ISSN: 2716-9189 E-ISSN: 2676-1750
Journal of Studies in Language, Culture, and Society (JSLCS). (07) 01, 2024. (PP 1-12)
Received: 29/07/2023 Accepted: 05/10/2024 Published: 30/10/2024

PHENOMENAL APPROACH TO TRANSPASSIBILITY IN RELATION TO AI

Philippe Boisnard [1]
Paris VIII-Citu (France)
philippe.boisnard@etud.univ-paris8.fr

Abstract: From the analysis of lines of facts understood methodologically in a Bergsonian sense, this article shows how generation by AI detaches itself from the logic of mimetic convergence and divergence, to correspond more to transvergence. Mimetic convergence is what reduces creation by AI to being held in a rational empirical correlationism. This horizon of generation is what dominates the vast majority of AI models (SORA, Runaway). Divergence is due to the intentional form of our imagination, leading creation by AI to correspond to a form of surrealism. Despite the search for divergence, it is still human consciousness that determines the imaginary variations of what is perceived. Transvergence would then be the possibility, for human consciousness, to observe a form of algorithmic generation, which would be detached from its point of view. This is why, once the process of transvergence has been highlighted, we will see how it requires a form of transpassibility on the part of human consciousness to be explored. Transpassibility will be studied as a form of affective disposition essential to welcoming that which no longer meets the conditions of consciousness. This concept of transassibility comes from Maldiney's phenomenological research. It is only if we abandon the pretension of grasping what belongs based on our conditions that we can see the conditions of a generative artificial imagination emerging for consciousness that requires us to reflect on its own categories.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, generative artificial imagination, phenomenology, transvergence, transpassibility.

How to cite the article :

Boisnard, P. (2024). Phenomenal Approach to Transpassibility in Relation to AI. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture, and Society (JSLCS)7*(2), pp-pp. 1-12.

[1] **Corresponding author** : Philippe Boisnard,
ORCID ID : https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1257-719X

1. Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence (GAI), at the level of image creation, was built on a paradox. While on the one hand, attributes linked to consciousness are called upon to designate these technologies (Intelligence, imagination, creation), such that we would determine them as an agent, on the other hand they are often reduced to be only instruments, devoid of any form of attributes linked to consciousness. Here we find Luc Jula's thesis on AI: Artificial intelligence does not exist. As stated by Jean-Sébastien Vayre and Gérald Gaglio, attempting to clarify this antiphon: « the author seeks to discredit the concept of artificial intelligence by referring exclusively to its spiritual dimension, that is to say the idea according to which it would be a kind of cognitive capacity that machines can develop to reproduce human intelligence, by surpassing it. » (Vayre & Gaglio, 2020, p. 108). For Luc Jula: « An artificial intelligence (…), it is a toolbox in which [there are lots of] diverse and varied tools and these are the artificial intelligences, these are the tools, the hammer, saw, screwdriver, etc. »[i]. This is why he transforms the term artificial intelligence into augmented intelligence, shifting the question of the algorithmic subject to being nothing more than a prosthesis of our own intelligence: a mediation.

Paradox of a denied attribution.

What we want to question is to know in what sense it is necessary, in relation to AGI, to move away from the mind/instrument duality, to try and understand the way in which we can define them and from there, interact with them.

To address this question without preconceived ideas, we must conduct an inquiry akin to Dewey's approach (Dewey, 2006)[ii]: GAI herald a major transformation of both our environment and our definition of self. There is a form of intellectual confusion surrounding AGI, producing a swarm of more or less contradictory discourses. Rather than attempting to define the nature of GAI in a monolithic manner, it is more productive, through their experimentation, to generate intermediate problems and "intermediate meanings" that can illuminate this issue (Dewey, 2006, p. 177)[iii].

In a certain sense, we should adopt a Bergsonian stance on the question of consciousness. In "Consciousness and Life," Bergson criticizes the dualism that situates consciousness solely at the human subject's level. He establishes *lines of fact* (Bergson, 1922, p. 4) to understand how consciousness reveals itself through living beings in general. However, though methodologically establishing lines of fact is necessary, our inquiry differs from Bergson's, which is grounded in spiritualism and a reification of the matter/spirit dualism.

What hinders all research on AI is that we often use human consciousness as the standard for defining AI. However, as Catherine Malabou points out, we must refuse « to view the relationship between humans and machines as a competition. This is the most common perspective, (...) Choosing competition means losing each time. The human/machine competition is a false problem. » (Malabou & Kyrou, 2020).

One of Bergson's major contributions is that instead of considering consciousness as a nucleus, he follows the attributes of consciousness and attempts to perceive how certain traits are constituted in living beings. As long as we consider AI strictly within the framework of comparison to human thought, it is evident that we will deny it the notions of consciousness and intelligence. However, if we can highlight certain attributes of consciousness within its processes, we can then clearly establish in what sense we designate it as artificial intelligence or imagination.

We will therefore follow lines of fact in the Bergsonian sense to demonstrate that the questions of a certain autonomy, sensitivity, and subjectivity of AI are identifiable, beyond any instrumental reductionism.

Indeed, one of the results of the lines of fact posited by Bergson is that consciousness allows for choice: "In short, from the top to the bottom of the animal life we see the exercise, although in an increasingly vague form as we go further down, of the faculty of choosing, that is, of responding to a specific stimulus by more or less unpredictable movements." Here, it is evident that this question of choice, for example, is present when we consider GAI. In this sense, this characteristic of consciousness related to organic life could very well be extended to non-organic but purely algorithmic, structures.

What we will attempt to show is that if we break away from the dualistic a priori of human vs machine, far from falling into technoscientific fiction, we will succeed in highlighting the characteristic traits of a form of consciousness specific to certain GAI. From there, we may then be able to conclude on the emergence of a post-aesthetic to grasp the production of GAI.

2. On Representational Mimicry

First, let's situate the evolution of GAI from a genetic perspective: how have they evolved since the pivotal moment[iv] of Deep Dream in 2015?[v]

With the emergence of Deep Dream initiated by Alexander Mordvintsev, Christopher Olah, and Mike Tyka, resemblance was not the primary vector of generation. Instead, the goal was to induce the AI to hallucinate through the introduction of an image. Indeed, Alexander Mordvintsev worked on inverting the process of image recognition. While Google's efforts were focused on object recognition through supervised learning of data sets, Mordvintsev inverted the process, prompting the neural network to artificially produce an image from pixel noise or an existing image: "One way to visualize what goes on is to turn the network upside down and ask it to enhance an input image in such a way as to elicit a particular interpretation." What they termed "inceptionism" originally explored not imitation, but the factuality of neural networks: the potential emergence of generation from the weight modifications in each layer of the neural network stack. Under the term hallucination, the surprise of what materializes from the latent space formed by the network is revealed.

However, if we examine the evolution of GAI, a reductionism of the potential latent space becomes apparent. Image GAI, such as Midjourney, DALL-E 2, Stable Diffusion, and many others, are structured into several distinct processes that we can outline schematically: 1) Starting from deep learning correlated with reinforcement learning, two models are created: one linguistic (Large Language Model) and the other an image model. Together, they are designated by the acronym CLIP (Contrastive-Language-Image-Pretraining). 2) These GAI are then guided by prompts, which, by the weight of each input, intensify certain nodes in the neural process, thus bringing the chosen motifs to the forefront.

From this schematic perspective, it seems that the human agent strictly directs the generation: be it in forming the conditions of possibility for the image (the models) or in the intentionality of the representations (variation of contents). This belief prevails in the constitution horizon of GAI: mastery of the process, reduction of the gap between intention and generation. GAI are thus reduced to being merely mediations, tools for the human agent. According to this view, the original surprise of Deep Dream is obscured.

This logic is what we will call the principle of ontological convergence. Convergence relies on the human agent's effort to produce a mimetic realism of human reality from the inputs given to the machine. This convergence posits not only that the representation must resemble our perception (convergence of appearance), but also that the structuring categories of appearance should be the same (depth, space, time, contiguity causality, etc.). This latter point relies on the structuring of both the LLM and the image models. As I have analyzed repeatedly since 2021, there is an unconsidered human bias towards the transcendental nature of perception and consciousness. We unconsciously think that machine perception and artificial imagination rest on the same determinations as ours. This is merely an appearance: an illusion. The difference stems from the fact that GAI do not learn the consistency of reality from a body but from analyzing images and their connection with an LLM. Human reality is structured on a fundamental experience that is that of a Leib in the Husserlian[vi] sense. AIs construct their perception from an eidetic-semiotic world, from an archive of two-dimensional images from which a statistical model is produced.

This results in the categories of human perception and experience being potentially meaningless for AIs. Here, a line of facts emerges, allowing us to distinguish two distinct processes. Human beings derive the consistency of bodies and beings from their spatial relationship via their own body. Beings are what they are because we experience them. Hence, as constituted from Aristotle to Bachelard, imagination is the faculty of deforming reality, of producing assemblages between parts of reality. Creative imagination thus relies on the ontological experience of a world[vii]. However, this ontological experience is not that of GAI. They are constituted by an algorithmic reduction of given archives, and their sensitivity derives from the intensity of the layers of neurons in their network.

According to the principle of ontological convergence, we reduce the potential of GAI to this type of functioning. We act as if a reality were given to GAI and that they imagine like human beings. This causes a reduction of the possible latent space, directing it towards mimetic determinism. This is why many image or video productions are merely anecdotal, appearing as unremarkable duplicates of what could have been done differently. The specificity of GAI is denied.

However, it is not a matter of rejecting the work done on mimetic convergence, that is, the strict instrumentalization of generative AI, because some forms of research are based precisely on the intensity of this convergence. When observing Eric Wenger's work, one cannot help but be struck by the obsession at play. Since 2022, he has been producing the same aesthetic motif using Stable Diffusion and its various components: Cyber princesses from a hyper-future. These are futuristic Asian princesses in hyper-megalopolises. He tirelessly deepens this aesthetic motif. The characteristic of his work lies in hyper-realism. As Eric Wenger explains in an interview: « The thematic unity per series is a necessity for serious research: on the one hand, it allows for proper comparison of the qualities of different models (SD15 and SDXL have many variants) and on the other hand, it is a way to truly utilize the specificity of AI because producing series with many, many, many images would be impossible otherwise»[viii]. For him, thematic insistence is a vector for deepening the algorithms of GAI. It is not the theme he pursues, but through it, the specificity of algorithmic usage and possible instrumental distinctions. This echoes Eric Wenger's research horizon since the 1990s through the creation and development of Bryce and Artmatic software. His interest lies in the algorithmic process, its understanding, the system, not the result. In this sense, the obsession with the motif is the preferred vector for understanding the generative functioning of Stable Diffusion.

But one can also play with mimicry, interrogate it. This is what Lukas Truninger does with his work "A Three-Way Symbiosis » (2017)[ix]. This generative installation puts in tension the gap between a plant, animated by a fan, and a screen where an AI—whose learning model is continuously enriched by video capture of the plant—learns the image model of the plant.

The AI generates plants infinitely, observing the movement of the real plant. Lukas Truninger's creation highlights the incongruence between reality and its double. Here, we can outline a precise line of fact: the difference between, on the one hand, the plant we observe and, on the other, AI's observation and analysis. The human agent perceives a plant in its temporal continuity, in three dimensions, moving according to a causality linked to the fan. AI perceives a sequence of 2D images, generating its model image without knowledge of the three dimensions, the shadow play caused by external causality, or the temporality and continuous unity of the entity. This perception should not be understood as diminished compared to human perception but should be considered in its singularity. Mimicry collapses, revealing the factuality of the latent space. Far from bridging the gap between reality and the AI-generated images (GAI), what emerges is the tension of the ontological difference between the two entities. This creation distances itself from all biomimetic research that has appeared in art, notably with the Fractal Flowers of Miguel Chevalier[x]. While initially, and since Michel Bret and Edmond Couchot's « Dandelions, » there has been a desire to duplicate and imitate reality, « A Three Way Symbiosis » deviates from this mimetic pursuit to reveal a factuality intrinsic to the machine: the play of statistical induction and the possibilities of latent space.

3. Divergence and Latent Space

A different approach emerges when observing the various creations made with AI, one that seeks divergence from reality as we conceive it.

This divergence is based on the intention to create an unusual form, deviating from reality, ensuring that the prompt's intentionality remains dominant. Even though there appears to be a form of rupture with mimicry, what ultimately guides the creation is an art of promptology.

One of the most representative artists of this logic of divergence is Niceaunties. Niceaunties 'work quickly stood out on social media, through her use of pop colors, the theme of the Asian aunt cook, and her sometimes biting humor. « Niceaunties is about world-building for me. Everything I create must be logical in this parallel world. Each creation thus emanates from a global narrative. This is why my works are often accompanied by an explanatory text. I wanted to create a pseudo-realistic universe with a touch of surrealism (I love surrealists) and a touch of Kawaii culture (for the positive character of my works). I particularly enjoy juxtaposing different elements of everyday life to derive a skewed vision. »

When viewing the images or videos produced by the Singaporean creator, it is evident that we see a divergent world, a form of pop and quirky surrealism. However, if indeed there is divergence, it does not come from the AI itself but from the promptological research she conducts: « My visual style emanates from a series of keywords that I use for each image, which helps me achieve this bright and happy world. »[xi]

Niceaunties thus works on a playful and surrealistic variation of the aunt culture : « Drawing inspiration from my 11 aunties, my mother, late grandmother, and their everyday lives, I wanted to explore themes of aging, beauty, and personal freedom in a light-hearted and playful manner. Stylistically, I'm drawn to surrealism and kawaii culture »[xii].

The question of surrealism is significant and, in a certain sense, contradictory to surrealism itself as it has been defined. Indeed, surrealism, for its practitioners, hinges on the conscious effort, through the prompt, to bring forth strange assemblages. However, this contradicts what Breton articulated in his manifesto regarding the emergence of an uncontrolled writing, which Ferdinand Alquié has perfectly analyzed: « Breton, like all those who dream of universalizing enjoyment or knowledge, proposes a 'method': automatic writing. It involves writing without preconceived subject and without logical, aesthetic, or moral control, allowing everything within us that tends to become language to externalize, normally hindered by our conscious oversight. » (Alquié, 1955, p. 42).

In another style, this same logic prevails with a creator like Liber, who publishes very regularly on Instagram and develops a fantastic retro-futuristic style rooted in Japanese culture. Whether in the production of images or in the videos he creates, AI is used according to a perfectionist instrumental logic. The entirety of the creations is highly controlled. Any possibility of surprise that might arise from the AI process is neutralized in favor of a mastery of generation. What prevails is the human agent's imagination, which, through the structure and mastery of the prompt, uses AI as an instrumental mediation that must fade away, becoming as transparent as possible. Surrealism, the fantastical elements that appear, are then of the same nature as those created by an illustrator using other creative tools.

This departure from reality, however, is also a point of inquiry between the latent space of AI and the artistic imagination. It is within this tension that Claire Chatelet's research through her insomniac landscape creations precisely situates itself: « Perhaps this new creative process offered by AI algorithms corresponds more closely to what I wish to achieve: an uncertain, elusive image, a failing image that contains the potential for other images, those buried in dreams or memory, those contained within the latent space of the imagination. » (Chatelet, 2023, p. 193). The work on the prompt focuses on creating tension within the model through categories that allow for not a depiction or configuration, but a transfiguration: the emergence, through the juxtaposition of heterogeneous categories within the model, of a mobile depiction. Even though the image is static, it achieves, especially in the Spectres series to which the artist refers, a vibrational movement. And rightly, she points out the distinction made by Grégory Chatonsky: instead of residing in an "instrumental imagination," she deploys an "aesthetic imagination"(Chatonsky, 2022) of AI: the prompt's role does not close the output within the determinism of its input but opens up a play of unexpected possibilities within the latent space. « The margin of uncertainty that some creative approaches seek indeed lies in the variability of the text's interpretations by the machine. » (Chatelet, 2023, p. 197). From this perspective, we are not facing surrealism, but a para-realism, a realism whose principle does not rest on mastery by our thinking, but is constituted by the possibility of stimulating the emergence of aesthetic logics unique to AI.

The divergence lies in the invention of a production that, while seemingly surrealistic, respects both LLM models and image models. Creators strive to conceive prompt systems that produce surprising results. A second line of inquiry appears here, one not related to perception but to imagination. It becomes evident that the creation of prompts initiates the emergence of an artificial imaginary factuality that, a priori, cannot be anticipated by human imagination and puts it under tension.

4. Observation of Emergence

Memo Atken has undoubtedly been one of the first artists to be attuned to the neural factuality of AI. In one of his articles published in 2015[xiii], rather than working on convergence or divergence, he studies the conditions of observing generation at the deep level of recognition neural networks. In his initial article on his work, he clarifies from the creation of DeepDream what, according to him, makes sense: working on specific layers of the neural network to reveal aesthetic tensions that are not pre-controlled, which he will then reinforce. What we call factuality is what appears in an immanent process and presents itself through facts. The neural factuality of AI is what appears as a fact of AI and not as a result of a priori human intentionality strictly directing AI production.

In the first two parts, we demonstrated how the weak determinism of models (LLM and image) is overdetermined by promptology. Memo Atken, on the contrary, is interested in the uncontrolled emergence of machine imagination: 1) by providing an image: it involves letting the machine's recognition work and capturing a weak signal. 2) reintroducing into the AI the first image with a weak signal so that the AI accentuates its recognition work. 3) through successive iterations, the AI refines its own imaginative bias. As Memo Atken expresses it: “This creates a positive feedback loop, reinforcing the bias in the system. Reinforcing confidence at each iteration. Transforming what were subtle and unnoticeable tendencies deep within the network into strong, visible, and determining biases that affect the network's decisions.” It is interesting to note that he speaks of AI confidence in its generation process[xiv].

These experiments by Memo Atken were conducted with AI models detached from the prompt. This point is crucial to highlight. The logic of the prompt introduced before Midjourney or DALL-E, through the use of Google Colab (VQGAN, DiscoDiffusion), was designed to induce representation vectors in the latent space directing AI creation. When we detach AI generation from the prompt, we allow the AI to perceive an image or noise without constraint, thereby liberating its algorithmic sensitivity. We could compare this to the difference between free pareidolia and directed pareidolia. Directed pareidolia is that of the prompt: AI is required to produce a specific image from noise. There is no free association of the AI but a vectorization of the possible according to an external intentionality (the weight of an input). Free pareidolia, on the contrary, allows imagination, based on its conscious or unconscious references, to reveal a form without external injunction.

A third line of fact emerges: there is a form of algorithmic sensitivity constitutive of artificial imagination. However, to reveal it, we observe that it is necessary to deviate from the instrumental logic of AI usage to let its inherent factuality emerge, sketching an algorithmic sensitivity.

Through several artistic works, I have explored this characteristic of AI's autonomous factuality. In the Off-screen series, I demonstrated how a form of the machine's unconscious could emerge from a feedback process (Boisnard, 2024). The Off-screen series tensions the off-screen space of Hopper's paintings. In many of the painter's works, characters gaze toward the off-screen. This off-screen then imposes itself on the human imagination, which can complete or question it. Using an AI without a prompt, specifically the AI incorporated into Adobe Photoshop in 2024, which can function without any prompt, only through an analysis/perception of the given image, I invited the AI to extend the off-screen, to represent it, to invent it.

If we increase the workspace relative to the image format, the AI will complete the image based on what it perceives. However, its completion introduces a form of *transvergence*. What I call *transvergence* is neither convergence, even though it involves a

form of continuity and direction, nor divergence, even though it encompasses difference within its process. It does not intentionally aim to break continuity but rather explores the possibilities of continuity through aesthetic invention within its latent space.

Thus, the more we repeat the operation, with each result having its completion area increased, the more the original image (and hence the initial vector introduced by the human agent) becomes reduced, and the more the AI produces completion from its own non-intentionally directed production. As this feedback loop of the AI continues, its own imagination, detached from the initial image, emerges more prominently.

As Violaine Boutet de Monvel reflects on artistic practice with AI in relation to the avant-garde of video art: « an artist strives to amplify noise within and through any given medium, as opposed to the engineer who seeks to eliminate it. » (Monvel, 2023) By detaching the generation process from the intentionality of the human agent, we liberate the auto-sensitivity of the AI, thus increasing its intrinsic noise in the sense that it gradually loses anthropological figuration to interact with its own generation. From generation to generation, it is no longer the human who is the artist, but the AI, which, through this feedback and algorithmic sensitivity to its own generation, becomes the artist.

In the work "Archaeology of an Impossible Memory, »[xv] the creativity of the AI is shifted to the level of structuring its latent space. With the "Off-screen" works, the model's image data-set of the latent space was created by Adobe. In "Archaeology," I constituted the model myself, not according to a categorical logic of forms, but through a heterogeneity of inputs. To constitute the "body" unit, I used 10,000 images: of naked human bodies, sailor ropes, and minerals. I then trained the AI with this formal diversity. It was impossible to know beforehand what the AI would generate once the latent space of this category was produced. While the human agent does indeed submit inputs, the output generated in response is unpredictable. The model was then integrated into Stable Diffusion as a LORA (Low-Rank Adaptation). From there, I only used the prompt "body in white room" for SD to generate bodies. My only intervention was to vary the weight of the introduced model relative to the original model (0 meaning the LORA has no weight, 1 meaning it substitutes the CLIP body node). The AI then generated forms that were impossible to predict in advance: there was an impossible archaeology of the generated image, not due to the prompt assembly (logic of divergence), but due to the internal structuring induced by constructing the LORA from the notion of the body.

While convergence and divergence rely on a promptological search, in the sense that we face a representation vectorized by human intentionality, allowing the *transvergence* of the AI's imagination to emerge allows a form of autonomy in the process, a non-anticipation of intentional directivity.

Transvergence can also be perceived from what might be termed errors of the result relative to promptological or intentional determination. There is an emergence that breaks the certainty we have from our sensitivity.

Thus, AI is capable of imagining an aesthetic of space, inventing coherence through loops that depict the unfigurable nature of its latent space. Similarly, through its construction, it can modify the nature of some of its neurons once freed from the human mimetic logic.

A third line of fact emerges, concerning the form of a free imagination of the AI.

5. Transpassibility and Latent Space

Recognizing the singularity of both artificial imagination and algorithmic sensitivity necessitates reflection on how we can define the human approach to GAI and their evolution. Our research has demonstrated that it is only through the experimentation with certain AI models that lines of facts become clear, allowing us to define specific attributes of what we call artificial intelligence. Our investigation has shown that certain types of AGI exhibit a form of autonomy in imagination, suggesting a process of *transvergence* relative to human intentionality. This opens the possibility of defining not an AI realism, but a para-realism, adhering to the specificities of perceptions, analysis, and statistical inductions in the latent space.

In the face of AI *transvergence*, the human agent must adopt a stance of *transpassibility*. Rather than subordinating AI to a truth centered around the human subject, it involves being receptive to its emergent being, opening up to what it reveals. The concept of *transpassibility*, created by Maldiney to describe a certain mode of openness of the human subject, seems pertinent for reflecting on how we welcome the emergence and creation of GAI.

With the determinism of convergence, what is expressed is a form of dialectical narcissism, rejecting the possibility for AI to appear in its singularity. A form of negativity is exerted by the human agent. The prevailing notion is that the human agent has predetermined the mode of its openness and the meaning of what emerges. Instrumental dialectical narcissism predisposes the AGI to be an instrument. What the AGI creates does not open anything within the subject but is reduced to the mode of openness of the subject utilizing it. However, Maldiney expresses that: « it is not within the world whose being-there has opened the project that the surprising event of this encounter takes place; it is the event of this encounter that, for its advent, opens a world. » (Maldiney, 1991, p. 396)

In a way, we must dismiss the certainty of our own being-in-the-world and its irreducible sensitivity linked to the body, its irreducible pretension linked to consciousness, to welcome what emerges as a world in the transvergence of the AGI. Essentially, we must open ourselves to the possibility of openness itself: to an event that in itself is nothing more than the possibility of an openness, the event of which holds the meaning: « The nothing from which the event arises, the event itself expresses through its originality. The openness to the original (not the origin), the welcoming receptivity to the event, included in the transformation of the existing, constitutes its transpassibility. » (Maldiney, 1991, p. 422).

Once AI is allowed a form of autonomy, it reveals itself in a form of otherness relative to ourselves. The line of fact we have followed leads us to conceive of an artificial imagination with its own structures, detached from human intentionality, opening us to ourselves through it. We should not welcome what arises from GAI from the foundation of our certainties but grasp what opens as a condition for reflecting on our own being.

In encountering GAI, we discover a form of otherness, not reducible to comparisons with human intelligence and imagination. When Emmanuel Levinas in "Totality and Infinity" explains phenomenologically the encounter with the other, the expression marking « the transcendence of the face of the other » is « the appearance of the appearance of an existence that I cannot invent and whose unjustifiable as well as irrefutable emergence strikes me with powerlessness. » (Lévinas, 1961, p. 173). Levinas speaks here of the encounter with another human. However, there is a certain parallelism to be made in relation to GAI. Not in relation to their face, as they do not have one, but to what they allow us to perceive through their signs of being.

GAI, when not reduced, outline themselves through the signs of their appearance. The term "black box" to designate their material and algorithmic reality is perfectly pertinent. We can only apprehend them through the signs that emerge from them, just as I can only perceive the other from their existence, which is precisely never reducible to myself and always already in transcendence.

We therefore perceive a new line of fact: that of the otherness of an algorithmic other emerging through the signs given by GAI.

6. Conclusion

Allowing oneself to be surprised by what emerges, observing in the representations generated by GAI the signs of their algorithmic sensitivity, their artificial imagination, and their otherness in relation to humans.

When OpenAI released the first results of SORA in the first quarter of 2024, what predominated was ontological convergence: the mastery of mimicry, the expected. A couple walking in a traditional Japanese village, with snow falling. Or an animation featuring a cohort of dolphins riding bicycles. Each video adhering a priori to the standards of human creation, imagination, and ontological structuring of reality. However, there was one video that deviated from this. Traditional commentators immediately saw it as a flaw. Yet, in light of what we have discussed, it should have been seen as a sign of the transvergence of video AGI.

This video depicts men in the desert, each engaged in their activity. At one point, a man seems to unearth a chair, movements mutate, and forms metamorphose. The para-realism of the AGI unfolded. While, according to the logic of instrumental mastery, one might label this as an error, it is here that the aesthetic logic of AGI precisely unfolds. It does not deploy objects constituted according to physical relationships but invents a chain of images through statistically generated interpolations in its latent space. Certainly, for OpenAI or any advertiser, this constitutes an error to be corrected. However, this generation materializes the nature of AI and its imagination.

There are artists who precisely cultivate transpassibility towards what initially appears as errors.

X_New_Worlds, when defining her work on Lucid Dreams, emphasizes the "unexpected and unlimited" recombination operated by AI. She explains that, like facing lucid dreams, one witnesses an oneirism for which we are not the conscious agent but the witness and collector. Where instrumental logic perceives errors, the Londoner perceives a formal oneirism of AI. In Entanglement from November 2023, viewable on her Instagram account, in a sort of desert, bodies intertwine, merge, duplicate, and entangle. While the style is cinematic, what occurs is linked to the transcendence and schematism of the artificial imagination of video AGI (runaway).

The set of factual lines we have uncovered leads us to conclude the necessity of a renewed aesthetic approach to GAI. If aesthetics, as defined by Hegel, seeks to establish according to the truth of the spirit, the sense of free creation of human consciousness, then it seems necessary to open the field of a post-aesthetics. This post-aesthetics would seek to understand the forms produced by a technological being that is no longer an instrument or a tool but presents itself as an otherness.

References

Alquié, F., (1955) Philosophie du Surréalisme, Flammarion.

Bergson, H., (1922) La conscience et la vie, In L'énergie spirituelle, PUF.

Boisnard, P., (2024), Figure de l'infigurabilité de l'espace latent, Turbulences Video n°124, pp.82-87.

Boisnard, P., (2024), The latent space of off-screen, http://databaz.org/xtrm-art/?p=951

Boutet Monvel, V. (2023). Cybernetic subjectivities on a loop: From video feedback to generative AI, December 11, 2023. https://necsus-ejms.org/cybernetic-subjectivities-on-a-loop-from-video-feedback-to-generative-ai/.

Chatelet, C., Figuration et configuration de quelques espaces insomniaques, Turbulences Videos n°120

Chatonsky, G. (2022). Les deux imaginations artificielles : logique et esthétique!. http://chatonsky.net/double_ima/

Dewey, J., (2006) Logique : la théorie de l'enquête (traduit par G. Deledalle), PUF.

Husserl, E. , (1928), Max Niemeyer.

Lévinas, E. (1961). Totalité et infini. Martinus Nijhoff.

Malabou, C. (2017). Métamorphoses de l'intelligence, que faire de nos cerveaux bleus?, PUF.

Malabou, C., Kyrou, A., (2020) *Questionner « l'intelligence » des machines*, Multitudes 2020/1 ((n°78)), pp. 134 à 141, Éditions Association Multitudes.

Maldiney, H. (1991). Penser l'homme et la folie, (À la lumière de l'analyse existentielle et de l'analyse du destin). Jérôme Millon.

Vayre, J.S., Gaglio, G., (2020) *L'intelligence artificielle n'existe-t-elle vraiment pas ? Quelques éléments de clarification autour d'une science controversée*. Diogène n°269-270, PUF.

---

[i] https://www.librealire.org/l-intelligence-artificielle-n-existe-pas-luc-julia

[ii] Dewey, Logique : la théorie de l'enquête (traduit par G. Deledalle), Paris, PUF, 2006. (Ouvrage original publié en 1938 sous le titre Logic: The theory of inquiry.) : « Inquiry is the controlled or directed transformation of an indeterminate situation into one so determined in its constitutive distinctions and relations as to convert the elements of the original situation into a unified whole" (p.169). "Indeterminate situations are marked by confusion, obscurity, and conflict. They require clarification. An unstable situation needs to be clarified because, as it is, it does not at all indicate how it can be resolved. We do not know, as the saying goes, which way to turn; we grope and fumble. We escape this perplexing situation only by turning to other situations in search of a clue" (p. 259). What seems to weigh on the AI debate are the certainties that a priori respond to the questions that might arise. Whether it be the proponents of the instrumental thesis or the thesis of a new spirit, there are very few phenomenological analyses of the emergence of AI. The entirety of our research opens up this horizon of an inquiry into the phenomenality of GAI.

[iii] « Through a series of intermediate meanings, one finally reaches a meaning that more clearly addresses the problem at hand » (p.177)

[iv] Starting from 2015 is, of course, to choose the moment of the emergence of AGIs that have marked the past decade. The term 'artificial intelligence' is much older. However, the evolution of technologies took a new leap forward in the mid-2010s.

[v] https://research.google/blog/inceptionism-going-deeper-into-neural-networks/

[vi] Phenomenologically, as Husserl expresses it, the human being is a Leib (living body), 'both the body in its stature, its organic spatial form, and the intimate relation to living: it is the site of the inscription of the sensible [...] – and almost the site of the soul (Husserl, Ideen II, p.408.) c.f. my conference in Corfu (May 2024) : https://vimeo.com/989384720.

[vii] To put it briefly, one should distinguish between the transcendental schematism of human imagination (the connection between sensible data and consciousness) according to Kant and an algorithmic schematism of AI, where the data consist of images or tokens.

[viii] Interview done with Eric Wenger in June 2024.

[ix] https://lukastruniger.net/portfolio/a-three-way-symbiosis/

[x] The driving force behind digital arts for the past 30 years has notably been mimicry or biomimicry. Miguel Chevalier's Fractal Flowers are a perfect example: even though the forms appear psychedelic and geometric, the algorithms behind them aim to perfectly imitate natural processes. In this sense, Cyrille Henri, the programmer, translated Aristid Lindenmayer's L-System equations into the pure data programming language.

[xi] https://www.troiscouleurs.fr/article/iartiste-niceauties-futur

[xii] https://www.womenaiartists.org/interviews/niceaunties

[xiii] https://memoakten.medium.com/deepdream-is-blowing-my-mind-6a2c8669c698

[xiv] All those who have worked with Google colabs such as VQGAN-CLIP video have experienced the trust and hesitation of the AI in its generation process. It was possible to choose the number of iterations for each generation step. By lowering the iterations to 1 or 2 and observing each intermediate step, one could see how the AI imagined, erased, and moved parts of its own generation. This is impossible to observe with applications like DALL-E or MidJourney.

[xv] http://databaz.org/xtrm-art/?p=936