

AI urgency and editorial work at the *Journal for Artistic Research*

Carolina Benavente Morales

Urgency, as the necessity felt to act soon to trigger or stop an event, vary depending on the importance given to the event, and the promptness of the action can also be relative, as well as the solutions envisaged to meet them. On another side, as new urgencies appear, they entwine with all kinds of emergencies that need immediate solutions, as well as with historical problems that are somehow obscured by the former. The list has no end: global warming, bird flu pandemic, wars, colonialism, imperialism, patriarchy, classism, racism, ethnocentrism, fundamentalism, capitalism, and the international rise of fascism, among many others. Artistic research helps to explore and address those urgencies, emergencies and dragging problems as they relay and overlay, but in parallel it also faces its own disturbances, some of which concerns our editorial work.

The *Journal for Artistic Research*, JAR, shows that urgencies are being intensively felt, investigated, and thought, giving way to the creation of different kind of expositions. Besides leaving a testimony of disturbance amidst turbulence, these contributions explore and propose new relations to other humans and non-humans, as well as to bodies, territories, work, leisure, technology, and much more has been made and is on the way. Through their esthetic articulations, they even prefigure events, as it is shown by a Chilean exposition about modernity ruins shaken by the noise of balloon explosions, just before Chile's explosion took set with its 2019 social outbreak, el Estallido. For it articulates knowledge and creation about urgencies in various senses, art must have a fundamental place in research that JAR's help to profile and legitimate. Nevertheless, the urgency that I will address is Artificial Intelligence or AI, and not only because this digital technology is having huge impacts in every cultural aspect, but also because *JAR* is a digital technology-based project.

AI refers to the development of computer systems that can perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as perception, reasoning, learning, and decision-making. For this, the question that many people have at this moment is: will this artificial performance replace human performance in those tasks? This question is disturbing existentially and in a more quotidian way, for its relation to human activity and work as sources of meaning and sustain. As the Italian philosopher Franco "Bifo" Berardi saysⁱ, intelligence is the ability to decide on

logical, computable bases, while consciousness is the capacity to take decisions between undecidable alternatives, based on an ethic, aesthetic, empathic perception of the other. For Bifo, the issue is mainly that humans might forget this conscious dimension, giving AI the power to decide for us at the highest levels of decision-making processes; just like it is happening with automatized financial system, for instance.

How AI might impact our editorial work, at JAR? This work is crucial, as we decide what goes public through the journal, which have an impact in the field of artistic research, as well as in artistic, cultural, and epistemic fields in general. As members of JAR's Editorial Board, we try to be very conscious of what and how any proposal poses or evoke through its own expositional means, and we make our better efforts to enhance the deployment of the matters for its public knowledge, with the kind collaboration of the authors and of many specialists throughout the years, and the world. The fact that we take our decisions on ethic, aesthetic, poetic, and empathetic bases make our tasks even more critical, as we try to actualize a consciousness in peril. The challenge is to not lose it, and this is why I want to focus AI impacts on JAR's editorial work, stressing that we —still— have some power to decide.

The AI “conceives” itself as an assessment tool and distinguishes between automatized and not fully automatized editorial tasks. The former would be *proofreading, language checking, and grammar correction, which can increase efficiency and accuracy while reducing costs, though AI-powered tools can also assist with content creation and analysis, providing editors with insights on reader engagement and content performance*. AI has effectively been useful for proofreading tasks, but what might we expect for the others? More than making predictions, I will pose some questions focusing our editorial work areas.

The first area, creation, submission, and change of contributions does not directly involve us, but it crucially relates to expositiveness as JAR's main editorial aim. Recently, the Research Catalogue has implemented a new block editor that added accessibility to expositions, but, as we might face a growing number of proposals that use AI generated media, and, perhaps, whole contributions, will we feel the need to adapt the platform to the developments to come? The second area, revision, evaluation, selection, and improvement, directly concerns our works. Contemporary artists have widely worked on the meta side of art, so I suppose that this would not be an issue, but we cannot know: will we be able to detect AI generated expositions? Will we understand them as genuine artistic research

contributions? What will we do if we someday receive a contribution from the AI itself? And, on another side: what kind of AI tools are helping and might help us to manage submissions, define reviewers, revise expositions, and improve them? Will the AI soon be able to decide, and will we let it decide on esthetic and epistemic matters? On the third area, publication, viewing, and public interactions, how can AI tools assist us in communicating what we do, in interacting with old and new publics, and in facilitating access to our different sections and contents? Will we accept that the AI replace us in those interactions?

My questions are intended to trigger a reflection that should focus on what enhanced perception, reasoning, learning, and decision-making capacities of machines might imply for editorial practices, artistic research, general intelligence, and consciousness. Now, every tool is not exactly “a” tool, but “somebody’s” tool, in the sense that it has been developed through “his/her or their” codes, algorithms, neural networks, interphases, and the like. AI is —still— not unified, it’s not an entity, but a multiplicity: should we develop our own editorial AI tools to not be controlled by other’s? And when the Artificial General Intelligence or Superintelligence emerge in a few years, or in a few months, or weeks, how will we articulate to it? Another question involves the pricing, which contributes to deepen the global digital divide, as well as the research and artistic divides, not to mention the cybercolonialism that it implies; a colonialism that comes from metropolis, but that has chances to come from machines. So, let’s adopt AI tools as an urgency of times, but not before urgently jumping into the future to remember that, *as the world became increasingly complex, humans looked to AI to make the tough decisions. But when the machines started making choices that went against human values, it was already too late to turn back.*

Presented at: Michael Schwab et al. "Journal for Artistic Research: URGENCIES" [Editorial Board panel, streaming], The 14th International SAR Conference 2023, The Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway, 04/21/2023

Reworked for publication with video, 05/26/2023

<https://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/2079976/2079977>

ⁱ Presentation at the First International Book Fair of the Social Sciences at Recoleta, Santiago, Chile, April 2023.