

DISECNO

IX/01

journal of design culture
Homogenised Heritage:
AI and Central Europe



***HOMOGENISED
HERITAGE: AI AND
CENTRAL EUROPE***

***THE IMPACT OF AI ON LOW-
RESOURCE LANGUAGES AND
VISUAL CULTURES IN THE
VISEGRAD COUNTRIES***

Disegno

JOURNAL OF DESIGN CULTURE

Double-blind peer-reviewed, open access scholarly journal

Editorial Board: VICTOR MARGOLIN, PROFESSOR EMERITUS: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS (1941–2019)

Roy Brand, Associate Professor: Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Jerusalem

Loredana Di Lucchio, Professor: Sapienza University of Rome

Jessica Hemmings, Professor: University of Gothenburg

Lorenzo Imbesi, Professor: Sapienza University of Rome

Ágnes Kapitány, Professor Emerita: MOME Budapest

Gábor Kapitány, Honorary Professor: MOME Budapest

Viktor Malakuczi, Research Fellow: Sapienza University of Rome

György Endre Szőnyi, Professor: University of Szeged; Visiting Professor: CEU

Editors: Zsolt Gyenge, Olivér Horváth, Márton Szentpéteri;

Péter Wunderlich (Project Manager). Founding Editor: Heni Fiáth (2014–2018).

Guest Editor: Brigitta Iványi-Bitter

Graphic Design: Borka Skrapits

Cover Design: Zsófia Kéry, Éva Szabó

Copy Editing: William Potter

Aims and Scope

Disegno publishes original research papers, essays, and reviews on all aspects of design cultures. We understand the notion of design culture as resolutely broad: our aim is to freely discuss the designed environment as mutually intertwined strands of sociocultural products, practices, and discourses. This attitude traverses the disciplinary boundaries between art, design, and visual culture and is therefore open to all themes related to sociocultural creativity and innovation. Our post-disciplinary endeavour welcomes intellectual contributions from all members of different design cultures. Besides providing a lively platform for debating issues of design culture, our specific aim is to consolidate and enhance the emerging field of design culture studies in the Central European academia by providing criticism of fundamental biases and misleading cultural imprinting with respect to the field of design.

All research papers published in *Disegno* undergo a rigorous double-blind peer review process.

This journal does not charge APCs or submission charges.

Contact: Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design

H-1121 Budapest, Zugligeti út 9–25.

disegno@mome.hu

The full content of *Disegno* can be accessed online: disegno.mome.hu

Published by: Csaba Kovács

Publisher: Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design, 1121 Budapest, Zugligeti út 9-25.

ISSN: 2064-7778 (print) **ISSN:** 2416-156X (online)

Creative Commons Licence

This work is licenced under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Contents

introduction

- 004** Brigitta Iványi-Bitter: *Visibility under AI Mediation*

research papers

- 008** Ania Malinowska: *AI Assimilationism: The Cultural Flattening of Localities in Generative Models*
- 026** Michał Krzykowski: *Beyond Computational Illusion: Futures Worth Wanting for Artistic Practices and Technical Cultures*
- 040** Brigitta Iványi-Bitter, Tibor Bacsi, and Szilárd Szakács: *Epistemic Cultural Flattening in Generative Visual AI: Benchmarking Hungarian Heritage and Designing a V4 Path Toward Culturally Aware Text-to-Video*
- 068** Kateřina Marková: *Against Collective Vulnerability: Understanding Cultural Alignment in LLMs (Not Only) in Central Europe and Calling Design Research to Help*
- 090** Anna Keszeg: *The Paprika-Effect. Central and Eastern Europe as a Noisy Label in AI-Generated Images*
- 108** Jiří Philippe Janda: *North Bohemia as a Low-Resource Visual Context: Everyday Heritage, Uneven Visibility, and Synthetic Aesthetics*
- 132** David Kořínek: *The Liminality of Generative Creation: The Artistic Process Between Intuition and Algorithm*
- 148** Albín Kuchta & Alžbeta Kuchtová: *Virtual Spaces: Tools of Poetic Resistance or Censorship Devices?*
- 168** ***about the authors***

THE LIMINALITY OF GENERATIVE CREATION: THE ARTISTIC PROCESS BETWEEN INTUITION AND ALGORITHM

David Kořínek

ABSTRACT

*This study theorises artistic collaboration with generative artificial intelligence through the concept of generative liminality, understood as a transitional and unstable zone in which human intention, cultural memory, and algorithmic inference enter into negotiation. Grounded in a case study of Rafani's exhibition *Everyone Has the Right to Everything* (Gallery 8smička, 2025), the analysis examines how AI-assisted creation operates within a small-language, post-socialist context shaped by ideological ambivalence, satire, and distrust of universalist promises. Developed in Czech and structured around locally specific political references, the project exposed the frictions that emerge when globally trained AI models engage regional realities. Rather than functioning as neutral tools, these systems selectively translate, flatten, and recompose local imaginaries, design vocabularies, and rhetorical forms. Such distortions are approached here not simply as technical limitations, but as epistemic symptoms of the asymmetries embedded in contemporary generative infrastructures. A central component of the exhibition was an AI-generated audiovisual layer. Four satirical short films, styled as "Pixar-like" animations, presented a tardigrade interviewing four "successful" Czech women, while three additional videos featured fictional male influencers performing polarised monologues on migration, left politics, and the pre-election climate. Produced entirely through AI-based image, animation, voice, sound, and script generation, these works mobilised speculative fiction as a mode of cultural diagnosis. The chapter argues that generative systems participate in the reconfiguration of political and cultural representation, reshaping not only aesthetic production but also the conditions under which locality becomes legible.*

#artistic collaboration; #generative liminality; #post-socialist visual culture; #locality and representation

https://doi.org/10.21096/disegno_2025_1dk

POSITION OF THE AUTHOR AND THE CONCEPT OF LIMINALITY

This chapter is a reflection on my own artistic practice, specifically the practice of the Czech artist collective Rafani, of which I am a member. It does not take the form of an external analysis or a distanced theoretical commentary; rather, it seeks to articulate the experience of making work “from within” at a moment when the artistic process has been fundamentally transformed by the introduction of artificial intelligence (AI), specifically generative AI systems. The text is grounded in the preparation and realisation of the exhibition *Everyone Has the Right to Everything*, presented at the Czech gallery 8smička in 2025, and traces how collaboration with AI gradually became a structuring element of artistic thinking as a whole, rather than a merely technical tool.

The central question addressed here is not whether AI can create, but how the very nature of artistic practice changes once AI becomes an active partner in processes of thinking, decision-making, and the articulation of meaning. Artistic practice is therefore not understood as the execution of an authorial intention, but as a field of negotiation between human intuition, collective experience, and algorithmic operations whose internal logic remains only partially controllable. This shift calls for conceptual tools capable of naming a state of “in-betweenness”—between intention and outcome, control and contingency, human and non-human agency.

To describe this condition, I propose the concept of the liminality of generative practice. This notion draws on the anthropological understanding of liminality as a transitional phase in which established roles dissolve without being immediately replaced by new ones (Turner 1969). In collaboration with AI, authorship is not erased but destabilised; decision-making becomes shared, albeit asymmetrically; and outcomes are simultaneously intentional and unforeseen. Liminality here is not a temporary problem to be resolved, but a productive tension that becomes the very material of artistic practice.

The text is consistently anchored in Czech linguistic, cultural, and political contexts. Both the exhibition and the broader process of working with AI emerged within an environment shaped by post-socialist experience and by an ambivalent relationship to notions of collectivity, automation, and ownership. Working with generative AI systems trained predominantly on English-language datasets did not result in a universalising aesthetic;

on the contrary, it intensified the friction between global algorithmic structures and local meanings. These tensions—linguistic, political, and visual—became a key material of both the exhibition and the present text.

The following sections focus on specific situations, decisions, and failures in which collaboration with AI proved decisive. They trace how generative AI systems entered into the formation of the exhibition's conceptual framework, its internal structure, and its explicitly political content. Collaboration with AI is thus understood not as a technological innovation, but as an intervention into the very logic of artistic thinking.

This paper argues that the liminality of generative practice is not merely a descriptive condition, but a methodological framework through which artistic meaning emerges as a negotiated process between human intuition, collective authorship, and algorithmic operations. In the context of small-language environments shaped by post-socialist experience, this liminality becomes particularly visible, as generative AI systems both reproduce and destabilise locally embedded forms of political and cultural expression. The paper therefore demonstrates how generative liminality functions not only as a conceptual lens, but as a concrete working condition that reshapes the production, interpretation, and circulation of artistic meaning.

Methodologically, the paper adopts a practice-based case study approach combined with elements of autoethnographic reflection. The primary material consists of the development and realisation of the exhibition *Everyone Has the Right to Everything*, including AI-generated scripts, visual outputs, installation strategies, and curatorial decisions. These materials are treated as situated data rather than neutral artifacts, understood through the author's direct involvement in their production. The analysis focuses on selected and documented moments where tensions between intention and output, local specificity and global patterning, or control and unpredictability become particularly visible. Rather than aiming at systematic generalisation, the paper proposes a situated analytical perspective in which interpretation emerges through close reading of representative examples within a broader conceptual framework. Recent discussions on AI and artistic practice provide a broader context for this approach (Zylinska 2020; Crawford, 2021).

GENESIS: FULLY AUTOMATED SOCIALISM AND CZECH AMBIVALENCE

The genesis of the exhibition *Everyone Has the Right to Everything* emerged from Rafani's long-term engagement with political language, institutional imagination, and the ways in which society relates to concepts of equality, labour, and the distribution of resources. The initial impulse was a question: whether it is still possible today to think about future forms of social organisation without allowing AI to enter that thinking—not as an external tool, but as a structural condition of thought itself. It became clear that any attempt to imagine a future that ignores AI is necessarily anachronistic and politically disingenuous.

From this realisation the framework of fully automated socialism gradually took shape as a working concept for the exhibition. This was neither a programmatic proposal nor a political utopia in the traditional sense, but rather a speculative field in which it was possible to test the consequences of radical automation of labour, decision-making, and the governance of shared resources. The framework consciously engaged with the debate opened by Aaron Bastani's book *Fully Automated Luxury Communism*, which links technological accelerationism with a leftist critique of capitalism. While Bastani's concept operates with a vision of abundance enabled by technological progress, the exhibition focused instead on the tension between such a vision and the concrete historical and cultural experiences of the post-socialist context.

It was precisely here that the ambivalence of the entire project became apparent. As soon as the utopian premise began to be concretised—in the form of scenarios, visual proposals, linguistic formulations, or institutional models—elements of contemporary dystopia inevitably surfaced. Automation revealed itself not only as a promise of liberation from labour, but also as a mechanism of control; collective ownership merged with abstract forms of administration lacking an accountable subject; and the language of equality easily slipped into empty rhetoric. This shift was not understood as a failure of the original vision, but rather as its exposure.

Within this context, collaboration with generative AI systems proved to be crucial. AI was not invited in order to “illustrate” the future, but because it itself embodies one of the future's most fundamental conditions. It was precisely through working with algorithmic models that it became evident that future-oriented imagination is not a neutral projection of desires, but a contested field in which historical experience, technological structures, and political fantasies intersect—often in contradictory and mutually destabilising configurations.

In the Czech context, socialist imagination is inevitably burdened by ambivalence. Concepts such as collectivity, common ownership, or equality are not merely political categories, but carry a strong historical imprint of state socialism, its institutions, its linguistic clichés, and everyday experiences of their exhaustion. Any attempt at their contemporary reactivation thus treads a thin line between nostalgic gesture, ideological provocation, and ironic distance. Czech cultural tradition tends to respond to this burden not through direct identification, but through satire, absurd humour, and strategies of ridicule that make it possible to work with these concepts without unambiguously committing to them.

Irony therefore did not function as a mere aesthetic filter, but as a necessary method for the survival of political imagination itself. It made it possible to maintain a critical distance from utopian promises without abandoning the effort to test them. In this sense, socialist imagination did not appear as a return to the past in the exhibition, but as a problematic and continuously contested experiment—one whose aim was not to offer solutions, but to expose the tensions between ideology, technology, and artistic practice.

PRODUCTIVE FAILURE: LANGUAGE WITHOUT MEMORY

The first significant turning point in working with AI occurred when we began to use it to formulate the exhibition's basic textual layers—slogans, short programmatic statements, and descriptions of individual parts of the installation. While concepts such as equality, collective ownership, or the right to everything were for us heavily burdened by historical experience and the necessity of critical distance, the generative AI system approached them with striking literalness. The language produced by AI was smooth, self-assured, and normative; it operated as if socialist imagination were not a historically problematic field, but an open and universal project still awaiting realisation. It was precisely this absence of local memory that proved decisive.

What initially appeared as a “wrong” interpretation of the Czech context gradually became a productive moment of the entire process. AI-generated texts were almost uncomfortable within the local environment: they sounded too serious, too direct, too convinced of their own validity. Where we, as authors, would instinctively seek refuge in irony, exaggeration, or linguistic displacement, AI offered statements without a safety net. Rather than rejecting these outputs, we deliberately chose to leave them in tension with local modes of reading. Language thus became a site of confrontation between a global algorithmic discourse and a post-socialist experience that approaches similar formulations with persistent suspicion.

Similar failures recurred in later phases of the project. AI tended to unify political positions, simplify conflicts, and smooth over antagonisms that are fundamental in the Czech context. In its proposals, different layers of leftist, liberal, and conservative rhetoric often merged into a single voice that was unmistakably political yet culturally unanchored. In this very process, however, the algorithmic logic became visible—one that operates with probability rather than memory, and with dominant patterns rather than local experience.

These moments of imprecision were not understood as technical errors to be corrected, but as symptoms of a broader imbalance between global data structures and regional meanings. Within the exhibition, productive misreading thus became a method: a way of revealing what is lost in the algorithmic translation of Czech political and cultural contexts, and what, conversely, becomes unexpectedly sharpened. It was precisely within these fissures that the project's specific aesthetic and political logic began to take shape.

NO ONE HAS THE RIGHT TO ANYTHING: SOCIAL IMAGES AND THE TEMPORAL TRACE OF AI

This logic of *productive misreading* became particularly visible in a series of five short videos provisionally titled *No One Has the Right to Anything*, which were incorporated into the exhibition as a counterpoint to the utopian framework of fully automated socialism. While the exhibition's central

concept operated with the idea of universal entitlement and collective distribution, these videos focused on the opposite pole—images of social insecurity, inequality, and exclusion. They did not take the form of documentary records of specific situations, but rather AI-generated visual fictions that borrowed the language of a global social imagination and applied it to locally legible themes.

The visual form of the videos is crucial in this respect. The imagery includes children carrying plastic bags through landscapes marked by extractive industry and energy infrastructure; family dinners frozen in

DISEGNO_IX/01_HOMOGENISED HERITAGE: AI AND CENTRAL EUROPE



FIGURE 1. *No One Has the Right to Anything 2, 2024, AI-generated video, still frame*



FIGURE 2. *No One Has the Right to Anything 4, 2024, AI-generated video, still frame*



FIGURE 3. *No One Has the Right to Anything 5, 2024, AI-generated video, still frame*

oppressive silence; improvised piles of luggage at a bus stop somewhere on the periphery; or futuristically stylised urban environments filled with advertising panels devoid of clear messages. These images feel familiar, yet strangely detached. They do not refer to any specific Czech event or location, and yet they activate strong local associations—experiences of debt enforcement, social downward mobility, escapism, and the invisible boundaries structuring society.

An important aspect of this series is its temporal trace. The videos were produced earlier than the other AI-generated components of the exhibition, a fact that is visible both aesthetically and technically. Here, AI operates with a lower image quality, less sophisticated compositions, and more pronounced stereotypes. This apparent “outdatedness”, however, proved meaningful. Rather than attempting to update or correct these images, we chose to retain this layer as a trace of a particular stage in the technology’s development. In this respect, AI thus does not function as a smooth generator of the present, but rather as an archive of global imaginaries of poverty, family, and crisis—imaginaries that are universal and, at the same time, imprecise.

Within the Czech context, the videos therefore function as a peculiar mirror. They do not depict “Czech reality” in any direct sense, but instead reveal how that reality can be algorithmically substituted by a generic image of social failure. It is precisely in this substitution that the asymmetry between global data structures and local experience becomes apparent. The title *No One Has the Right to Anything* does not designate a political program, but a condition in which the language of entitlement collapses and leaves behind only the image—powerful, affective, yet semantically unstable. The series thus does not illustrate social critique, but rather simulates it algorithmically, exposing how easily local social questions dissolve into global visual cliché.

THE TARDIGRADE: SATIRE, DIY RATIONALITY, AND LOCAL FORMS OF REASONING

It was precisely the experience with this series that led to a decision to change the strategy of working with AI and to move away from a melancholic, globalised imagination of social crisis toward a more explicitly satirical and narrative mode. While the videos *No One Has the Right to Anything* demonstrated how easily generative systems reproduce generalised images of poverty and exclusion without clear cultural anchoring, the next part of the exhibition attempted to deliberately invert this tendency. The result was a series of four short AI-generated films in which the central figure is a tardigrade—a microscopic organism known for its extreme resilience and its ability to survive conditions that are destructive to most other forms of life.

Here, the tardigrade functions as a paradoxical figure. On the one hand, it is a being outside the human world, almost abstract; on the other, it is endowed with a voice, a personality, and the role of a talk-show

host. In the individual films, it conducts interviews with four “successful” Czech women whose statements address work, self-realisation, care, and social recognition. All components of these films—image, animation, script, voice, and sound—were generated using AI, combining language models such as ChatGPT with image- and video-generation tools such as Kling AI, while the visual style deliberately references the aesthetics of global entertainment production, particularly the smooth, emotionally charged “Pixar-like” animation.

DISEGN_IX/01_HOMOGENISED HERITAGE: AI AND CENTRAL EUROPE



FIGURE 4. *Tardigrade02 Tardigrade Interviews (The Entrepreneur), 2025, AI-generated animated video, still frame*



FIGURE 5. *Tardigrade03 Tardigrade Interviews (The Writer), 2025, AI-generated animated video, still frame*



FIGURE 6. *Tardigrade04 Tardigrade Interviews (The Teenager), 2025, AI-generated animated video, still frame*

Unlike the previous series, AI here does not operate as a generator of anonymous social melancholy, but as a tool that amplifies irony and the ambivalence of the Czech context. The tardigrade, the ultimate survivor, is juxtaposed with human narratives of success that reveal themselves to be fragile, conditional, and often internally contradictory. Satire does not function here as a mockery of individual figures, but as a means of disrupting the apparent self-evidence of dominant narratives of performance, equality, and happiness. While in *No One Has the Right to Anything* local meanings dissolved into global visual cliché, the tardigrade made it possible to re-anchor these meanings—not through realism, but through an absurd displacement.

This contrast reveals two distinct modes of collaboration with AI. In the first, AI exposes its tendency toward universalisation and the flattening of difference; in the second, it becomes a collaborator in an ironic construction that consciously works with these tendencies. Both strategies belong to the same liminal zone between human intention and algorithmic logic, yet each demonstrates a different way of inhabiting this zone—either as a site of alienation or as a space of critical deviation.

The shift in strategy represented by the series of interviews conducted by the tardigrade was especially evident on the level of language. Unlike *No One Has the Right to Anything*, where the image and a general social atmosphere dominated, the focus here moved toward dialogue and the modelling of specific voices. The scripts of all interviews were generated using the language model ChatGPT and subsequently only minimally edited. This fact was not concealed, but explicitly acknowledged as part of the methodology: the aim was not to achieve authentic realism, but to expose the algorithmic simulation of local discourse to its own limits.

The language of these scripts operates with a range of distinctly Czech specificities without ever referring to a single concrete story or individual. Recurring motifs of modest self-realisation, improvisation, and “somehow making it work” are historically associated in the Czech context with life outside large institutional frameworks. The figure of a podcaster repairing household appliances activates the tradition of Czech *kutilství*—a Czech form of DIY rationality shaped by post-socialist conditions—a practice that functioned as a survival strategy under state socialism in conditions of scarcity and that, after 1989, transformed into a cultural gesture of self-reliance and adaptation. Here, *kutilství* does not operate as a nostalgic reference, but as a mode of reasoning: problems are not addressed systemically, but through improvised, individual solutions, often accompanied by ironic distance.

A similar logic appears in the other figures. A writer dependent on grants and crowdfunding, an entrepreneur combining the language of sustainability with neoliberal rhetoric of success, or a teenager oscillating between climate anxiety and algorithmic fatalism all represent figures that are easily recognisable in the Czech environment precisely because of their ordinariness. These are not extreme caricatures, but normalised ways of coping with uncertainty, institutional fragmentation, and the

absence of long-term visions. ChatGPT reproduces a discourse in which structural problems are translated into individual strategies—fix it, manage it, adapt to it.

In this context, *kutilství* becomes a surprising bridge between local experience and algorithmic reasoning. The generative model operates in a similar way: it does not address causes, but searches for functional combinations; it has no memory of crisis, but simulates its management. What emerged in human experience as a culturally specific survival strategy appears in AI as a purely operational logic. The tardigrade, as a non-human moderator, renders these parallels visible by positioning itself outside human categories of work, success, and failure—and precisely through this displacement allows Czech “DIY rationality” to appear in the algorithmic mirror as a historically conditioned, rather than natural, mode of thinking.

INFLUENCERS: ALGORITHMIC CERTAINTY AND CZECH MEDIA DISCOURSE

The third distinct configuration of collaboration with AI within the exhibition took the form of a series of three videos featuring fictional male influencers. As in the case of the interviews conducted by the tardigrade, the scripts were fully generated by the language model ChatGPT on the basis of very brief and deliberately open prompts. No specific political positions, names, or local references were introduced during the prompting process; the Czech context emerged instead as a result of the model’s probabilistic operations themselves. A key decision was to cast professional actors in these roles and to insist that they adhere strictly to the scripts without any improvisation. The language generated by AI was thus neither corrected nor “humanised,” but transferred into a performative register in an almost unchanged form.

At first glance, the resulting monologues appear exaggerated, yet their rhetorical structure is immediately recognisable within the Czech media environment. AI generates a language that repeatedly declares itself to be rational and non-ideological (“I’m calm, rational, a decent person”), while simultaneously producing a chain of simplifications and paranoid associations. A characteristic feature is the rapid shifting between themes in which migration, the political left, technology, and everyday infrastructure are collapsed into a single affective field: “illegal migration... crossing borders, fences, walls, seas, space, parallel dimensions—absolutely everything!” or “BENCHES ARE PART OF THE PLAN.” These statements do not function as imported extremism, but as intensified versions of rhetorical figures commonly circulating in Czech online debates and commentary formats.

It is particularly telling that AI repeatedly mobilises motifs of small, seemingly banal objects and situations—benches, parking spaces, butter in the supermarket—which in Czech discourse often serve as carriers of political frustration precisely because they translate structural problems



FIGURE 7. *influencers01*
Brainrot #1, 2025, AI-
generated script performed by
an actor, video installation,
exhibition view

FIGURE 8. *influencers02*
Brainrot #2, 2025, AI-
generated script performed by
an actor, video installation,
exhibition view

FIGURE 9. *influencers03*
Brainrot #3, 2025, AI-
generated script performed by
an actor, video installation,
exhibition view

into everyday experience. Similarly, the fictional “main news” segments merge global conflicts with cynical media routine: “everyone choose your villain, we’ll give you two versions of reality,” or “we’re broadcasting the same footage of tanks because we don’t have any new ones.” Here, AI simulates with surprising accuracy Czech scepticism towards the media—a distance that easily turns into resignation.

In contrast to earlier sections of the exhibition, irony here gives way to an overt affirmation of “truth”. While the tardigrade enabled ambivalence and distance, the influencers represent a moment in which language attempts to reclaim authority through certainty, volume, and speed. Statements such as “ELECTIONS ARE OVER” or “politics is no longer politics but a reality show with nuclear codes” sound absurd, yet at the same time uncannily familiar. This double register is crucial: AI does not reproduce a marginal discourse, but rather condenses linguistic patterns that already exist within the Czech context, albeit usually in more dispersed and less visible forms.

A closer look at a specific example helps to clarify this dynamic. The statement “politics is no longer politics but a reality show with nuclear codes” operates on several levels simultaneously. Linguistically, it adopts the structure of a simplified, emotionally charged claim typical of online commentary, while introducing an exaggerated metaphor that oscillates between irony and genuine alarm. In a Czech context, such a formulation resonates with a broader scepticism toward institutional politics and media representation, yet its articulation in English introduces a degree of abstraction and global recognisability. At the same time, when translated into a visual or performative register, the statement shifts again: what appears as ironic exaggeration in language can become disturbingly plausible when embodied by a human performer or visualised through AI-generated imagery. This layered instability—between languages, media, and cultural registers—demonstrates how generative

AI does not simply reproduce discourse, but reconfigures its conditions of intelligibility.

Within the exhibition as a whole, the influencers thus constitute its sharpest political moment. They demonstrate how easily locally recognisable rhetorical figures can be algorithmically generated and amplified without any understanding of their historical or social background. The decision to prohibit improvisation further intensifies this effect: the language remains closed, impermeable, and uncorrected. It is precisely here that the liminality of generative practice approaches a point of collapse—the space between intuition and algorithm turns into a field in which language no longer negotiates but asserts, and in which Czech political reality appears not as representation, but as an algorithmically accelerated symptom.

ALGORITHMIC CULTURAL MEMORY OF SMALL LANGUAGES

A fundamental question nevertheless remains: where does this knowledge of Czech realities, media language, and influencer rhetoric come from in a generative model? It is not based on understanding in the human sense but rather an accumulation of traces—fragments of texts, comments, video transcripts, subtitles, discussions, and media outputs that, over time, have been deemed sufficiently representative to become part of training datasets. AI “knows” Czech discourse insofar as it can statistically reconstruct it as a probable speech situation.

This fact is both unsettling and revealing. It suggests that local political and media culture has already become sufficiently digitised, repeated, and formalised that it is legible to a global model. Influencer rhetoric, conspiratorial shortcuts, or ironic cynicism are not generated “from the outside,” but return as a compressed image of what has long been circulating within online space. Here, AI does not demonstrate its intelligence but rather our collective discursive inertia.

In this sense, generative models can be understood as a peculiar form of algorithmic cultural memory (Bender et al. 2021; Crawford 2021). This is not memory grounded in experience, continuity, or interpretation, but a statistical memory in which past utterances are preserved as probable patterns. Cultural memory here is not defined by what is remembered but by what is repeatable. What appears frequently enough in language and images stands a chance of being algorithmically reconstructed; what is marginal, locally specific, or difficult to formalise tends to disappear.

The algorithmisation of cultural memory has profound consequences for small linguistic and cultural spaces. Czech discourse is “represented” in this process, it is reduced: its internal contradictions, historical layers, and contextual nuances are translated into a set of repeatable gestures, tones, and clichés. What appears in generated texts as precise knowledge of local realities is, in fact, their compression. Memory here does not function as a carrier of meaning but as a mechanism of selection.

At the same time, this process makes visible which elements of cultural memory are most stable within the digital environment. Influencer rhetoric, ironic cynicism, conspiratorial shortcuts, or the language of “common sense” survive the algorithmic filter precisely because they are continuously reproduced and easily transferable. Generative AI thus does not operate as an archive of the forgotten, but as an amplifier of what has already become dominant. In this sense, algorithmic memory does not threaten culture from the outside; instead, it exposes its own repeatable structures—and forces us to ask what, if anything, within local experience is still capable of escaping translation into data and resisting global levelling.

CONCLUSION: LIMINALITY AS METHOD

The experience of collaborating with generative AI systems for the exhibition *Everyone Has the Right to Everything* demonstrates that the liminality of generative practice is not merely a theoretical concept but a concrete working condition. It does not describe a transition from human to “machine” creativity, nor the replacement of authorship by an algorithm, but rather a persistent state of unresolved negotiation. AI does not appear here as a tool that could be fully mastered, nor as an autonomous author, but as an actor that disrupts established hierarchies of decision-making, meaning, and responsibility.

What distinguishes this situation from earlier understandings of art as a space of negotiation is precisely the presence of algorithmic agents that actively participate in shaping the terms of this negotiation. While art has always mediated relationships between cultural, social, and political forces, generative AI introduces a new layer in which these relationships are pre-structured by probabilistic models trained on globally dominant datasets. In small-language contexts, this results in a specific asymmetry: local meanings are not simply expressed, but filtered, compressed, and rearticulated through systems that are not grounded in their historical or linguistic specificity. The role of art thus shifts from representing or critiquing reality to actively exposing and inhabiting this condition of mediated negotiation.

It is precisely within the Czech—and more broadly Central European—context that this liminality becomes particularly pronounced. Small-language environments, marked by historical discontinuities and an ambivalent relationship to ideological narratives, enter into collaboration with global generative systems from an inherently unequal position. AI does not introduce a “universal” future but instead amplifies the tension between local experience and algorithmically preferred forms of language, imagery, and political imagination. What presents itself as technological progress thus simultaneously becomes a test of cultural memory and its capacity to resist compression.

From the perspective of Rafani’s artistic practice, working with AI did not emerge as a path toward efficiency or innovation in a technical

sense, but as a method that makes these tensions visible and sustains them. Liminality here is not a condition to be overcome, but a space in which it becomes possible to critically engage with what is lost, distorted, or, conversely, unexpectedly sharpened in algorithmic translation. In this sense, generative practice does not represent a closed model of the future, but an open field in which the relationship between technology, politics, and local experience is continuously renegotiated—and in which art can function as the site of this negotiation, rather than its illustration. Accordingly, the question is not so much whether this future will be social, socialist, or post-capitalist, but how it will be negotiated within the shifting relations between human and algorithmic agency.

REFERENCES

Bender, Emily M., Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Schmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. "On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: The Question of Whether Language Models Can Become Excessively Large is a Salient One." Paper presented at the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency.

Crawford, Kate. 2021. *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Groys, Boris. 2008. *Art Power*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Turner, Victor. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Aldine.

Zylinska, Joanna. 2020. *AI Art: Machine Visions and Warped Dreams*. London: Open Humanities Press.

