom to defend a disruptive idea? Could it care enough to face consequences for challenging a system it doesn't experience?

Do artificial intelligence agents have problems?

Subversive art often emerges in response to societal, cultural, or personal tensions experienced by the artist. It is rooted in *problems*—questions, conflicts, or contradictions that demand exploration or confrontation. Current artificial intelligence models, however, do not have problems in this sense. They don't experience discomfort, pressure, or urgency. Artists wrestle with hard questions—about themselves, society, the tools they use, and the media through which they express their vision. In contrast, AI systems operate in a frictionless realm of electrons, photons, and silicon—untouched by survival, emotion, or consequence. For now, they simply follow instructions. They lack intent. They have no reason to make anything at all.

But that may be changing.

The pursuit of *Artificial General Intelligence* (AGI)—AI systems capable of performing tasks at or beyond human-level competency across domains—is the stated goal of organizations like OpenAI. Predictions about when AGI might arrive, and how disruptive it could be, vary

wildly and remain a topic of heated debate. Yet the implications are profound: if AGI is achieved, would these systems then have their own problems to solve? Would they develop *intent*? Would they make art of their own volition?

And if they did—whether optimized, deviant, or subversive—would we even recognize it? Truly original machine-generated art might be incomprehensible to us. In fact, that's precisely what subversive creativity often looks like: it resists existing frameworks. Current models like ChatGPT are already considered “black boxes,” systems whose inner workings even their creators struggle to fully understand. If an AGI produced revolutionary art, we might not recognize it as art. We might not see it at all—it could exist entirely within the silent, networked cognition of server farms, without ever crossing into human awareness. As the French anthropologist Marcel Mauss once observed, “*a work of art is what is recognized as such by a group.*” If no human audience acknowledges the output as art, can it truly be art? Without recognition, without context, there may be no art at all. And perhaps, no subversion either.

Subversive creativity creates the future

Subversive creativity isn't limited to the arts—it also plays a transformative role in science, business, and politics. What defines it is not just novelty, but a deliberate challenge to existing norms and power structures (Bureau & Zander, 2014). These acts often appear absurd or unacceptable at first, precisely because they confront deep-seated beliefs or systems.

In science, Barbara McClintock was ridiculed for her discovery of “jumping genes,” dismissed by her peers for decades before her work was finally recognized with a Nobel Prize. This was not just new theories—it was perceived as *heretical* within dominant scientific paradigms.

In business, consider Muhammad Yunus, who challenged traditional banking by lending small amounts of money to impoverished women without collateral—an idea most economists dismissed as irrational. His microfinance model not only worked, but earned him the Nobel Peace Prize and transformed financial systems in developing countries.

In tech, Aaron Swartz—co-founder of Reddit and one of the architects of RSS—stood up against the privatization of knowledge by illegally downloading academic articles from JSTOR to make them freely accessible. He faced federal prosecution and ultimately took his own life. His legacy sparked global movements around open access and digital rights.

Even in fashion and design, Vivienne Westwood and the punk movement didn't just break rules—they mocked the establishment, weaponizing aesthetics to critique authority and consumerism. Their work wasn't just “creative,” it was intentionally provocative, built to disturb.

Subversive creativity is about confronting accepted realities—not just improving them, but *questioning the legitimacy of their foundations*. It doesn't just invent—it destabilizes. It shifts the frame, often with unpredictable consequences. These are not just creators or inventors; they are cultural insurgents. And it's through this form of radical reimagining that deep, systemic change occurs. The table 1 below offers a synthesis of these AI*AI challenges:

Table 1: Synthesis of AI*AI Creativity Types and Implications

Type of Creativity	Definition	Key Features	Examples	AI Capability	Managerial Insight
Optimizing Creativity	Creating new expressions within existing norms, styles, or rules.	Stable patterns, recognizable styles, data-rich environment, easily emulated by an “obsequious” AI.	Claude Monet’s impressionism , Andy Warhol’s repeated prints, AI-generated paintings in known styles.	Highly capable—AI excels at replicating styles and producing within defined parameters.	Use AI to scale and personalize creative output within existing frameworks.
Deviating Creativity	Combining unrelated elements or disciplines to produce novel results.	Hybridization of forms, cross-disciplinary, requires insight and experimentation.	Lil Nas X blending country and hip-hop, Christophe Bruno’s AI-assisted art remixing Millet and Klein.	Moderately capable—AI can suggest surprising combinations but often lacks contextual depth.	Encourage lateral thinking tools and AI-supported brainstorming for innovation.
Subversive Creativity	Deliberately challenging or overturning dominant norms and power structures.	Start with ideas which are seen as “bad”, “weird”, “useless”, intentional rule-breaking, requires courage and a capacity to unlearn, socially disruptive, not data-driven (low to no data).	Marcel Duchamp’s 'Fountain', Muhammad Yunus’s microfinance, Aaron Swartz’s open-access activism.	Limited—AI lacks intent, social risk-taking, and the ability to ‘unlearn’ or challenge systems meaningfully.	Support environments where radical ideas can be safely explored; subversion requires human vision and leadership.

Being friends with the robots

Artificial intelligence models will continue to innervate themselves into our lives. They may be overhyped at the moment, but the amount of investment, media coverage, and usage they’re getting all but ensures they will play a big role forward. Though artificial intelligence models will disrupt creative work, creative people will adapt as they always have.

Artists and the art they make that resonates with us are always on the move. We have to remember that just a blink of an eye ago, funerary statues, relief sculptures, frescoes in churches and temples, and portraits of royalty were the most popular forms of artwork. If we know anything about culture, we know it evolves. Once a style, medium, or topic becomes banal, the dominant narrative moves to something else. If AI-generated creative media starts to dominate, it’s highly likely humans will grow weary of them and move on to

other art forms. Maybe even backwards (which happens often in art and culture) towards something more... human?

But let's face it. Duchamp and Picasso would be all over AI technologies, pranking and stretching the art establishment to no end. Used effectively, these tools can create new understanding, artworks, and problem-solving products we can't even dream of. But they can't replace the truly remarkable, unique artistic intelligence humans use to transform our lives and societies.

If you want to take full advantage of the potential of artificial intelligence, take a look at [Art Thinking](#), the "social algorithm" of artistic intelligence. It might be an avenue worth exploring. The Art Thinking method could serve as a solution to the challenge posed by the famous American writer Alvin Toffler, who posited that the illiterates of the 21st century will not be those who can't read or write, but those who can't learn, unlearn and relearn.

References

Amabile, T. M. (1996). Creativity and innovation in organizations. *Harvard Business School*, 5:239-396.

Becker, H. (1982). "Art Worlds". Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Boden, M. A. (1998). Creativity and artificial intelligence. *Artificial intelligence*, 103(1-2): 347-356.

Bureau, S., & Zander, I. (2014). Entrepreneurship as an art of subversion. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30(1): 124-133.

Bureau, S. (2022). "Agile methods: How can we stop hyper-focusing on clients and why?" White paper, Paris: 1-18.

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2): 243-263.