

The Governance of Beauty: Access to Visual Art Encounters under Generative AI

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

Generative AI raises a conditional question about the political economy of visual art: when producing some representations becomes easier, which conditions continue to govern access to meaningful encounters, and who can benefit from controlling them? This paper distinguishes aesthetic significance, judgment, symbolic articulation, institutional attribution and economic returns. It develops the retained proposal that value can depend on historically formed relations whose contributors and controllers differ. Established work on aesthetic experience, social formation of taste, commercial experience and practical access supplies the philosophical context. Bounded empirical studies inform the research question while leaving a general migration of economic returns open. A small presentation-capacity model shows how an increase in eligible images can make a fixed downstream capacity binding; its assumptions and counterexample separate that result from claims about beauty, market power or profit. The paper then considers historically formed susceptibility, personalization and the evidence required to connect them. A separate normative argument examines the maintenance of shared conditions, fair terms and participant revision. Hypothetical cases include a remembered sunset, controlled access, a revenue-supported venue and an open digital initiative. Fees, generated imagery and curation each permit enabling and restrictive arrangements. The contribution is a scoped method for investigating changes in encounter conditions, with empirical causation, normative allocation and conceptual priority left open.

Keywords: aesthetic encounters; generative AI; visual art; access governance; capitalization; shared cultural conditions

Research Purpose and Scope

This note states the purpose of circulation, the status of the argument, and the role of research assistance. The paper presents current insights for criticism and wider discussion in public and scholarly settings. It makes no claim to conceptual priority. Similar concepts and arguments may already exist in other disciplines, languages, and intellectual traditions; further comparison may alter the terminology, scope, or contribution.

Definitions organize a bounded inquiry. Conditional formal results carry their stated assumptions, and illustrative cases support conceptual analysis. Empirical validation, wider applicability, and the adequacy of proposed normative premises remain open where the main text identifies those obligations. Relational analysis supplies a method of investigation while stronger ontological questions remain suspended.

AI assistance contributed to source discovery and pre-use verification, argumentative development, formal checking, organization, and drafting. The accompanying project records distinguish retained research insights, newly proposed analysis, and verified literature. The manuscript is prepared for the author's review; circulation and submission decisions remain with the author. Critical responses concerning antecedents, assumptions, counterexamples, and alternative formulations are welcome.

DRAFT

1 Introduction

This paper examines the governance of access to visual-art encounters in settings involving generative AI. Its objective is to distinguish changes in representation production from changes in attention, institutional authority, participation and economic returns. The discussion combines philosophical comparison, a limited capacity model and hypothetical institutional cases. It develops a conditional research programme whose empirical and normative premises remain explicit.

An image can circulate widely while a particular encounter with it remains difficult to obtain. The obstacle could concern discovery, an intelligible presentation, time, access to a venue, a relevant historical connection or a trusted account of provenance. These conditions differ in kind. Some can be expanded through technology; others depend on institutions, people or a participant's history. An increase in the number of available images therefore opens several possible trajectories. It can expand opportunities, alter the value of curation, intensify competition for attention or leave an established access arrangement largely unchanged.

The contemporary hypothesis considered here concerns a particular sequence. Where generative AI increases the supply of eligible representations or reduces a relevant production burden, an existing constraint on their presentation or use may become more consequential. An actor controlling that condition may then gain a different opportunity to organize access or obtain returns. Each transition requires evidence. Higher presentation prices and a transfer of income to an intermediary require evidence beyond a larger supply of images. Demand, alternatives, institutional rules and the distribution of costs remain additional conditions.

The philosophical problem concerns the relation between aesthetic significance and the arrangements through which it becomes available. A work can matter through visual qualities, acquired competence, personal memory, a practice of interpretation or a particular occasion. These relations can contribute differently to an encounter. The person who controls a venue or distribution channel may contribute to the experience while also depending on work, histories and shared resources supplied by others. Identifying those relations can clarify the conditions of value and the powers surrounding it. Their moral assessment requires a further argument.

The paper retains *the governance of beauty* as the name of this inquiry. Beauty functions as an important example within a wider field of aesthetic significance. The argument accommodates experiences of difficulty, disturbance and reflection alongside pleasure. A complete criterion of beauty and a universal account of aesthetic judgment remain wider philosophical questions. Its narrower contribution is a method for tracing how an encounter becomes articulated, attributed, circulated and connected to later control over its conditions.

This contribution has substantial antecedents. Aesthetic and sociological work already addresses experience and historically formed appreciation. Commercial organization of experience predates generative AI, and access theory already distinguishes practical benefit from formal property rights. Research on psychologically tailored communication also precedes the proposed extension concerning susceptibility. The present analysis must therefore earn its value through a clearer mechanism, a useful distinction or a better specified empirical question. Relational terminology alone supplies little differentiation.

The paper proceeds from encounter definitions and antecedents to codification, access and capitalization. It then separates the AI-related hypothesis into evidential steps and uses a small model to expose one possible constraint change. Later sections examine personalization, normative assessment, institutional countercases and open research questions. Visual art circulation provides the principal domain; a remembered sunset serves as a preliminary example of historical significance. All constructed cases remain hypothetical. The recovered writing packet preserves the source proposal, while its unavailable conversation is left unreconstructed.

The resulting position is deliberately conditional. Some changes in representation production can alter the importance of other encounter conditions. The direction of the effect, the distribution of control and the quality of the resulting participation require independent assessment. A useful political economy of aesthetic encounters should make those assessments possible while preserving cases in which

generative tools, curation or revenue sustain shared cultural opportunities.

2 Aesthetic Encounters and Historical Conditions

This section defines the encounter that the political-economic analysis concerns. It separates significance, judgment and report, then develops the retained example of a remembered sunset. The discussion clarifies the role of historical relations while preserving the possible aesthetic value of generated images and the difference between preparation and actual experience.

2.1 Encounter, Significance and Judgment

The working vocabulary identifies an episode and several ways it can become an object of inquiry. Its purpose is to keep experience, evaluation and public evidence distinct. The definitions organize the present argument while leaving contested questions in aesthetics available for further discussion.

Definition 2.1 (Aesthetic encounter). An aesthetic encounter is a temporally situated engagement in which an object, representation, environment or practice acquires aesthetic significance for a participant. A description of the encounter identifies the participant, relevant activity, circumstances, horizon and basis for attributing that significance.

The definition permits several kinds of significance. A participant may attend to form, discover a connection, become absorbed, experience disturbance or revise an interpretation. The claim that an encounter has aesthetic significance requires an appropriate basis; the definition alone cannot establish that a particular person has undergone it. A researcher's classification, a participant's later account and an immediate response provide different kinds of evidence.

Definition 2.2 (Aesthetic judgment). An aesthetic judgment is an evaluation or articulation concerning an object or encounter under some standard, orientation or practice of appreciation. It can concern an experience while remaining distinct from the occurrence and full character of that experience.

A rating can record a judgment under a specified task. It can also reflect expectations about the task, the available response options or the participant's willingness to report. A purchase records a transaction under an arrangement. It may express appreciation, support for a practitioner, convenience or another reason. The political-economic analysis should identify the outcome actually observed before interpreting it as evidence of beauty or meaningful participation.

The same caution applies to the object. An image can be physically available while remaining unnoticed. It can be noticed without being understood in the manner a curator intended. It can become meaningful through a relation the producer never anticipated. The arrangement can organize possibilities of encounter while leaving the participant's actual experience open.

2.2 The Remembered Sunset

The sunset example identifies a possible historical contribution to present significance. It compares visual resemblance with a participant's relation to an earlier occasion. The hypothetical example supports a conceptual distinction whose wider psychological applicability requires investigation.

Suppose evening light recalls an encounter with someone the participant loved. The present scene matters partly through that history. The other person can be absent while the earlier relation remains relevant through memory, acquired attention or an ongoing concern. This is the retained insight of social absence with relational significance. Its explanatory value depends on identifying a plausible present role for the history; an observer's retrospective association alone would leave that role uncertain.

A visually similar image can become significant in another way. It may prompt recollection, invite comparison, initiate a new conversation or become associated with a later event. An AI-generated sunset can participate in such an actual history. The method therefore distinguishes the history of producing a

representation from the history through which someone encounters it. Either history may matter for a particular judgment, and their importance requires an argument connected to that target.

The comparison does not require optical qualities to be irrelevant. The appearance of the light can contribute alongside memory, bodily circumstances and the current activity. Nor does it require the earlier encounter to be perfectly recoverable. A present recollection can be selective or mistaken. Historical explanation, current meaning and factual accuracy remain distinct questions that can be investigated together.

2.3 Preparation and Newly Occurring Experience

The temporal distinction prevents historical dependence from turning an emerging experience into a completed event already hidden in the past. It identifies prior conditions, the focal encounter and later articulation separately. This distinction becomes important when personalization attempts to anticipate a participant's response.

Prior learning, emotional history or an unresolved question may prepare a person to respond to an image. The response can still arise through new information, an unexpected arrangement or interaction during the encounter. A disposition toward response differs from a determinate proposition waiting to be retrieved. Evidence that someone was previously prepared therefore leaves the actual contribution of the new event open.

A useful account specifies what existed before, what changed during the encounter and what became available afterward. Preparation might involve a skill, a remembered relation or sensitivity to a contrast. The encounter might supply the image, a description or another person's interpretation. A subsequent report may stabilize a meaning that was less articulate during the episode. These distinctions preserve the generative character of the encounter without requiring a universal metaphysics of relations.

3 Antecedents and Philosophical Commitments

This section compares the proposed inquiry with verified work on experience, taste, commercial organization and access. It identifies the relevant antecedent position and then states the present paper's narrower use of it. The objective is to establish philosophical context while keeping inherited insights and newly proposed mechanisms distinct.

3.1 Experience and Formed Appreciation

The first comparison concerns the conditions through which an encounter becomes meaningful. It brings a philosophical account of experience beside a sociological account of appreciation. Their differences help clarify the present paper's deliberately limited commitment to historically situated significance.

Dewey's discussion of experience emphasizes interaction between a living creature and surrounding conditions, and the differentiated phases through which an integrated experience develops. He also distinguishes the developing episode from the analytical divisions used in its later description [2]. This provides a precedent for treating an encounter as more than an isolated stimulus followed by a public label. The present paper leaves the adequacy of Dewey's broader account open and uses the comparison to identify temporal and contextual questions.

In the Introduction to *Distinction*, Bourdieu relates cultural appreciation to upbringing, education and socially differentiated histories of acquisition. He also describes historically formed competence as relevant to the perception of artistic distinctions [1]. The present analysis retains the question of formation while leaving stronger claims about the necessity of a particular cultural code to further examination. A personal encounter can have significance beyond an established institution's preferred mode of appreciation.

These comparisons support an inquiry into conditions while preserving disagreement about explanatory scope. A historical relation can help explain a response without exhausting its visual, bodily or

practical character. A social account of taste can reveal unequal preparation without determining the value of every judgment. The proposed method therefore asks which condition performs which explanatory role in the encounter under investigation.

3.2 Commercial Experience and Transformation

The second comparison establishes that the commercial organization of experience is an antecedent to the AI-related hypothesis. It also tests the proposal's extension toward personally significant transformation. This comparison limits any claim that monetizing meaningful encounters constitutes a newly discovered economic mechanism.

Pine and Gilmore's 1998 article already proposed commercial staging of experiences [7]. Their organization's current programme also explicitly describes offerings intended to transform customers' lives [9]. These precedents make both organized experience and transformation relevant comparison points. The existence of the programmes establishes their stated commercial orientation; their effectiveness and wider historical significance require separate evidence.

The present question is narrower than a universal succession of economic stages. It asks whether a specified change in representation production alters the importance or governance of a particular encounter condition. A commercial provider can already organize a personally meaningful event before generative AI enters the arrangement. An AI-related explanation must identify what the technology changes beyond that prior practice. The comparison can therefore yield continuity as readily as transformation.

3.3 Practical Access and Property

The access comparison clarifies the object of control. It distinguishes a formal right from the means through which a person can obtain a benefit. The distinction is especially useful when an intermediary influences encounter conditions without owning the experience that results.

Ribot and Peluso develop access through the practical ability to derive benefits and the relations that enable or constrain that ability. Their analysis extends beyond property rights and examines mechanisms of control and maintenance [8]. This supplies an established framework against which the provisional phrase *relational enclosure* must be tested.

A venue operator can control admission, and a platform can organize visibility, while the participant's experience remains a different object. The relevant analysis identifies the actual permission, resource or decision under control. A claim of legal ownership requires the applicable rules and facts. The present paper addresses practical organization and its normative assessment, leaving particular legal entitlements to a separate inquiry.

Taken together, the antecedents support a restrained contribution. Historically formed appreciation, organized experience and practical access already have substantial conceptual resources. The proposed analysis connects them to a conditional change in visual representation production and distinguishes the successive evidential obligations. Its value depends on whether that connection improves diagnosis or research design, with novelty and wider applicability remaining open.

4 Codification and Institutional Attribution

This section traces the movement from an encounter to a portable articulation and an attributed characteristic. It distinguishes the functions of descriptions, images and institutional designations, then examines feedback into later encounters. The objective is to identify transformations that can matter politically and economically without assuming that every stage preserves the same object.

4.1 Portable Articulations and Their Targets

Codification makes some aspect of an encounter available beyond its original occasion. Its adequacy depends on the target it is intended to preserve or communicate. This subsection distinguishes a useful representation from a claim to reproduce the complete experience.

Definition 4.1 (Symbolic codification). Symbolic codification is the stabilization of a selected distinction, interpretation or expressive feature in a portable form, such as an image, description, classification or narrative. Its assessment specifies the target, intended audience, medium and relevant conditions of interpretation.

A description can identify a painting, explain a technique or record a participant's response. An image can preserve visible features while leaving scale, material texture or the circumstances of viewing differently available. A narrative can connect an encounter to an earlier relationship while selecting among the details of that history. Each form can be adequate for a limited purpose. The political-economic question concerns which purposes become institutionally privileged and which consequences follow from that choice.

Codification can also create a new encounter. Reading an explanation may direct attention toward a feature the participant previously overlooked. A generated image may become the object of a new practice of interpretation. The distinction between preserving a prior target and enabling a later experience matters because the two achievements can diverge. A representation can be valuable for a new purpose while being an incomplete record of the earlier event.

The project should therefore specify the claim made for the representation. An account presented as a participant's recollection carries a different evidential obligation from a general statement about the work's reception. A promotional image carries a different function from an archival photograph. Their circulation can overlap, but the basis for trusting or evaluating each use remains tied to its role.

4.2 Attributed Characteristics and Authentication

Attribution links an object, place or institution with a comparatively stable characteristic. Authentication concerns the warrant for a specified origin or identity claim. This subsection separates both from legal property and from the participant's aesthetic response.

Definition 4.2 (Institutional attribution). An institutional attribution is an identifiable practice through which an organization or recognized role assigns, endorses or communicates a characteristic or status concerning an object, participant or occasion. Its analysis identifies the issuer, target, criteria, procedure and scope of uptake.

A venue may describe a collection as distinctive, a platform may label an image's production method, or an organization may endorse a practitioner. These acts can influence discovery and expectations. Their existence does not independently establish aesthetic quality. A participant can reasonably value an authenticated origin while remaining unmoved by the work; another can find significance in an object whose provenance remains uncertain.

The phrase *property attribution* in the retained discussion initially concerns attributing a characteristic, such as beauty or prestige. A legal property right is a different object requiring its actual institutional basis. The distinction is essential to the argument. The route from a widely accepted characteristic to a power to exclude, charge or authorize use involves additional rules and practical arrangements. A descriptive attribution alone cannot perform that institutional work.

Authentication has a similarly specified target. Establishing the source of an image can support a provenance claim while leaving its interpretation open. Establishing a production method can matter to a participant's judgment without determining the appropriate judgment in advance. A political-economic analysis should identify which authenticity claim becomes valuable to whom and how an actor can control its verification or communication.

4.3 Feedback into Later Encounters

The feedback analysis considers how a codified judgment or institutional attribution can shape subsequent opportunities. It preserves the retained sequence from encounter conditions through articulation, attribution, returns and later governance. The sequence functions as a map of possible dependencies, with actual causal relations requiring evidence.

A description can affect what a curator selects. Selection can affect what participants encounter and which practitioners receive attention. Returns can support another exhibition, fund interpretive work or encourage a narrower programme. The later programme can then alter the conditions through which aesthetic significance develops. Each transition has an identifiable mechanism that should be investigated separately.

The sequence admits disagreement and reversal. A participant can challenge an institutional attribution, a new interpretation can change an object's reception, or a venue can revise its programme for reasons unrelated to prior revenue. Multiple actors can attach different values to the same encounter. The method retains these possibilities so that a neat diagram cannot silently substitute for the history of the arrangement.

5 Capitalization and Control of Access

This section distinguishes the economic and institutional processes that can follow aesthetic attribution. It defines capitalization, governance, enclosure, capture and extraction, then identifies the evidence needed to connect them. The purpose is to preserve critical analysis while keeping enabling institutions and justified restrictions within the comparison.

5.1 Economic Objects and Realized Returns

The economic vocabulary specifies what an actor organizes or receives. It separates expectations about future benefit from realized outcomes and identifies the unit of each comparison. This distinction prevents attention, price, income and aesthetic value from becoming interchangeable measures.

Definition 5.1 (Capitalization). Capitalization, in this paper's working sense, is the organization of resources, expected value or institutional positions to support an actor's future accumulation or practical control. The relevant object, mechanism, horizon and form of benefit must be specified.

An actor may invest in a venue, assemble a collection, develop a distribution service or promote a recognizable programme. Such activities can create or maintain conditions of participation. Their future returns remain uncertain. The working definition identifies an organizing process and leaves its economic success and ethical quality to further assessment.

Definition 5.2 (Value capture). Value capture identifies the allocation of specified realized returns among actors within an arrangement. The return may be money, attention or another declared outcome; comparisons preserve the distinction among these units.

A platform study that measures favorites locates a distribution of peer attention under its measure. A venue's ticket income records a financial flow. An artist's income can differ from the revenue generated by the event presenting the work. These descriptions can illuminate one another, but a conversion between them requires evidence. The paper therefore reserves claims about income concentration or economic redistribution for an analysis that actually observes those outcomes.

5.2 Governance and Baseline-Relative Enclosure

Governance concerns the practical organization of encounter conditions. Enclosure concerns a restriction relative to a stated prior or alternative arrangement. This subsection identifies the comparison needed to describe a restriction without treating its existence as a complete moral verdict.

Definition 5.3 (Governance of encounter conditions). Governance of encounter conditions is the practical organization of access, visibility, presentation, support and revision within a specified field of participation. It includes the powers, rules, resources and decisions through which the arrangement operates.

Governance can make an encounter possible. A curator selects material, a technician maintains equipment, an organizer coordinates a meeting, and a contributor supplies a work. These functions can require resources and differentiated authority. The question is how their powers and burdens are arranged in relation to the purposes and affected people.

Definition 5.4 (Relational enclosure). Relational enclosure is a provisional description of an actor's restriction of access to or control over specified encounter conditions relative to an identified baseline. The description identifies the condition, actor, affected parties, mechanism and comparison arrangement.

A controlled viewpoint illustrates the definition's possible application. Admission rules can restrict a route to a view even when the visitor's experience remains beyond the operator's ownership. Whether this is an objectionable enclosure depends on the baseline, the operator's legitimate role, conservation needs, alternatives and the distribution of burdens. The word *relational* locates the object of analysis; a critical conclusion requires independent justification.

5.3 Extraction and the Need for a Normative Bridge

Extraction is a stronger critical category than capitalization or receipt of revenue. This subsection states the additional premises needed to use it responsibly. It preserves cases in which an institution earns returns while maintaining the conditions on which participants depend.

Definition 5.5 (Extraction in the present analysis). Extraction is a proposed critical classification of an arrangement in which appropriation or control violates a defended standard concerning contributors, affected participants or shared conditions. The judgment requires a specified wrong-making feature, evidence, a feasible comparison and consideration of counterclaims.

The relevant feature could concern unconsented use within a scope where consent is required, disproportionate burdens, unjustified exclusion or degradation of conditions that an actor has reason to maintain. Each possibility needs its own argument. A general claim that many people contributed to a cultural field does not determine a particular ownership right or a fixed distribution of income. The grounds of a claim, the response owed and the actor capable of providing it must be established.

A fee can fund a venue, compensate practitioners and support access arrangements. A free service can shift costs to contributors or make visibility dependent on terms they have little capacity to contest. Price alone leaves these differences unresolved. The normative analysis should examine the actual relation between realized returns and the continuation, revision or restriction of shared opportunities.

The distinction also protects a legitimate role for selective programming. A venue cannot present every work at once. Selection can be necessary to provide a coherent occasion, and restrictions can protect people or material. A criticism should identify the particular mechanism and norm at issue. Otherwise, the vocabulary of extraction risks becoming a general expression of dissatisfaction with any organized cultural activity.

6 The Conditional Generative-AI Hypothesis

This section separates the contemporary hypothesis into claims that require different evidence. It considers production, downstream constraints and economic conversion, then compares two bounded empirical studies with the proposed visual-art inquiry. The objective is to preserve plausible mechanisms while leaving their prevalence and causal significance open.

6.1 Production and Downstream Constraints

The first stage concerns a specified change in producing representations. Its description must identify the artifact, eligibility criteria, participants and resources involved. The next stage concerns the conditions under which those representations become usable in an encounter.

Generating an image file, producing an image suitable for a particular purpose and preparing a work for a public programme can require different amounts and kinds of effort. Prompting, selection, revision, permissions, technical preparation and contextual work can remain relevant. A claim of reduced production cost should specify which tasks are included. More published images can indicate a change in output while leaving the full resource comparison unresolved.

The downstream conditions include discovery, interpretation, attention, trusted provenance and appropriate opportunities for participation. An increase in eligible images can make a previously ample presentation capacity restrictive. It can also improve the range of available alternatives within that capacity. A curator may select from a larger field; participants may gain meaningful digital opportunities; an established venue may remain largely unaffected. These are rival trajectories within the hypothesis, not deviations from an assumed universal transition.

Claim 6.1 (Conditional change in a downstream constraint). Where eligible representation supply increases while a relevant downstream capacity remains fixed, that capacity can become binding for a specified participation target. The claim requires a stated feasibility relation and leaves the value of the resulting encounters and the allocation of returns open.

The following section gives an exact idealized instance. Empirical application requires evidence that supply changed, the downstream condition remained restrictive and the target was actually affected. An observed increase in interest in exhibitions, for example, would require a further comparison before being attributed to generative AI. Earlier curation practices, changing incomes, institutional programmes and other technological developments can provide rival explanations.

6.2 Control and Conversion into Returns

The next stage concerns actors who can govern the relevant condition. It distinguishes a constraint's practical importance from the distribution of authority and economic benefit. This distinction identifies the missing premises in a claim that a production change transfers power to gatekeepers.

An institution may already control presentation before its capacity becomes binding. The production change can increase demand for that capacity while leaving the institution's legal powers and practical choices unchanged. A competitive service, an open public arrangement and an exclusive provider can respond differently. Their prices, selection rules and allocation of opportunities depend on further conditions.

To establish a change in returns, an inquiry must identify the beneficiary, the outcome and a credible mechanism. A provider might charge more, serve more people at a fixed price, receive additional support or earn nothing from the increased demand. Costs may also rise. Even an observed revenue increase leaves net income and its distribution open. The proposed hypothesis therefore assigns separate evidence requirements to production, constraint, control and return claims.

6.3 Bounded Empirical Comparisons

The selected studies provide evidence of particular changes in creative production and evaluation. This subsection states their design and measurement boundaries before considering their relevance. It uses them to sharpen the research question, with visual-art governance and economic redistribution requiring additional investigation.

Zhou and Lee examine more than four million artworks on an art-sharing platform using identified AI adoption, event-study comparisons and measures of posting, favorites per view and embedding-based

novelty. They report increased output and peer evaluation following adoption, alongside a less concentrated distribution of favorites among adopters [10]. The study’s adoption coding and observational identification require their stated assumptions. Favorites are a platform outcome, and published artifacts leave unobserved production work. The results therefore inform the production question while leaving monetary returns, embodied experience and a shift in access control unresolved.

Doshi and Hauser study a different domain through randomized access to AI-generated ideas for eight-sentence stories. Their design includes 293 writers and 600 evaluators. They find improvements in evaluated creativity alongside increased embedding-based similarity among stories within assisted conditions [3]. This supplies a bounded comparison between individual evaluation and collective output properties. Transfer to visual-art markets remains an additional hypothesis.

The studies also caution against a single account of collective consequences. An increase in individual output can coexist with a change in similarity, attention distribution or the range of available material. Those outcomes can move differently, and each measure has a limited interpretation. A political-economic inquiry should therefore specify the shared condition it values and the evidence that connects production to it.

7 A Limited Presentation-Capacity Model

This section gives an idealized instance of the proposed constraint change. It defines the counted target, states the compatibility assumptions and derives an exact capacity result. It then supplies a counterexample and separates feasibility from aesthetic value, institutional power and economic returns.

7.1 Target and Feasibility Assumptions

The model concerns a programme that presents distinct eligible images during a fixed interval. Its purpose is to isolate supply and presentation capacity. The target deliberately counts each image at most once, leaving repeated digital viewing and the quality of any resulting experience to other inquiries.

Let I be a finite set of eligible images and O a finite set of usable presentation opportunities. Write $R = |I|$ and $V = |O|$, where R and V are nonnegative integers. Eligibility is a declared programme criterion whose aesthetic adequacy remains outside the model. Each opportunity presents one image, and each image is used at most once. A presentation arrangement pairs selected images with distinct opportunities. Its size counts distinct images presented.

Assumption 7.1 (Complete and joint usability). Every image in I is compatible with every opportunity in O . Any pairing that uses each image and opportunity at most once is jointly feasible. Attention, permission, timing and technical conditions needed for that pairing are included in this usability assumption.

The second sentence matters because separate compatibility can conceal a shared constraint. Two opportunities might each be usable alone while competing for the same equipment or participant time. The model excludes such additional conflicts explicitly. Its capacity result is conditional on that explicit premise; application to actual cultural participation requires independent evidence.

7.2 Capacity and a Changing Binding Constraint

The proposition derives the maximum programme size from the stated assumptions. It establishes both an upper bound and an attainable arrangement. Table 1 then illustrates a supply increase with presentation capacity held fixed.

Proposition 7.2 (Maximum distinct presentations). *Under complete and joint usability, the maximum number N^* of distinct images that can be presented is given by Equation 7.1.*

$$N^* = \min\{R, V\}. \quad (7.1)$$

Table 1: A hypothetical increase in eligible images with fixed presentation capacity. Counts concern distinct presentations under the model’s usability assumptions.

Eligible images R	Usable opportunities V	Maximum presentations N^*
2	3	2
5	3	3
8	3	3

Proof. Each presented image must be a distinct member of I , so every arrangement has size at most R . Each presentation also uses a distinct member of O , so its size is at most V . Consequently its size is at most their minimum. Let $m = \min\{R, V\}$. Select m images and m opportunities and pair them one to one. These selections exist by the definition of m . Complete compatibility makes each pair admissible, and joint usability makes the complete pairing feasible. The arrangement therefore attains the upper bound. If $m = 0$, the empty arrangement provides the same conclusion. $\square$

Initially, image supply limits the programme to two presentations. Increasing supply to five allows three, at which point the fixed presentation capacity limits the target. Increasing supply further to eight leaves that maximum unchanged. Equation 7.1 thus supplies an exact instance of a change in the binding constraint. The larger image set can still matter for which images are selected, even when the maximum count remains fixed. The model’s count leaves that qualitative question open.

7.3 Compatibility and Preserved Options

The counterexample identifies a condition under which the minimum formula overstates attainable capacity. A separate argument then clarifies what follows when supply expands and all earlier opportunities remain feasible. Together they prevent the simple example from becoming a general law of encounter access.

Suppose there are two images and two opportunities, but both images are compatible only with the first opportunity. At most one image can be presented because the second opportunity has no compatible image and the first accepts only one. Presenting either image in the first opportunity attains that bound. The maximum is therefore one, although $\min\{2, 2\} = 2$. Complete compatibility has failed. The example shows why counting resources alone can overstate access when the relations among them matter.

Now consider an expansion that adds eligible images while retaining all earlier images, opportunities and feasible pairings. Every earlier arrangement remains available by assumption. The expansion consequently preserves the earlier feasible options. A later policy that changes ranking, permission or scheduling can remove options, but that removal has an additional cause within the comparison. A claim that production expansion itself narrows access must identify a mechanism beyond the mere addition of eligible images.

7.4 Economic and Aesthetic Boundaries

The final distinction identifies what the capacity result leaves unresolved. It separates the number of possible presentations from the reasons participants value them and from the conditions through which an institution receives returns. These limits determine the evidence required for the next stage of the research programme.

Price, income, demand and control rights remain outside the model. Two institutions can have identical capacities while operating under different arrangements: one offers an open public programme, another uses paid admission, and each can have different costs and support. The minimum formula

therefore cannot establish an increase in market power or profit. Such a conclusion would require an additional model or empirical account of those relations.

The model also leaves aesthetic experience open. A participant might value one sustained encounter more than several presentations, or find the expanded set meaningful in a way the count misses. Repeated viewing can deepen an encounter while leaving the distinct-image total unchanged. The formal result concerns a deliberately narrow target. Its usefulness lies in clarifying a possible constraint transition and exposing the assumptions needed to infer more.

8 Prepared Susceptibility and Personalization

This section develops the retained proposal concerning historically formed susceptibility to meaningful encounters. It defines the target-relative profile, compares it with existing personalization research and distinguishes organizing an opportunity from guaranteeing an experience. The objective is to preserve the insight while keeping prediction, causation and commercial appropriation separate.

8.1 A Historically Formed Response Profile

Prepared susceptibility describes what a current configuration may permit before a focal experience occurs. Its scope depends on the encounter family, target and horizon. This subsection aligns the proposal with the earlier distinction between prior preparation and learning during an encounter.

Definition 8.1 (Prepared susceptibility). Relative to a specified person, current circumstances, encounter family and horizon, prepared susceptibility is a profile of possible target-bearing responses supported by the prior configuration. Evidence for the profile, the history that formed it and the actual response in a later encounter remain distinct.

The notation $\Gamma_i(t)$ can mark this profile for participant i at time t . It is a heuristic reference to a structured set of possibilities, with the encounter family and target supplied by the surrounding description. Empirical measurement and predictive adequacy remain open. A fuller model would require definitions of admissible encounters, response evidence and the conditions under which the profile changes.

A remembered relation, a learned technique or an unresolved concern can make a later image salient. The resulting encounter may also supply information that changes the participant's orientation. A system that accurately predicts an immediate response may be relying on a current preference, a contextual cue or a broad population pattern. Its predictive performance alone leaves the formation history and meaning of the response unresolved.

This distinction protects an important temporal insight. Conditions for being moved can predate an event while the particular experience develops through the event. A completed meaning need not already exist as an encoded proposition. Conversely, a later narrative about a transformative encounter may exaggerate the preparedness that existed before it. Evidence about the prior condition and the new contribution should therefore be sought separately.

8.2 Existing Targeting and Transformation Research

The literature comparison tests whether the proposed commercial extension adds a distinct mechanism. It examines established psychological targeting and keeps the interpretation of its evidence bounded. The aim is to avoid treating a new label for susceptibility as evidence of a new kind of influence.

Matz and colleagues report comparisons of psychologically tailored advertising with outcomes involving clicks and purchases [5]. Eckles and colleagues subsequently criticize the absence of random user assignment and the possible role of platform-optimized exposure [4]. The original authors published a reply disputing the algorithmic explanation; the reply's existence and title are verified, while its detailed argument remains outside the present assessment [6]. The exchange supplies a methodological caution about inferring influence from differences among exposed audiences.

The present target differs from a click or purchase. It concerns an encounter's significance within a participant's history and the governance of opportunities for that encounter. Establishing this target would require evidence beyond engagement measures. A proposed capitalization of susceptibility should therefore identify the additional information, mechanism or institutional consequence that existing preference-based or psychologically tailored accounts leave unresolved.

Transformation-oriented commercial programmes also make the comparison demanding. A service can already seek personally significant change without relying on generative AI. The new hypothesis must specify whether an AI system changes the available material, the selection process, the history inferred, the scale of intervention or the terms of access. If the same mechanism is adequately described by an established account, the new term should serve clarification or be omitted.

8.3 Opportunity, Influence and Participant Revision

The final distinction concerns the powers a curator or platform can actually exercise. It separates opportunity organization, response influence and participant interpretation. This distinction supports both empirical design and the subsequent normative assessment.

A service can select what appears, when it appears and which alternatives remain available. It may influence attention or make a useful encounter more likely under a specified model. A claim about probability requires measured evidence or clearly stated assumptions. A probability distribution over aesthetic experiences requires an evidential or modeling basis beyond the existence of an organized environment.

Participants can also reinterpret, ignore, decline or repurpose what they encounter. These possibilities have practical conditions. A person may need usable alternatives, time, information or the ability to change a ranking preference. The relevant inquiry examines those conditions without romanticizing unplanned experience. Curation can create valuable opportunities, while an unexpected encounter can be distressing or trivial. The normative question concerns the terms under which influence and revision are organized.

9 Normative Assessment of Shared Conditions

This section states the ethical premises needed to assess aesthetic capitalization. It identifies relevant interests, develops a conditional argument about fair terms and shared conditions, and distinguishes several outcomes that can diverge. The analysis permits enabling institutions while preserving a precise basis for criticizing particular restrictions or appropriations.

9.1 Participation, Contribution and Permissible Limits

The interest analysis begins with people and practices affected by an arrangement. It includes contributors, participants and those who bear costs without directly taking part. Its purpose is to identify the grounds of an assessment before deciding which response or distribution is justified.

Practitioners can have interests in sustaining their work, receiving appropriate acknowledgment and participating under defensible terms. Participants can value access, understanding, privacy, exploration or a meaningful relation to a work. Other affected people can bear environmental, financial or social burdens. These interests need an account of their significance and scope. A person's worth is independent of the amount of aesthetic or economic value attributed to their contribution.

The continued existence of a cultural field can matter because it supports valuable possibilities of making, learning, interpreting and encountering. That importance does not establish that every existing practice should continue unchanged. A field can contain exclusion, exhausting expectations or harmful arrangements. The relevant normative target is a defensible pattern of opportunities and relations, including the possibility of revision or ending.

Privacy, solitude and cultural limits belong within that target. A participant may prefer uncured exploration or freedom from repeated attempts to produce an intense response. A community can have justified restrictions on a practice. An institution may need selective programming to use resources responsibly. These considerations defeat any simple instruction to maximize the number or intensity of aesthetic events.

9.2 A Conditional Argument about Fair Terms

The proposed argument connects the descriptive mechanism with a limited normative conclusion. It states the relevant commitments and then identifies the application conditions. The steps preserve a distinction between a reason for institutional change and a final allocation of duties or benefits.

Assumption 9.1 (Fair and answerable participation). Where an arrangement materially depends on people's contributions or shapes their consequential opportunities, its terms should be answerable to their legitimate interests. The appropriate form of participation, acknowledgment, support or review depends on role, evidence, feasibility and competing claims.

The premise is motivated by the relation between dependence and control. An institution can benefit from work or shared conditions while influencing how the people involved can continue to participate. Requiring answerability makes that influence responsive to the interests it affects. The premise supports differentiated roles and justified expertise; it leaves the particular distribution of authority to a further argument.

Assumption 9.2 (Proportionate maintenance of valued conditions). Where an actor has a defensible responsibility for shared conditions that support valuable participation, foreseeable decisions affecting those conditions should be assessed against feasible alternatives, relevant burdens and opportunities for revision.

The responsibility in this premise requires its own ground, such as an undertaking, role or justified allocation. Mere receipt of a benefit does not settle that ground. The premise prevents the argument from assigning every cultural institution an unlimited obligation to preserve all surrounding practices.

Step 1: specify the valued opportunity. Identify the activity, people, horizon and reasons it matters. Distinguish support for meaningful participation from a target such as maximizing publicity or ticket sales.

Step 2: establish the mechanism. Show how the actual terms, control or allocation of returns materially affect the relevant opportunity. Compare a feasible arrangement and consider rival causes. Contribution and consequence require evidence, not an inferred entitlement based on the word *relational*.

Step 3: identify the governing norm and role. Explain which interest, undertaking or responsibility supports a claim on the actor. Distinguish a request for acknowledgment, a say in access conditions and a financial claim. Their grounds can differ.

Step 4: assess alternatives and burdens. Compare responses that can address the mechanism, including support, changed terms, review or a justified limit. Consider costs, conservation, privacy, expertise, other contributors and the practical conditions of provision.

Step 5: state the limited judgment. Identify the supported reason for retaining or revising the arrangement and the claims that remain unresolved. A final duty or a classification of extraction requires the additional conclusion that the defended standard is violated after relevant counterclaims are considered.

9.3 Individual and Shared Outcomes

The final distinction identifies outcomes that a normative assessment should keep separate. It considers individual productivity, immediate satisfaction and the continuation of shared opportunities. Their divergence is central to the proposed research programme.

An individual can produce more images while a programme becomes more or less accessible to others. A highly engaging service can support learning or reduce the practical room for exploration. An

institution can earn revenue while sustaining practitioners, or while leaving an identified responsibility unfulfilled. Each relation requires evidence and a defended criterion. Justice requires an assessment of the defended interests and norms beyond output or pleasure.

The framework therefore evaluates the particular arrangement and its alternatives. It can support a paid venue, an open digital initiative, a restriction protecting participants or a revision to an intermediary's terms. Its critical force lies in the explicit grounds of those judgments. The direction of the conclusion remains responsive to the case.

10 Hypothetical Encounters and Institutional Comparisons

This section tests the proposed distinctions through hypothetical visual-art arrangements. It compares image supply, controlled access, revenue-supported provision, personalized discovery and open digital participation. The hypothetical cases identify mechanisms and counterconditions for empirical investigation.

10.1 An Image-Rich Programme

The first case applies the capacity example to a curated programme. It distinguishes the number of eligible works from the opportunities through which participants encounter them. The comparison examines both a possible constraint and the qualitative changes that a count leaves open.

Suppose an organization receives a larger set of suitable images after contributors begin using generative tools. Its programme retains the same number of presentation opportunities. The organization can now choose among more works while presenting the same number as before. This arrangement is compatible with improved selection, increased similarity, greater diversity or little change. Evidence about the selected works and the purposes of the programme would distinguish these possibilities.

The organization might respond by adding an open digital presentation, revising its selection process or retaining the existing scope. Each response changes different conditions. A wider digital programme can support participants who previously lacked access; it can also require attention and technical support. The appropriate assessment examines actual opportunities and their quality, with the expansion of the source pool treated as one input.

10.2 A Controlled Viewpoint and Its Alternatives

The second case concerns access to a visual field whose significance depends partly on a situated occasion. It identifies the operator's practical control and the comparison needed to assess a restriction. The case leaves both maintenance needs and alternatives visible.

Suppose an operator controls admission to a viewpoint and displays representations of the view in promotional material. Access to the image and access to the viewpoint are different opportunities. Some people may value the representation independently; others may value the bodily occasion, a remembered relation or the place's history. The operator controls an entry condition, while the resulting significance remains participant-dependent.

A fee alone leaves the normative question unresolved. Evidence would be needed about the basis of control, maintenance costs, conservation, affected contributors, alternative routes and the terms of participation. An arrangement that supports care and accessible participation differs from one that unjustifiably removes an established opportunity. Both are consistent with charging admission. The comparison should identify the actual baseline and the grounds of any claim to access.

The example also prevents physical presence from becoming an automatic authenticity criterion. A representation can sustain a meaningful connection when travel is unavailable or unwanted. Its value depends on the participant's target and circumstances. A stronger claim that only the original location permits a worthwhile encounter would require a separate argument.

10.3 A Revenue-Supported Community Art Venue

The third case tests a positive role for capitalization. It considers a venue whose income supports practitioners and shared participation. The objective is to distinguish receipt of returns from a conclusion about extraction while keeping the institution's actual performance assessable.

Suppose a community venue charges for selected events and uses the income to maintain equipment, compensate contributors and provide other opportunities under accessible terms. Participants can receive an intelligible explanation of programming decisions and raise concerns through a relevant process. If these conditions hold, the revenue can help sustain the field on which the venue depends. The example defeats a definition that makes every commercial exchange extractive by stipulation.

The favorable description still needs evidence. A stated allocation of funds can differ from actual support; an accessible programme can remain impractical for particular participants; a review route can lack authority. The framework examines those conditions directly. It can also identify justified tradeoffs, such as a smaller programme that protects contributors from unsustainable demands. More events would be a poor measure of success where they undermine the very participation being defended.

10.4 Personalized Discovery and Open Digital Participation

The fourth comparison concerns two hypothetical services that organize visual-art encounters. One uses personalized ranking within a commercial arrangement; the other supports an open digital collection. Their differences illustrate why technical form and price alone cannot determine the normative assessment.

A personalized service may help a participant discover unfamiliar work. It may also prioritize items associated with commercial returns, limit alternatives or infer sensitive interests. Evidence should identify what the service optimizes, the information it uses, the options it presents and the participant's practical ability to revise the arrangement. A change in clicks would leave the encounter's significance and the fairness of the terms open.

An open digital initiative may let practitioners share generated and conventionally produced images under clear terms, retaining attribution and interpretive discussion. Such a project can expand opportunities without creating the proposed concentration of control. It can still face maintenance costs, unequal visibility or disputed contributions. The countercase therefore supports a differentiated assessment of the opportunities, burdens and powers within an open arrangement.

The two services can also coexist. A participant might use a recommendation to discover a work and then continue inquiry through an open collection or a venue. These complementary routes matter when assessing dependency. A claim that one intermediary controls the relevant field should examine the alternatives actually available to the people concerned.

10.5 Place-Based Research and Historical Comparison

The final case distinction addresses the move from an illustrative site to an empirical claim. It preserves the recovered suggestion of Ginza as a possible field of inquiry while leaving its actual history and contemporary mechanisms unasserted. The objective is to specify the work required before using a place as evidence.

A place-based study could examine relations among visual presentation, brands, institutions, movement, memory and access. Ginza remains a proposed site from the retained research brief. An AI-caused transition at that site remains an empirical hypothesis requiring investigation. Such a claim would require a bounded period, identified actors, relevant changes in production and evidence connecting them to access or returns.

A historical comparison should include arrangements that predate generative AI. Similar curation, authentication or admission practices may already have governed meaningful encounters. Their persistence can qualify the proposed mechanism, while a documented change can sharpen it. The research question

is whether a specific production change alters an identifiable relation, with continuity and alternative causes retained as serious possibilities.

11 Objections and Scope Revisions

This section considers objections to the argument's conceptual and explanatory value. It examines the breadth of relational language, the relation between representation and situated experience, and the interpretation of constraint changes. Each objection identifies a condition under which the framework should be narrowed or revised.

11.1 Relational Breadth and Explanatory Increment

The first objection concerns a vocabulary broad enough to include every relevant circumstance. If every contribution to an encounter is simply called relational, the description can fail to distinguish explanations. The response requires a specified mechanism and a useful comparison.

A historical fact about a participant may be irrelevant to the focal encounter. An institution's presence may have little effect on access. A remembered association may explain a later report without explaining the original experience. The method should identify the target, proposed function, evidence and alternatives before treating a relation as explanatory. Its value depends on the work performed by that identification.

The same test applies to the provisional terms *relational enclosure* and *capitalization of susceptibility*. If access theory or an established personalization account describes the mechanism adequately, a new term may add little. The paper's contribution can then be a scoped comparison or an application of existing resources. A claim of theoretical invention would require a different and much stronger argument.

11.2 Representation and Situated Significance

The second objection challenges a hierarchy that privileges physical encounters over generated representations. It emphasizes that images themselves can enter real histories and support meaningful practices. The framework must preserve those possibilities to avoid confusing production origin with aesthetic worth.

A generated image can be encountered with friends, used in a personal project or become associated with a consequential event. A physical visit can be disappointing, coercive or trivial. These possibilities defeat an inference from medium alone to the value of the experience. The relevant comparison concerns a specified target and its conditions.

Some targets remain tied to particular histories or material properties. Seeing a representation of a painting and examining its surface can provide different information. Their difference need not establish a general ranking. A participant may value either or both. The political-economic question concerns access to the relevant opportunity and the terms through which it is organized.

11.3 Constraints, Competition and Causation

The final objection challenges the move from a binding constraint to concentrated economic power. It identifies competition, public provision and institutional alternatives as counterconditions. The response preserves the distinction between the formal capacity result and the empirical political-economic hypothesis.

An increase in demand for presentation can encourage new providers, support an open initiative or intensify competition. A fixed capacity can remain publicly governed. An intermediary can gain revenue while facing increased costs or reduced discretion. The simple capacity model leaves all these arrangements possible. A claim of concentrated control requires evidence about the actual choices and alternatives available to the relevant actors.

An observed change in cultural consumption also requires a causal comparison. Generative AI may be one influence among changes in infrastructure, income, institutional policy and existing distribution practices. A persuasive analysis should establish timing, mechanism and rival explanations. Where those links remain uncertain, the paper's strongest warranted result is a conditional research hypothesis.

12 Open Questions and Empirical Design

This section turns the argument into a bounded research agenda. It separates measurement of production, identification of encounter constraints and assessment of governance. The proposed designs retain counterexamples and distinguish causal evidence from normative judgment.

12.1 Production and Participation Measures

The first research task concerns the units used to describe a production change. It asks how eligibility, hidden work and later participation should be measured. The objective is to connect the artifact count with a declared task without treating it as a complete measure of creativity.

Open Problem 12.1 (Task-specific production change). Under which conditions does generative AI change the total resources required to produce visual material eligible for a specified programme, including selection, revision, permission and preparation, and how does that change affect the participants who perform those tasks?

A study could compare documented workflows within a defined visual-art setting. It should record the target, production stages, participants, resources and criteria of eligibility. Published output would be one observation among others. A credible comparison would consider changes in who contributes, what work becomes visible and which tasks move to another actor. These distinctions are especially important where an apparent reduction in one person's effort depends on additional work elsewhere.

Participation outcomes should also be specified independently. Access to a programme, time spent viewing, a stated judgment, a learned distinction and a meaningful experience are different targets. A study can investigate their relations, but it should preserve the evidence required for each. Participant accounts can illuminate significance while remaining open to interpretation and disagreement.

12.2 Constraint Change and Institutional Alternatives

The second task concerns the proposed downstream mechanism. It identifies the condition that limits a particular opportunity and asks whether its practical role changes. The design should include alternatives that could weaken or reverse the hypothesized concentration of control.

Open Problem 12.2 (Constraint and control transition). When eligible visual representation supply changes, which discovery, presentation, authentication or access conditions become more restrictive for a specified audience, and does control over those conditions become more concentrated, more distributed or largely unchanged?

Relevant evidence could include programme capacity, selection procedures, actual access terms, available substitutes, distribution routes and the reasons participants use them. A study should distinguish the number of opportunities from compatibility and practical usability. It should also identify whether the controller's powers changed or whether an existing capacity merely became more heavily used.

Economic outcomes require their own observations. Revenue, costs, compensation and attention should remain separate. A comparison could examine whether a change in demand produces higher income for practitioners, intermediaries, venues or none of these. The investigation should include open and revenue-supported arrangements, as well as cases where conventional curation already provided the relevant function before AI adoption.

12.3 Susceptibility and Normative Evaluation

The final research task connects personalization with participant history and evaluates the terms of influence. It requires evidence beyond engagement measures and an explicit account of the relevant interests. The objective is to make the extension concerning susceptibility empirically and philosophically assessable.

Open Problem 12.3 (Historically significant personalization). What evidence would distinguish selection based on immediate preference from selection that materially engages a participant's historically formed concerns, and which governance arrangements permit meaningful revision, refusal and access to alternatives?

A study could compare the information used by a service, the opportunities it presents and participants' accounts of their significance, with appropriate permission and attention to privacy. Causal claims should consider selection into exposure and changes produced during the encounter. The history inferred by a system may be inaccurate even when an output proves engaging. Interpretation of that history therefore remains an independent obligation.

Normative evaluation should then state the interest, mechanism, responsible role and feasible alternatives. It can assess whether terms support fair participation, maintain a justified shared condition or impose a disproportionate burden. A favorable outcome on one measure does not settle the assessment. The framework remains open to revision when participants' perspectives, rival explanations or established theories provide a better account.

13 Conclusion

This section states the paper's limited contribution and the conditions required for further application. It connects the philosophical distinctions with the capacity example and the normative argument. The result is a scoped research programme concerning access to visual-art encounters under generative AI.

Aesthetic significance can depend on relations among objects, participants, histories, practices and institutions. Its articulation, institutional attribution and economic circulation involve further transformations. The actors contributing to an encounter can differ from those controlling its conditions or receiving specified returns. These distinctions identify a political-economic question while leaving the value and justification of the arrangement open.

The contemporary hypothesis concerns a possible change in constraints. Where generative AI expands eligible representation supply, a downstream condition can become more consequential for a declared participation target. The presentation model provides an exact illustration under complete and joint usability. Its counterexample shows why compatibility matters, and its scope leaves aesthetic experience, market power and profit outside the result. Those claims require additional evidence and connecting assumptions.

Historically formed susceptibility extends the inquiry toward the conditions under which an encounter becomes meaningful. It remains distinct from a predetermined experience or an established probability of response. Existing targeting and transformation-oriented work supplies important comparisons. A proposed new mechanism must identify what it adds beyond those accounts and retain uncertainty about participant history and actual influence.

The normative argument assesses fair terms, legitimate interests and proportionate maintenance of valued shared conditions. It permits revenue, curation and justified restriction while providing a basis for criticizing specific arrangements. Privacy, solitude, cultural limits, participant revision and the possibility of ending remain substantive considerations. Output, attention, pleasure and income provide partial information; a justice assessment requires the independent normative argument.

The hypothetical cases show possible enabling and restrictive trajectories. Further research should identify the relevant production change, downstream condition, controller, return and comparison before proposing a wider historical conclusion. The paper's contribution lies in making those dependencies

and obligations explicit, with conceptual priority unclaimed and the adequacy of particular applications available for criticism.

DRAFT

References

- [1] Pierre Bourdieu. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press, 1984. Translated by Richard Nice; selected Introduction consulted.
- [2] John Dewey. Having an experience. Chapter III of *Art as Experience*, 1934. Selected chapter text hosted by Western Oregon University:
https://people.wou.edu/~girodm/670/having_an_experience.pdf.
- [3] Anil R. Doshi and Oliver P. Hauser. Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. *Science Advances*, 10(28):eadn5290, 2024.
- [4] Dean Eckles, Brett R. Gordon, and Garrett A. Johnson. Field studies of psychologically targeted ads face threats to internal validity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(23):E5254–E5255, 2018.
- [5] S. C. Matz, M. Kosinski, G. Nave, and D. J. Stillwell. Psychological targeting as an effective approach to digital mass persuasion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(48):12714–12719, 2017.
- [6] S. C. Matz, M. Kosinski, G. Nave, and D. J. Stillwell. Reply to eckles et al.: Facebook’s optimization algorithms are highly unlikely to explain the effects of psychological targeting. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(23):E5256–E5257, 2018. Publication metadata and title consulted; full reply unavailable.
- [7] B. Joseph Pine, II and James H. Gilmore. Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(4):97–105, 1998.
- [8] Jesse C. Ribot and Nancy Lee Peluso. A theory of access. *Rural Sociology*, 68(2):153–181, 2003.
- [9] Strategic Horizons. Experience and transformation economy programmes. Organizational homepage. Accessed 14 September 2026: <https://strategichorizons.com/>.
- [10] Eric Zhou and Dokyun Lee. Generative artificial intelligence, human creativity, and art. *PNAS Nexus*, 3(3):pgae052, 2024.