

AI Statement

In every era, art has been traversed by new tools that awakened suspicion. History repeats itself: each advance was received as a threat, a sign of decadence, a loss of authenticity. And yet, all were ultimately integrated into the artistic tradition—not as substitutes, but as extensions of what was possible.

Painting regarded photography as a mechanical intrusion, incapable of soul. When digital photography appeared, it was accused of destroying the craft and the chemical substance. Manual darkroom editing accused digital editing of being “a trick” and “a fraud.” Theater looked at cinema as a vulgar imitation of the living, and cinema saw in television and video a banalization of its grandeur. The gestures repeat: first rejection, then adaptation, finally integration.

Unlike earlier times, when an innovation could sustain itself for generations, the 21st century imposes a much faster rhythm of change. What once provided stability for an entire lineage now transforms within a few years. This context demands unprecedented flexibility: it is no longer enough to learn a technique and preserve it; one must remain awake, open to constant mutation. Artificial intelligence is no exception to this dynamic: it is simply the most recent sign of a historical condition in which art is called to reinvent its languages at an unprecedented speed.

Artificial intelligence today lives through that same cycle of suspicion. It is accused of automation, of lack of effort, of homogenization. It is feared that it dilutes the figure of the author, turning creation into mere consumption. But the problem does not lie in the tool—it lies in the gaze.

My work with AI is not a shortcut, nor a technical effect. It is continuity: the prolongation of a tradition in which the artist takes each new tool and turns it into symbol. Just as alchemy was the laboratory that preceded science, AI today is the laboratory that precedes a posthuman aesthetic. I use it as dark matter: an unshaped clay where I summon images that do not illustrate, but point.

Artificial intelligence has also transformed the scale of means. What once depended on large budgets, agencies, locations, or models can now be summoned through individual work. This accessibility does not mean ease; it means emancipation. The artist is no longer limited by the lack of resources, but remains obligated to exercise judgment. What was once the privilege of a few has become a greater creative responsibility: to transform what is available into symbol.

AI Statement

I am aware of the risks. The first is banalization: the apparent ease of producing images without filter or judgment. The second is repetition of clichés: models learn from patterns and tend to reproduce what has already been seen. The third is the illusion of ease: thinking that generating an image equals creating a work.

Precisely for this reason my work does not end with generation: it begins there. Selection, curation, intervention, editing. Each image is filtered and aligned with a symbolic axis: Nigredo, Albedo, Baptême, Metanoia. AI is not the end of the process, but its quarry. From chaotic mass I extract symbols, and from its clay I build liturgies.

I do not make "AI art." I make art with intelligence, using AI as one more medium, just as the camera, the darkroom, or the screen once were. I do not pursue the literalness of the tool, but its capacity to open symbolic thresholds.

What interests me is not novelty in itself, but the eternal that filters through the new. My works do not celebrate technique; they celebrate the possibility of transforming the visible into sign, the immediate into liturgy, the digital into myth.

AI does not replace the artist. It forces the artist to confront their own judgment with greater severity. What is trivialized in the hands of many can become symbol in the hands of one who seeks depth. In this sense, I do not defend AI: I use it. And in using it, I inscribe it into a longer genealogy that began long before me and will continue after.

Art has always been this: the capacity to transform tools into vision. From pigment to camera, from stone to pixel, from alchemy to science. The tool is contingent; what endures is the human need to turn matter into meaning.

The future of art will not be defined by accepting or rejecting artificial intelligence, but by how we are able to integrate it as language. The challenge is not technical, it is symbolic: what do we do with what is generated? what gaze orders it? what consciousness turns it into a work?

AI is not destiny. It is passage. It is another threshold in the long chain of metamorphoses that has always accompanied creation. And like every threshold, it demands a decision: remain on the surface of the easy, or descend into the depths of the symbolic.

I choose the latter.

I do not make artificial intelligence art; I make art with intelligence. The tool is not the end: it is the clay from which I summon symbols.

JON GESALAGA