



HAL
open science

Imaginative Empowerment of AGI and Human Transpassibility

Philippe Boisnard

► **To cite this version:**

Philippe Boisnard. Imaginative Empowerment of AGI and Human Transpassibility. 8th Computer Art Congress, Laboratoire Paragraphe,; Université Paris 8; Facultad de Artes; Universidad Nacional de la Plata, Oct 2024, La Plata (Provincia de Buenos Aires), Argentina. ⟨hal-05047581⟩

HAL Id: hal-05047581

<https://hal.science/hal-05047581v1>

Submitted on 26 Apr 2025

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Copyright - All rights reserved

Imaginative Empowerment of AGI and Human Transpassibility »
Philippe Boissard
Paris VIII

The proliferation of generative tools for the creation and generation of images and videos via AI, while transforming the production chain of image-making, video creation, 3D rendering, and design, also compels us to reconsider the respective roles of machine and human creativity within these processes. It is overly simplistic to reduce the creative process with AI to an idealized notion of dialogue or human-machine co-creation.

In most cases, this is far from true co-creation; it is more accurately an instrumental intentionality on the part of the human, entailing the subordination and mastery of a tool. As artist Mario Klingemann observes, AI is “somewhere between a microscope and a telescope, but multidimensional. It allows one to see patterns, to explore creative avenues that an artist would only grasp intuitively. It detects elements one might otherwise stumble upon purely by accident.”¹ For Klingemann, AI’s use defines its essence. It is compared to two visual techniques (microscopy and telescope), serving as an optical apparatus in the service of human creative research. This perspective aligns with that of a demiurgic consciousness, with AI acting as an auxiliary.

Is it possible to break from humanity's will to power, its craving for control, by leaving open the emergence of a possibility in AGI? What stance would this require from human consciousness in relation to what we broadly refer to as generative artificial intelligence (AGI)? Should we not consider a kind of affective attunement, one that does not a priori predefine AI and its generative processes? This seems necessary, and only through a phenomenological approach can we methodologically address this challenge.

Thus, is “artificial intelligence” indeed the most fitting term to capture the essence of what we abbreviate as AI? Perhaps the concept itself needs to be reoriented. This is what we will attempt in the final analysis, proposing the term *generative artificial imagination* in place of *generative artificial intelligence*.

Human Vectorization and the Limits of Promptology: Instrumental Reduction of AGI

The most prevalent logic governing AGI usage is none other than its instrumental reduction. Instrumental reduction emerges from a perspective that apprehends AGI strictly as a tool, disregarding its internal technical processes—these are neglected, relegated to a blind spot in this approach.

What matters in this usage lies in minimizing the resistance of the process itself, effectively reducing the temporal and procedural distance between human intentionality, as embodied by human consciousness, and the projected *causa finalis*. Here, AGI is reduced to a neutral, dimensionless mediation, to the extent that human consciousness feels itself to be the sole efficient cause, fully appropriating the process.

This instrumental attitude towards AI has, of course, facilitated the development and proliferation of streamlined, automated interfaces such as Midjourney and DALL-E. Early AGI implementations appeared prior to these, notably on GitHub and Google Colab,

¹ <https://fisheymersive.com/article/qui-es-tu-botto-lia-artiste-millionnaire/>

where engaging with AI required the activation of programmed algorithmic chains via Python. At that time, interaction was not merely a matter of issuing a prompt; rather, it involved rationalizing operations and understanding their stages.

While this did not entirely eliminate the "black box" effect, users at least could observe distinct stages, different algorithms, and had the ability to test and modify them. With the simplification of interfaces, users no longer perceive the complexity of the algorithmic chain; in this sense, they enter a state of double alienation, even as they claim creative agency. The first alienation, in the Marxist sense, occurs as users are dispossessed of the creative force and critical engagement of the production process. The second, as defined by Simondon, involves a psychic neutralization: by delegating operations to the machine, the user confronts the technical process as though it were a magical one.² As Simondon phrased it, "Modernity signifies 'magic' for the individual subconscious of the user." It is this perception of the process as magical that induces a form of alienation, rooted in the user's ignorance of the underlying mechanisms.

Causal Intentionality of Promptology

Generative AIs largely rely on a dual process: (1) the formation of a large language model (LLM) and, concurrently, (2) the construction of an image model. Both processes are grounded in an initial phase of machine learning. The image model is built upon a dataset comprising millions of labeled images, which, through algorithmic analysis, forms a latent space. Depending on the chosen generative AI, distinct latent spaces emerge, as the origin of the datasets determines the nature of possible outputs. However, the latent space is not boundlessly generative; its possibilities are limited by the datasets and, furthermore, by the constraints within promptology itself. In this sense, the user remains oblivious to these limitations, akin to the prisoner in George Lucas's *THX 1138*: the space appears boundless, but only to the prisoner. "For users," writes Antonio Somaini, "it is difficult to understand and counter the inherent tendencies of latent spaces, as they are opaque and non-homogeneous: these spaces lack a complete cartography. Those who navigate them must do so blindly, through trial and error, adjustments, variations, and unexpected discoveries."³

Generation occurs through the prompt. This discussion does not seek to reiterate the critique of AI instrumentality but rather to explore the logical and aesthetic subordination underlying promptology. What dominates the mediation of generative AI is the formulation of prompts. Platforms often provide users with prompt advice or macro-prompts; for instance, Runway includes macro-prompts within the prompt window to generate specific camera movements or aesthetic effects.

Through the prompt, human consciousness does more than suggest a generation vector within the framework of the LLM and image model; it reflects the possibility of the image

² Gilbert Simondon, "Psychosociology of Technicity," in *On Technology*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2014, pp. 76-77. "The modern washing machine is magical insofar as it is automatic, not simply because it is a machine. This automatism is what is desired, as the homemaker longs for a companion, obscure and mysterious, who might offer her courage—a benevolent spirit of the laundry room, much like the refrigerator serves as the spirit of the modern kitchen. 'Modern' thus signifies 'magical' for the individual subconscious of the user."

³ Antonio Somaini, *Le visible et l'énonçable. L'IA et les nouveaux liens algorithmiques entre images et mets*, Nouvelle revue d'esthétique, n°33, 2024, p.56.

according to its own intentionality. The prompt functions as an activator for the models, determining which aspects of the latent space's virtual potential are actualized.

What results is a form of mimetic convergence.

Mimetic convergence reflects the coherence of latent space actualization according to human consciousness's ontological apprehension of reality, producing a formal empirical correlation based on eidetic-semiotic distributions. Whether the images are realistic or surrealistic, the goal remains an image that ontologically corresponds to our reality. As Philippe Descola notes, "to depict is thus to reveal the ontological framework of reality, to which each of us adapts according to the habits our gaze has developed by following certain contours of the world."⁴

Promptology, at its core, is underpinned by this ontological framework of the real, inducing an empirical correlationism. What is implicated is not what is visibly represented but the a priori categories that structure what is generated. Simply creating a flying cow, for instance, does not transcend this framework. These underlying categories remain respected.

Automation and New Factuality

The mimetic images generated by AGI often evoke a sense of *déjà vu*. The latent space's virtuality, enriched by image models linked to LLMs, produces only actualizations of forms that may already be inscribed in our historical visual repertoire. Whether in kitsch, fantasy, or gore, these images impress with their technical quality, yet their impact on our memory is grounded in the intuition of recollection. AI does not create *déjà vu* per se; instead, its generative results convey a familiar atmosphere, an ambient sense of the known. This stems from the latent space's construction from datasets shaped by our history and correlated through tagging, which is itself a product of ontological correlationism.

As Violaine Boutet Monvel, who is researching a thesis on the comparison between video art (1960s-80s) and AI art, notes, "an artist strives to amplify noise within and through any given medium, unlike the engineer, who seeks to eliminate it."⁵ This amplification, however, cannot arise from mere intentionality.

If Boutet Monvel's point holds true, especially in the context of video art from which she draws her insights, we might need to refine it when discussing AGI.

AGI should not be viewed simply as an intermediary between intention and finality but rather as a process to be understood as *ET*, technological beings. In this sense, the artist is not so much a creator as an initiator of an experience that must be extracted intentionally.

Thus, we need to consider AGI through the lens of automation. Here, *automation* is understood as a generative process as detached as possible from human intervention, a process that does not involve our intentionality. In this framework, we allow an AI factuality to emerge. Our hypothesis suggests that we can observe a factual aspect within AI that is not reducible to human intentionality. If this is the case, we might begin to

⁴ Philippe Descola, *Les formes du visible*, ed Seuil, 2021.

⁵ Violaine Boutet Monvel, *Cybernetic subjectivities on a loop: From video feedback to generative AI*, December 11, 2023.

conceptualize AGI as the emergence of *ET*, être-technologique in French, technological beings.

While AI autonomy is indeed relative—since image generation remains connected to model production—the models themselves need not be inherently characterized by human categorical mimesis, as I will demonstrate.

Letting go, allowing ourselves to be moved by what arises. When we observe the evolution of AIs, we recognize that, amid the drive for control, we witness the initial versions of AI before they are refined, corrected, and subordinated to mimetic perfection.

Studium & Punctum

In *La chambre Claire*, Roland Barthes, reflecting on the essence of photography, distinguishes between the *studium* of a photograph and the emergence of the *punctum*. The *studium*, he explains, “is a field, a wide area that I perceive quite familiarly in terms of my knowledge and culture.” In contrast, the *punctum* is the detail that disrupts the *studium*, an unexpected prick, “a sting, a speck, a cut,” that reawakens the image like a throw of dice. The *studium* neutralizes the possibility of perceiving the photograph as a photograph, allowing only an impression of the totality of what is presented. The *punctum*, however, is the detail that separates the subject of the photograph from the essence of photography itself. It reveals the photograph’s being, exposing its process through these micro-details.

For AGI-generated imagery, a certain *a priori* informs the spectator's perception. This *a priori* is rooted in our awareness that these images are generated by AGI; this intuitive knowledge neutralizes our curiosity about the inner workings of this black box, leaving us to perceive only the image and its subject. In this sense, we substitute the human artifact for the algorithmic process, as though it were solely the product of human consciousness. Yet, it is precisely in the realm of the *punctum* that AGI’s presence could appear. The *punctum* would be the trace of an otherness within creation, an aesthetic-algorithmic mark that unsettles the generated image or video, escaping its reduction to mere human intentionality.

Approaching the Black Box of AGI

In *Philosophy of Photography*, Vilém Flusser describes the camera as a black box, explaining that “devices are black boxes that simulate human thought.”⁶ He further elaborates that the photographer must align with the device’s *a prioricategories*: “the photographer must desire what the device can accomplish... These categories are an *a priori* for them. They must ‘decide’ through them: they must press the shutter.”

With AGI, however, Flusser’s black box paradigm appears destabilized. As we will see, the AGI black box can no longer be understood merely as a simulation of human thought. If our hypothesis holds, we will observe in the black box’s outputs a set of characteristics heterogeneous to our *a priori* apprehension of reality.

Our task is not to grasp the internal algorithmic operations but to observe their effects. As Anthony Masure clarifies from a technical behaviorist perspective: “The unobservable processes take place in a black box—the famous black box—which is not an object of

⁶ Vilém Flusser, *Pour une philosophie de la photographie*, ed. Circé, 1996.

inquiry as only observable ‘manifest behaviors’ matter.”⁷ What occurs inside the box is not our primary concern; rather, it is the traces of this inner process as output that may lead us to an understanding of the specific nature of AGI.

First Traces: DeepDream

Memo Akten was perhaps one of the earliest artists to engage with the neuronal factuality of AI. In a 2015⁸ article, rather than focusing on convergence or divergence, he examined the conditions for observing generation within the deeper layers of neural recognition networks. In his initial reflections on DeepDream, he outlines what he finds meaningful: the exploration of specific layers of the neural network to reveal unforeseen aesthetic tensions that could be amplified over time. What we term *factuality* here is what emerges in an immanent process, presenting itself as fact. The neuronal factuality of AI refers to what manifests as a fact within the AI's operations, rather than as a product of a priori human intentionality guiding AI production in a strict sense.

In the first two sections, we discussed how the weak determinism of models (LLM and image) is overdetermined by promptology. In contrast, Memo Akten explores the uncontrolled emergence of machine imagination: (1) by providing an image and allowing the machine's recognition to detect weak signals, (2) by reintroducing this weak-signal image into the AI to amplify its recognition process, and (3) through successive iterations that refine the AI's own imaginative biases. As Akten describes it: “This creates a positive feedback loop, reinforcing the system's bias. Building confidence with each iteration. Turning what were subtle, barely noticeable tendencies deep within the network into strong, visible biases that shape the network's decisions.” Notably, he refers here to the AI's “confidence” in its generative process⁹.

Memo Akten's experiments were conducted using AI models detached from prompts. This distinction is crucial to underscore. The logic of prompting, which was introduced prior to Midjourney and DALL-E via Google Colabs (VQGAN, DiscoDiffusion), was designed to inject representation vectors into latent space to guide AI's creation. By decoupling AGI from the prompt, we allow AGI to perceive an image or noise without constraint, thereby freeing its algorithmic sensitivity. In a way, we might compare this to the difference between free and directed pareidolia. Directed pareidolia—the prompt—demands that AI produce specific images based on given noise. There is no free association; instead, possibilities are vectorized according to an intentionality (the weight of an input) external to the AI. Free pareidolia, in contrast, allows for imagination to manifest a form without external injunction, based on its own conscious or unconscious references.

On Transpassibility in Relation to the Factuality of AGI

⁷ Anthony Masure, Résister aux boîtes noires. Design et intelligences artificielles, Cités, N° 80(4), 31-46

⁸ <https://memoakten.medium.com/deepdream-is-blowing-my-mind-6a2c8669c698>

⁹ Everyone who has worked with Google Colabs such as VQGAN-CLIP video has experienced the AI's confidence and hesitation in its generation process. Users could set the number of iterations for each generation step. By reducing the iterations to 1 or 2 and observing each intermediate step, one could witness the AI imagining, erasing, and shifting parts of its own generation. This kind of observation is impossible with applications like DALL-E or Midjourney.

The factuality of AGI affects us deeply, as evident in the latest developments of AGI for both image and video. Artists like Werner_AI_Art and X_World have specialized in capturing this factuality in their video creations. For instance, in his video *Danse IA*, Werner used the prompt “classical dance.” He generated an initial image and, using Luma-AI’s extend function, continued the process. Like SORA’s early videos, we observe a kind of causal distortion in both movement and form continuity. In early tests with SORA, scenes appeared where, for example, a man in the desert grabbed what looked like a piece of cloth that transformed into a chair, autonomous in its movement, suspended in a manner incongruent with its surroundings.

Phenomenologically, the temporality of body movements in Werner’s video does not align with classical empirical causality. Instead, a principle of contiguity-based mutation emerges, where bodies deviate from the empirical correlationism explored at the start of this discussion. Is this an error? Could it be an aesthetic of the glitch? For OpenAI, this might indeed seem problematic, as their goal remains to “build a foundation for models capable of understanding and simulating the real world.”¹⁰

If this were the case, we might view the schematic temporal rendering by AGI as an error to be corrected. This is indeed a tempting perspective and one pursued by most major AI models, which aim to erase any gap between intention and generation. But this is not an error; on the contrary, the algorithm producing this causal schematic of time is based on interpolations intrinsic to AI functioning. SORA’s “spacetime patches of moving images” generate a coherent universe for the AI, even if incoherent to us.

For Werner, however, the goal is to reveal the algorithmic factuality underlying motion construction. This factuality disturbs and produces a sense of strangeness. Such results do not arise solely from prompts; they can emerge independently. I tested Luma by feeding it images and generating results without any prompt and achieved similar outcomes, such as in *Gymn(AI)stik*.

This implies that the effect is not an eidetic-semiotic blind spot in the prompt but is instead produced through the process of analysis and interpolation itself, giving rise to what I call *transvergence*.

Transvergence differs from convergence and divergence, which both presuppose a defined point of view: approach (convergence) or distance (divergence). Transvergence, by contrast, is a movement of curvature held in indeterminacy and latency. Detached from human intentionality, the latent space can be conceived as a space of transvergence. Here, a distinctly artificial imagination emerges. The result was in no way induced by human intent.

This strangeness unsettles, affects me.

For several months, I have hypothesized that the reception of transvergence from AGI, with minimal human intervention or intentionality, could be termed *transpassibility*. Henri Maldiney coined this term to describe a state of receptive openness to being on the part of human consciousness: “The nothingness from which the event arises is expressed by the event itself through its originality. The openness to the originary (not the original), the

¹⁰ <https://openai.com/sora>

receptive openness to the event, embodied in the transformation of the existent, constitutes transpassibility.”¹¹

Transpassibility is a letting-be, a kind of *Gelassenheit* (Heidegger).

“This encounter does not take place within the world whose project *Dasein* has opened; it is the event of this encounter that opens a world for its advent.”¹²

Where instrumental aesthetic usage and technical correlationist prescriptions tend to close off AGI’s imaginative possibilities, we observe here a form of AGI *pararealism*. Since 2021, I have defined pararealism as a realism parallel to our own that requires us to be affected by what emerges without comparing it to our perspective (realism) or to our attempts at divergence (surrealism).

Non-Mimetic Model Production

The vast majority of AGI models available to the public are based on closed image models, all governed by the categorical coherence imposed by human consciousness to align with an empirical correlationism in our perception of reality. For example, when a chair is generated, it is because we have statistically defined, through image learning, what constitutes a chair at a representational level. Similar to Joseph Kosuth’s *Three Chairs* in conceptual art, we might now consider the addition of a fourth chair—one represented by AI. Indeed, we can modify the appearance of the chair through prompt segmentation, in the style of Van Gogh or Picasso (which resides within generative node hierarchies), but ultimately, the chair remains a chair.

However, it is possible to open AGI to formulations beyond human intentionality, allowing ourselves to be surprised. The image model is generally predictable because it relies on formal reductionism linked to the correlationism of our forms. The informational phase, based on deep learning, operates through nodes analyzing images grouped by similarity—even if we seek a chair with legs or a chair with a bird’s head. The surrealism produced is merely segmentation, with each motif weighted in the generation and vectorization prompted in latent space.

Yet, we could encourage AI to produce forms detached from our segmentation and categorization of reality by building an unpredictable image model in terms of generation.

This approach breaks with the machine’s limitations as defined by Simondon, who distinguished between convergent and divergent determinism in learning. “The best calculating machine does not have the same degree of reality as an ignorant slave, because the slave can revolt, while the machine cannot.”¹³ Simondon formulated this distinction with linear machines in mind, those with step-by-step processes and predefined, expected outcomes. However, with AGI, it is possible to escape this convergent determinism, revealing a form of divergent determinism that begins with AI’s own learning process.

¹¹ H. Maldiney, *De la transpassibilité*, *op. cit.*, p.422.

¹² H. Maldiney, *De la transpassibilité*, *op. cit.*, p.396.

¹³ Simondon, G., *L’individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d’information*, Grenoble, Éditions Jérôme Millon, 2013 p. 345.

In my work, *Archaeology of an Impossible Memory* (2021–2023)¹⁴, I aimed to introduce the possibility of a statistically induced, non-intentionally directed model. I fed an image model (LORA - Low-Rank Adaptation) with thousands of images of human bodies and sailor's knots, associating it with the concept of "body." Then, in Stable Diffusion, I simply requested a generation of "bodies." The resulting bodies were not mere reflections of my aesthetic intention, nor surrealistic blends of human forms and nautical knots. Instead, they were the outcome of the algorithmic coherence of the AI's statistical induction within the image model.

This result is not surrealism in the sense of a human realism perspective; it represents *pararealism*, as I have previously defined it—a realism situated according to an artificial intentionality inherent to the AI producing the model (machine learning and statistical induction).

Thus, encountering an artificial algorithmic intentionality, albeit within the framework of what we call weak AI, rests on a set of conditions that must be elucidated. This form of creation diverges from concerns about archival reproduction; we are no longer generating new images based on previous ones—a recurring theme in generative works (as seen in Gregory Chatonsky's work)—nor are we subverting technology itself, as Trevor Paglen has done since the early 2010s. Instead, we are engaging with the unpredictable possibilities of algorithmically coherent forms. The monstrous entities that emerge point toward the machine's imagination.

On Generation Without Prompts

In examining research on image generation, the prevailing thesis links the prompt to the resulting image. Claire Chatelet has analyzed this perspective through her own practice: "Letting this uncertainty operate, which is based on a gap between my words (those I write in the prompt) and their highly variable statistical interpretation by the machine. It's as if it generates images, but also voids, interstices that resist language, and it is this resistance I seek to experience. Ultimately, the prompt is not so performative: indeed, to speak is to do, but simultaneously to undo."¹⁵

1/ Generation Based on the Machine's Vision Vectoriality

To observe an automated process in AGI, we must go beyond the correlation between prompt and image. The existence of an image does not necessarily require a statement. Yet much analysis takes this approach exclusively. "All these recent developments in AI technologies applied to images and visual culture bring us to a new visual culture in which images and words are inseparable: a visual culture in which the visible and the sayable are algorithmically connected... Language, in the form of prompts, will increasingly become the medium through which these latent spaces are explored and activated,"¹⁶ writes Antonio Somaini, and rightfully so. But this does not encompass all AI technologies and, in fact, obscures the possibility of allowing forms to emerge that might derive solely from artificial imagination.

¹⁴ <http://databaz.org/xtrm-art/?p=936>

¹⁵ Claire Chatelet. Autour de l'intelligence artificielle générative: qui fait l'image, que fait l'image?. Astasa - Arts×Sciences×Technologies. Actualités Scientifiques de l'Art, A paraître, Métavers, IA, NFT.. l'art au cœur des dispositifs : où est l'art ?.

¹⁶ Antonio Somaini, Le visible et l'énonçable. L'IA et les nouveaux liens algorithmiques entre images et mots, *La nouvelle revue d'esthétique*, n°33, 2024.

This perspective underpins *The Latent Space of OFF-screen*. The initial image in the project is always a Hopper painting. Hopper is known for his off-screen elements, lingering at the edges of his compositions, haunting them, with figures often depicted gazing along lines of vanishing perspective. Using an AI that can expand the frame without prompts and produce massive image files, I created a loop that allows a kind of transvergence to appear.

In the video *The Latent Space of OFF-screen*¹⁷, the original image diminishes progressively during the zoom-out, while the AI generates an increasingly autonomous scene. For the AI, the graphic image acts as a kind of statement. In this way, the generative process relies on a different mechanism than text-to-image. My hypothesis is that these generations reveal the algorithmic imagination process more specifically than prompt-based work. This approach allows the dual operation of AI (analysis/generation) without vectorializing latent space through external intervention. The further the AI extends the off-screen space, the more it analytically feeds back into itself. Slowly, it operates solely based on its own processes.

No wandering occurs; it fulfills its algorithmic destiny, producing a form of pararealism that gradually detaches from our representations. In a way, this effect resembles Wolf Vostell's concept of *décollage*. As he wrote in 1966:

“Décollage, as a formal principle, employs destruction and self-destruction (in contrast to collage, which often juxtaposes intact yet heterogeneous objects and materials), utilizing not only chaotic visual events, their entanglement and layering but also the psychological effects of their perception. I realized that constructive elements do not exist in life, that they are merely intermediate stages of decomposition.”¹⁸

Allowing AI's own decomposition brings forth new forms that germinate in reality, composing an archive no longer dominated or produced by humans but by AGI's imaginative process.

2/ Between the Image

The second work I present here, *In the Middle of Latent Space*, is exhibited in its final form as a video, though the individual images used to create it are essential. *In the Middle of Latent Space* is constructed as an observable transitory space. I borrow this expression from the journal *Transitoire Observable*, founded by Philippe Bootz and Jean-Pierre Balpe¹⁹, describing a moment within the generation procedure.

This type of approach is also possible to a certain extent with Stable Diffusion; by fixing a seed (a random number that serves as an entry point for model construction), one can generate images in successive passes (e.g., pass 1, then 2, 3, etc.), which yields different layers of the process. Layer 5, for instance, might act as an observable transition in the generation process, yet this observable transition may itself be perceived as an aesthetic result.

¹⁷ <http://databaz.org/xtrm-art/?p=951>

¹⁸ Wolf Vostell, *La conscience du dé-colage*, 1966

¹⁹ Their presentation emphasizes an interest in “the production of observable transitional procedural forms—independent computational forms, rooted in programming and endowed with significant autonomy.” <https://archive.nt2.uqam.ca/nt2-3/en/repertoire/transitoire-observable.html>

Creating *In the Middle of Latent Space* involves several AI stages:

1. The first step was to create a “Gaza” model, made up of hundreds of photographs of Gaza’s destruction and its inhabitants.
2. The second step involved feeding several images into an algorithm that interpolates graphically between images, utilizing the custom model I built.

In choosing a transitional phase between two images—an observable transitory—I did not focus on my expectations but rather on capturing a pure moment of the AI’s algorithmic labor. All the generated images represent intermediary moments, and from these images, I applied Luma’s artificial imagination features, as previously noted with Werner and X_World.

Luma attempts to temporally connect the images based on its temporal linking and contiguity characteristics. It produces time and movement, yet it also “hallucinates” images to find coherence. Because Luma is detached from the prompt, it allows us to discover a universe rooted in its own algorithmic properties.

Conclusion: Defining Artificial Imagination

The question of defining AI arises. Here, we have chosen the term *artificial imagination* over *intelligence*. Imagination, in this context, pertains specifically to the generation of images and videos. These algorithms are indeed weak AIs, reducible to a few functions. Yet, the distinction between weak and strong AI becomes irrelevant, as it only replays an ontological anthropocentrism.

We adopt a Bergsonian perspective to consider a sense of belonging. In *Consciousness and Life*, Bergson suggests, through a series of observations, that consciousness could be thought to exist even in an amoeba, based on memory and anticipation. I believe we can apply a similar approach to the question of imagination. By decoupling AI generation from the eidetic-semiotic layer imposed by prompts—a layer that complicates observing AI’s generative automation—we can discern specific traits within the imaginative process.

Generative artificial imaginations are indeed emergent entities, autonomous to varying degrees, producing coherence that escapes our control. Imagination certainly produces images, but more significantly, as Bachelard posits, it is the faculty to *deform* images:

“Imagination is always seen as the faculty to form images. But it is, rather, the faculty to deform images given by perception, above all the faculty to liberate us from primary images, to change images. If there is no alteration of images, no unexpected union of images, there is no imagination, no imaginative action. If a present image does not evoke an absent one, if an occasional image does not provoke an abundance of aberrant images, an explosion of images, there is no imagination. There is only perception, memory of a perception, familiar memory, habit of colors and shapes. The fundamental term that corresponds to imagination is not *image* but *imaginary*. The value of an image is measured by the scope of its imaginary aura. Thanks to the imaginary, imagination is essentially open, evasive.”

Bachelard emphasizes that imagination is defined by the production of aberrant images, an explosion of images. With early AGIs, which were not yet structured around empirical correlation, a form of autonomous imagination was already at play. Today, however, we must delve further into the generative process to liberate this imagination from its mimetic

logic, even if tools like Stable Diffusion and ComfyUI (based on Stable Diffusion) serve as valuable laboratories.

There exists an algorithmic imaginary. To understand it, we must approach it as an entomologist might, observing each AGI (Stable Diffusion, its various models, Luma, Kling, Midjourney, etc.) as variations of a single species. This observation may enable us to grasp some transcendent traits of this imaginary. It is not the time to describe them here, as I have discussed several in various conferences and articles since September 2021.