Communicating the Value of Human Creativity in AI Filmmaking Debates: The Odyssey Case

Pagon Gatchalee
Chiang Mai University Business School
Chiang Mai University
Chiang Mai, Thailand
pagon.g@cmu.ac.th

Abstract—Public arguments about AI filmmaking question whose work deserves recognition and what makes a film worth watching. This study examines 18 English-language online media articles about the 2026 Odyssey controversy through close reading. It compares how the articles name creators, describe production and use reported defects to justify judgments of creative value. Critics appeal to physical craft and specialist knowledge, while Fountain 0's filmmakers defend their project through personal expression and access to production. These positions do not divide neatly into human creativity versus AI. Both claim a human contribution, but they disagree about which contribution matters and what it warrants. The completed-film review introduces a further distinction: an opportunity valued by a maker does not by itself establish the worth of the result for viewers. Nolan's acceptance of some imaging tools also qualifies an outright opposition between humans and AI. The study contributes to marketing rhetoric by showing how media coverage can change the grounds on which a production story is judged, from what it enables a creator to what a critic expects the finished work to offer. The findings concern arguments within this controversy, not measured audience attitudes. Searching with "AI slop" may favor critical coverage and limits claims beyond this corpus.

Keywords—human creativity, AI filmmaking, AI slop, marketing rhetoric, close reading

I. Introduction

A film's value is discussed through accounts of its making as well as judgments of its finished form. Who conceived a scene, how it was performed and what skill its production required can become reasons for praising or dismissing it. A marketing rhetoric perspective directs attention to how such reasons are expressed and made persuasive [1]. In this study, value refers to the worth attributed to a creative work or contribution through the reasons offered for recognizing it. This includes recognition of its makers and judgments about what the work offers viewers.

Generative AI makes those arguments more difficult to settle. Information about human or AI authorship can affect evaluations of persuasive content, but a preference for human authorship does not necessarily imply a general aversion to AI [2]. In film promotion, an experimental study found that describing an actor as AI-generated increased perceived novelty but lowered perceived quality and viewing intention relative to a human description [3]. The expression 'AI slop' raises a related question about the grounds of evaluation. Its value cannot be understood solely through individual preference without considering the social conditions in which cultural meaning is made [4].

Coverage surrounding Christopher Nolan's The Odyssey in 2026 brought these issues together. Reports linked his defense of physical filmmaking with his criticism of AI slop [5–7]. Fountain 0 announced its AI project Odysseus: The Fall and released a teaser in July [8], [9]. Other articles addressed Grok Imagine clips and Elon Musk's promise of an adaptation [10–13]. In September, The Verge reviewed Fountain 0's completed film as a paid browser rental [14]. These are distinct objects within a connected debate. A short Grok clip is not Fountain 0's film, and a promised adaptation is not a completed release.

This case makes it possible to examine how the value of human creativity is argued over in public. Critics appeal to craft and expertise, while AI filmmakers describe intentions and opportunities that conventional production could not accommodate. These explanations offer different reasons to regard a creative product as valuable. Independent criticism can also challenge the reasons advanced by filmmakers and technology providers.

Using close reading to connect particular wording with each article's argument and context [15], the study addresses two research questions:

RQ1: How do media texts use language and rhetorical devices to make claims about the value of human creativity in AI filmmaking debates?

RQ2: What tensions arise between the grounds for valuing creative work in these debates?

The Odyssey debate provides the case through which these questions are examined. RQ1 concerns how descriptions and comparisons support a judgment of worth. RQ2 examines where those judgments conflict. The contribution is to distinguish recognition of a human contribution from acceptance of that contribution as a reason to value the finished film. In this case, both critics and AI filmmakers appeal to human creativity. Media coverage gives space to these competing accounts and introduces different tests of their worth. This extends the marketing rhetoric perspective to the way production claims are challenged through criticism, rather than simply repeated as reasons for valuing a product.

II. Related Work

A. Marketing rhetoric and the communication of value

Marketing rhetoric examines the persuasive work of language in marketing theory and practice. It extends beyond isolated advertising devices to the arguments through which participants advance interests, establish authority and seek agreement [1]. This perspective makes praise, criticism and the reasons offered for them relevant to marketing inquiry. Applied here, it directs attention to how filmmakers' claims are circulated and challenged in media coverage of creative products.

A claim of value and its reception are different objects of study. Media texts give filmmakers room to explain a project's purpose and critics room to question it. Close reading examines how wording, comparisons and appeals to authority support these positions. Audience research would be needed to establish their reception.

Authenticity scholarship offers a related perspective on how judgments are negotiated. Discourse about the authenticity of AI intelligence can also define what counts as human intelligence [16]. Applied to this case, that observation raises a question: when a text dismisses generated work, what human contribution does it recognize? Authenticity is relevant here where articles invoke personal purpose or human involvement as a reason to value the work.

B. Authorship, effort and creative contribution

Recognition of authorship depends on the contribution attributed to a person as well as the identity of the assistant. Greater assistance can reduce the authorship, creatorship and responsibility attributed to a novelist, whether the help comes from a person or ChatGPT. Yet human assistants receive greater recognition than AI assistants providing comparable help [17]. These findings distinguish using AI from relinquishing creative contribution. They also suggest examining whose work an account makes visible and whose it discounts.

A creative control account approaches authorship through the whole process of conception and execution. It argues that selection and revision can express human creativity even when outcomes cannot be fully predicted [18]. This is a legal and aesthetic proposal, not a theory of audience preference. It provides a useful comparison with meaningful creative work, which emphasizes autonomy, recognition and opportunities to exercise skills [19]. Filmmaking research also describes generation as part of workflows involving iteration, selection and editing [20]. Together, these accounts make the nature of human involvement worth examining rather than inferring it from the use of a tool alone.

Descriptions of human involvement can also influence evaluation. Human-only attribution benefited persuasive texts without a corresponding general penalty for AI involvement [2]. Perceived effort and creativity helped explain more favorable evaluations of television-show descriptions under human labels, while responses to human–AI collaboration varied [21]. The effects need not be symmetrical: an AI label reduced perceived effort for human-made short videos, whereas a human-made label did not significantly increase it relative to an unlabeled condition [22]. These experiments make attribution relevant to the present study, which examines the content of those attributions in media discourse.

C. AI slop and judgments of creative value

The meaning of AI slop remains contested. A critique of arguments for its social and aesthetic value calls for attention to communicative intent, shared interpretation and the conditions under which cultural value develops [4]. It does not settle whether AI slop can ever acquire aesthetic value. Other work questions a simple division between genuine and generated images [23], while an account of video production argues that generative tools need not produce slop when creative vision guides technical execution [24]. These positions make the grounds for praise and dismissal an empirical question for textual analysis.

Production and promotion add further complications. Commercial AI short-video production can be organized around rapid testing, templates and disposable accounts [25], but the use of generative tools does not establish that every producer works this way. In film promotion, human and AI descriptions of identical actor imagery produced competing quality and novelty judgments [3]. The absence of a significant main effect on narrative transportation in a second experiment also cautions against assuming a uniform response. How AI use is described therefore matters alongside the fact that it is disclosed.

The reviewed work addresses recognition of authorship, responses to provenance and disputes over AI slop's cultural value. The experiments examine how attribution affects evaluation [2], [3], [21], [22], while accounts of creative control and meaningful work explain why human participation matters [18], [19]. They leave a different question for this study: how do makers and critics justify the value of that participation when discussing the same projects? Close reading examines the reasons offered in those public exchanges. It can distinguish a claim about what a technology enables its user to do from a claim about what the resulting work offers its audience. The present analysis concerns the expression and contestation of these claims, rather than testing their effects on readers.

III. METHOD

A. Corpus and scope

The study examines 18 English-language online media articles published between July 11 and September 17, 2026. They were retrieved through Google News searches in October 2026 using “odysseus ai” and “odysseus ai slop.” Selection focused on the Odyssey debate, in which Nolan's statements and AI-generated adaptations prompted arguments about human creativity. An article was included when it addressed this controversy and offered an evaluative argument, a critical comparison or an interview discussion concerning creative contribution, production practices or the worth of the work. A brief announcement without such discussion was excluded, as was material using “Odyssey” for an unrelated subject. Selection therefore depended on the content of an article rather than its genre label alone.

The sample includes commentaries, reviews, interviews and news reports with relevant discussion. Table I identifies each article as A01–A18 and records its date and type. “AI slop” was included because it was a term being used within the controversy, not because it was adopted as the researcher's judgment of the films. Nevertheless, the query may favor critical accounts. The corpus was selected to examine arguments within this debate and cannot establish how common those arguments are in media coverage of AI filmmaking more broadly.

TABLE I. MEDIA CORPUS AND ARTICLE TYPES. ALL DATES ARE IN 2026.

ID	Source	Date	Genre / ref.
A01	Variety	22 Jul	Trade report [26]
A02	CBC News	15 Jul	News feature [27]
A03	Euronews	15 Jul	Commentary [8]
A04	The A.V. Club	14 Jul	Commentary [9]
A05	Variety	13 Jul	Trade report [5]
A06	IGN	11 Jul	News report [6]
A07	The Guardian	13 Jul	News report [28]
A08	Tbreak	12 Jul	News analysis [7]
A09	Polygon	22 Jul	Commentary [10]
A10	Dawn Images	23 Jul	Commentary [11]
A11	Euronews	22 Jul	Commentary [12]
A12	Rolling Stone Canada	22 Jul	Commentary [13]
A13	The Hollywood Reporter	20 Jul	Q&A interview [29]
A14	The Straits Times	11 Jul	AFP report [30]

ID	Source	Date	Genre / ref.
A15	Kotaku	14 Jul	Teaser criticism [31]
A16	The Verge	17 Sep	Film review [14]
A17	Cybernews	13 Jul	News analysis [32]
A18	TechCrunch	19 Jul	News report [33]

The analysis covered article headlines, introductory summaries, main text, subheadings and relevant captions. Advertisements, navigation menus, recommendations for other stories and automated summaries were excluded.

The articles discuss Nolan's film and public statements, Fountain 0's July teaser and September film release, and Grok-generated clips alongside Musk's announcements. These were kept separate during analysis so that criticism of one project or production stage was not attributed to another.

B. Close reading procedure

Close reading was used to examine how the articles gave reasons for valuing or dismissing creative work. It allows particular words and passages to be considered in relation to the argument of the whole text. The procedure drew on three steps: establishing the text's readability and the purpose of reading, exploring the text, and interpreting it [15]. These steps were adapted to the analysis of online media articles.

Each article was read in full, noting its author, publication date, article type and the project it discussed. Passages concerning authorship, creative work and AI use were then examined in context. The reading recorded the exact wording, its speaker, the work being discussed and the reason offered for praising or dismissing it. Attention was paid to naming, comparisons, qualifications and the order of quotations and responses. A phrase was interpreted in relation to the surrounding passage and the article's argument, rather than treated as a keyword with a fixed meaning.

The analysis distinguished the journalist's account from the statements of interviewees and other quoted speakers. For example, Nolan's own words were read separately from a reporter's explanation of them. Descriptions of film defects were attributed to the critics who reported them. Predictions about AI filmmaking were also kept as the speakers' claims rather than treated as established outcomes.

The article-level readings were compared by asking which accounts supported the same interpretation, which used a different reason for judgment and which qualified it. A comparison record linked the findings to source passages and recorded limits on each inference. For example, the dismissal of AI authorship in Euronews and The A.V. Club [8], [9] was read alongside Koosha's explanations in CBC and The Hollywood Reporter [27], [29]. The account of errors in The Verge [14] was considered alongside its admission that spotting those errors was entertaining. Nolan's acceptance of some tools [28], [30] and the film scholar's conditional acceptance in CBC [27] constrained any reading of the debate as a uniform rejection of AI. The findings describe these arguments and tensions, not categories inferred from how often a phrase appeared. Marketing rhetoric [1] and research on creative contribution [17–19] informed interpretation of the comparisons.

Some articles drew on the same interviews, including Nolan's remarks to AFP and The Telegraph. Repeated quotations were treated as shared source material, not independent confirmation of public opinion. Articles using that material were retained where their headlines, selection of quotations or added context allowed editorial differences to be examined. The two Euronews articles were also compared as related accounts by the same author. Claims found in only one article, such as The Verge's account of watching the completed film, remained attributed to that source rather than presented as a position shared by all 18 articles.

C. Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis was the article, with individual passages read in context. Audience comments quoted within an article were examined as part of the writer's presentation of the debate. They were not collected or analyzed as a separate audience dataset. The findings therefore concern the arguments presented in media coverage and how those arguments were expressed.

IV. Findings

A. Recognizing the creator and the contribution

Euronews questions Koosha's status as a filmmaker through the names it gives him and his work. It puts quotation marks around “director,” calls him a “content generator” and describes the project as a “135-minute AI video file” [8]. Together with “AI stunt,” these choices invite doubt about whether the work deserves to be called cinema. “File” alone would not carry that judgment. Its dismissive force comes from the surrounding descriptions and the writer's suspicion about the project's timing.

The A.V. Club similarly refers to “the person who clicked generate on that video file” [9]. This phrase replaces the filmmaker's name or professional role with a single action. It reduces production to pressing a button even though the article also reports that Koosha worked part-time for three months. The contrast matters: the writer includes information about time spent on the project while using wording that gives that work little creative weight.

Variety gives professional experience a different role in its coverage of Musk. The headline identifies Scott Derrickson through Doctor Strange before quoting his dismissal of Musk's knowledge of cinema [26]. Naming a familiar film establishes the basis of Derrickson's authority to make that judgment. The article also calls the Grok scene “manufactured,” but this word alone does not show that the writer denies it artistic value. The stronger evidence is the way the headline places a director's credentials beside his criticism of Musk.

The filmmakers explain their contribution differently. CBC quotes Koosha describing a “vision-to-screen possibility” [27]. Euronews reproduces his claim that AI reduces “the distance between a person with a story and the means to tell it” [8]. “Vision” and “a person with a story” place an originating idea before the use of a tool. These statements answer the button-press description with an account of human intention and access to production. They explain why the project matters to its maker without establishing the quality of its execution.

The Hollywood Reporter's interview develops this defense through a comparison with publishing on Substack [29]. Koosha explains that he can now express his interpretation through images and sound. The interviewer calls this a “discourse vehicle,” and Koosha responds with “tangential filmmaking.” The exchange presents the project as an interpretation that can exist alongside Nolan's film, rather than as its equivalent. The wording is developed jointly: the interviewer proposes one description and Koosha supplies another.

Koosha also relates the story to his own experience of moving from Iran to the West and being far from home [29].

That explanation gives the project a personal purpose that the button-press description leaves out. It does not settle the film's quality, but it makes the disagreement about authorship clearer. Critics emphasize how the images were generated. Koosha emphasizes why he wanted to make this particular version of the story.

B. Making craft and expertise grounds for value

Critics use visual defects to challenge different claims. In the Grok coverage, Polygon compares the generated figures with Dave Portnoy and Daisy Ridley, then criticizes the compression of the poem into brief shots [10]. Rolling Stone Canada compares the armor with a Halloween costume and the dresses with budget bridesmaid clothing [13]. These familiar comparisons make the promised historical accuracy seem implausible. They turn a claim of fidelity to Homer into an image of imitation drawn from contemporary popular culture.

These comparisons undermine a proposed selling point rather than simply listing unattractive details. The writers answer a promise of historical accuracy with images of contemporary imitation [10], [13]. Their criticism makes the ability to interpret the source, rather than reproduce its apparent surface, a basis for judging the adaptation.

Dawn Images extends the dispute beyond visual accuracy [11]. Its reverse-Midas analogy presents intervention by Musk as destructive rather than enriching. Its discussion of the literary source emphasizes interpretation and human concerns, while its concluding reference to hubris turns the classical material against the entrepreneur's confidence. The text questions whether reproducing selected surface details is an adequate account of adaptation. That argument differs from identifying an error in a frame: it disputes the criterion on which a proposed alternative is being promoted.

Kotaku gives its criticism of the Fountain 0 teaser a two-stage structure. The writer initially calls the images "incredibly impressive-looking," then qualifies that praise as "for something made by AI" [31]. "Just take a second glance" invites a more demanding inspection. The ensuing examples concern a changing face and rock-throwing figures that change shape and color between cuts. The sequence shifts the test from immediate visual impact to sustained continuity. The writer uses that shift to question whether the approach can support a full-length film. These are judgments of the teaser, not observations from viewing the completed release.

In September, The Verge reviewed the completed film rather than the teaser [14]. The critic describes a cyclops whose height changes between shots, bending oars and a sword turning into a dagger. The remark that the film seems designed to "prove why script supervisors exist" gives these defects a professional reference point. Instead of leaving them as isolated mistakes, it makes continuity work a reason to recognize specialist skill. The review's conclusion contrasts the small production team with the many skilled workers involved in filmmaking. This is the critic's argument about the value of that work, not an independent technical assessment by this study.

The review also describes an enjoyable part of watching a film it otherwise condemns. The writer and his child turn spotting mistakes into a game [14]. Their amusement coexists with the negative judgment, showing how this particular viewing experience provided entertainment without changing the reviewer's assessment of the film.

Nolan's reported wording supplies a positive counterpart. Variety and IGN quote his reference to 'more tactile, more real forms of storytelling' [5], [6]. The repeated 'more' presents physical production as a desirable direction, while 'real' connects a production method with an evaluative claim. Tbreak develops this association under the heading 'The Odyssey as a practical-effects statement' [7]. The film becomes an example through which the writer explains a defense of physical craft.

C. Creative access and the value offered to viewers

The Hollywood Reporter gives the filmmakers room to challenge the comparison with Nolan [29]. Koosha says "you can't judge them on the same terms" and contrasts the long history of conventional cinema with AI filmmaking's infancy. This appeal asks for different expectations of an emerging medium. It also shifts the discussion from whether the film matches a blockbuster to what might become possible through experimentation.

The interview does not leave that defense unchallenged. Questions about copying an existing hit and making films without actors bring commercial timing and employment back into the discussion [29]. The filmmakers must answer these objections as well as explain their intentions. Producer Tom Rogers predicts that actors could become more valuable. The interview presents this as his expectation, rather than evidence that AI production has already improved their position.

Other articles question why the project appeared close to Nolan's release. The A.V. Club's headline describes it as an attempt to appropriate his publicity [9]. Euronews includes Koosha's explanation of access but places it within criticism of the timing [8]. Kotaku goes further, calling the project a "tech demo" for software that Fountain 0 hopes to sell [31]. The writer thus recasts the project as a commercial demonstration, challenging the account of personal expression offered by its maker.

The Verge also judges the project as something sold to viewers. The critic describes paying $9.99 to rent it through a browser and mirroring a phone screen onto a television, "which is not exactly IMAX in 70mm" [14]. The comparison brings the conditions of viewing into an argument otherwise centered on production. The headline, "The 2.5-hour AI-generated Odyssey movie is 2.5 hours too long," turns the film's entire running time into a negative judgment. Price, duration and viewing conditions make the finished experience the test of worth. This is one critic's account of that experience, not evidence of what audiences generally received or felt.

Read together, these articles expose a tension between the opportunity to make a film and the reasons for watching it. The Hollywood Reporter interview develops a defense of access and experimentation [29], while The Verge judges the completed viewing experience [14]. This is an analytical comparison across the texts, not a claim that the critic directly answered that interview. The accusation of opportunistic timing introduces a further question about why the project was released [9], [31]. Recognition of personal expression does not by itself settle either objection.

D. Defending human judgment without rejecting every tool

Nolan's reported comments allow some uses of AI while rejecting others. Variety and IGN quote his qualification that not every aspect of the technology is useless or meaningless [5], [6]. The Guardian and The Straits Times report his expectation of useful imaging tools alongside his rejection of replacing people and creativity wholesale [28], [30]. Keeping

these statements together prevents his criticism from being read as opposition to every use of AI.

The outlets place these comments in different contexts. The Guardian adds an earlier statement about employers using AI to avoid responsibility [28]. Tbreak discusses regional cinema exhibition and calls the AI-voiced Odyssey audiobook an awkward footnote to Nolan's position [7]. IGN also mentions the audiobook [6]. These additions create different comparisons around the same remarks. The audiobook reference introduces a tension around adaptations of the story, not evidence that Nolan commissioned or controlled that separate project.

Cybernews places Nolan's remarks beside reports of AI storyboarding and objections to other industry uses [32]. This selection presents disagreement about particular applications rather than a single industry position. Attribution remains important: the statement that some tasks call for automation is the journalist's paraphrase, not a direct quotation from Nolan. The article combines these accounts with workforce concerns, which broaden the debate beyond whether audiences like generated images.

TechCrunch reports an exchange in which the interviewer introduces the Trojan horse and Nolan imagines it as transparent [33]. A horse that reveals the people inside changes the usual meaning of the metaphor. The danger is no longer hidden. Read with Nolan's following remarks about questioning the motives of technology providers, the image makes caution a response to a recognized concern. The article then notes that he did not specify the threat before adding context about Hollywood labor disputes. That labor context is the journalist's addition, not part of Nolan's explanation of the metaphor.

The same report quotes Nolan describing himself as a techno-skeptic and questioning why workable practices should be abandoned for new technology [33]. Alongside his comments about imaging tools [28], [30], this supports a distinction between accepting a useful application and accepting every change proposed in its name. The question becomes who decides how a technology is used and who remains responsible for the work.

E. Editorial selection and the shape of disagreement

Articles drawing on the same interview still make different editorial choices. Both The Guardian and The Straits Times reproduce Nolan's AFP remarks and distinguish widespread business uses of AI from resistance in creative industries [28], [30]. The Guardian additionally quotes his earlier warning against using AI to "sidestep responsibility," explicitly connecting the debate to employers' decisions [28]. The Straits Times does not include that earlier statement. The comparison therefore concerns the addition of employer responsibility, not an opposition between two entirely different accounts of AI adoption.

On July 22, Euronews organizes its criticism of Musk into three numbered lessons [12]. It starts with the fictional status of Homer's story, turns to Nolan's box-office success and ends with Fountain 0's earlier announcement. The lesson format casts Musk as someone who has failed to understand the subject. Each point dismisses a different part of his intervention: the demand for historical accuracy, the campaign against Nolan and the suggestion that an AI adaptation would be new.

In its third point, the Euronews article links Musk's proposed AI adaptation to Fountain 0's earlier project [12]. Calling both AI slop groups them within one controversy, even though the article distinguishes their timing. This link is made by the writer rather than by any shared production process. It is therefore important to keep the objects separate when interpreting the criticism: the claim about the earlier project is not a description of the Grok clip.

CBC places Koosha's explanation beside selected critical comments, a union representative's objections and a film scholar's conditional acceptance of AI [27]. Brenda Austin-Smith says a film made using such tools could enter her classroom if its maker had "creative vision and insight and skill and imagination." This condition locates value in how tools are used, rather than excluding a work because it uses AI. It also qualifies a simple opposition between critics and AI filmmakers. The quoted audience comments remain part of CBC's selection of voices, not an independently sampled measure of reception.

The form of the coverage affects which claims receive space and how they are tested. The Hollywood Reporter interview develops explanations of personal purpose. Commentaries challenge claims through ridicule and analogy, while reports place several speakers together. Human creativity consequently acquires different meanings across the corpus: personal interpretation, physical craft or coordinated professional work. It is not a single position shared by all 18 articles.

V. Discussion

A. Human contribution as a reason to value a film

For RQ1, the articles make claims about value by connecting human contribution with reasons to recognize a work. Professional credentials authorize criticism. Nolan's description of tactile production associates physical craft with real storytelling. The script-supervisor comparison makes specialist work apparent through failures of continuity. These devices give praise and criticism a persuasive basis [1]. They show how descriptions of production become arguments about what deserves attention. Editorial choices also shape these arguments. Euronews organizes its criticism into lessons, while CBC places competing voices together in a feature [12], [27]. These arrangements give different forms of authority and prominence to the claims. The media therefore participate in framing the disagreement through the voices they select and the order in which they present them.

An important finding is that both critics and AI filmmakers claim human creativity as a reason to value their preferred practices. Their disagreement concerns which contributions count. A director and a person who clicked generate are both human, but the descriptions assign different creative weight to their actions. This develops the distinction between the amount of assistance and the identity of the assistant [17]. It also brings creative control into the discussion [18]: the media accounts contest which decisions deserve recognition, even where the underlying workflow remains undocumented.

The script-supervisor comparison makes skilled coordination visible through its apparent absence [14]. It relates to the value of exercising expertise in creative work [19], but it is also an argument about what the film delivers. This connects labor with the viewing experience. Its force is specific to the review: defects are used to explain why the work is distracting. It should not become a general claim that generated imagery cannot be expressive, particularly when production research describes intentional uses of instability [20].

B. Competing reasons for recognizing creative value

For RQ2, a central tension lies between the maker's opportunity to express an idea and the critic's judgment of the result. Koosha's account of displacement and return gives the project a personal purpose. The Substack analogy presents it as an accessible way to share an interpretation. His defense asks for recognition of what AI made possible for him, rather than comparison with Nolan's production on identical terms.

Critics respond by evaluating continuity, commercial timing and the completed viewing experience. The dispute therefore cannot be settled by asking whether AI expands access. Access concerns the maker's opportunity, while a review can still ask whether the resulting film merits a viewer's time and money. The distinction is consistent with the argument that individual satisfaction alone does not exhaust questions of cultural value [4]. It also shows why claims about intention and claims about a finished product need separate examination.

Nolan's selective acceptance of imaging tools further complicates the opposition between humans and AI. His reported objections concern replacement and the motives of those proposing it. Meaningful creative work [19] and creative control [18] help interpret the importance placed on retaining human judgment. These concepts do not make his position identical to the filmmakers' access argument. The two positions value different aspects of participation, and the media coverage gives both a public form.

For marketing communication, the contribution is to show how media coverage can alter the value claimed through a production story. The opportunity to create may explain a project's importance to its maker, yet a film critic can answer with a different question: what does a paying viewer receive? The contribution to marketing rhetoric [1] is to show how a claim about creative opportunity can be challenged by a judgment of the finished product. Coverage therefore does more than circulate a claim. It can change the grounds on which that claim is judged. Practitioners need to distinguish what a production method makes possible from what it promises audiences. A claim of novelty or access may leave an objection about quality unanswered, a tension also evident in the film-label experiment [3].

C. Limitations and future research

The corpus contains English-language coverage of one controversy. Searching for "AI slop" follows language used in that debate and may favor critical accounts and overlook favorable or routine uses of AI. The corpus therefore represents discussion organized around this controversy, rather than the full range of reporting on AI filmmaking. The findings may not apply to other controversies or language contexts. Several articles share interview sources, and different formats give participants different amounts of space. Interpretation also depends on the questions and passages selected. Close reading requires attention to how those choices and the researcher's perspective shape the account [15].

Reported defects and production practices remain attributed to the articles. The study does not independently inspect every film or clip, measure audience responses or establish commercial effects. Future research could compare the public accounts with documented workflows and examine how readers respond to descriptions of specific creative decisions. Such work could test whether explaining a human contribution changes evaluations beyond a simple human or AI label.

VI. Conclusion

In the media articles examined here, human creativity is a reason advanced by both critics and AI filmmakers. Critics connect it with physical craft, specialist work and the quality of a finished film. AI filmmakers invoke personal interpretation and the opportunity to produce a work they could not otherwise make. Close reading shows how professional labels, comparisons and reported defects give these claims their force. Nolan's acceptance of some tools and the conditional acceptance expressed in CBC prevent the disagreement from being reduced to a uniform rejection of AI.

The case distinguishes recognition of a maker's contribution from acceptance of that contribution as a reason to value the result. Media coverage can place an account of creative opportunity beside a criticism of what the finished film offers. This explains how production stories are challenged in public communication about creative products. It does not establish which argument audiences accept. The conclusion is limited to this English-language controversy and the coverage retrieved through the stated searches.

Acknowledgment

ChatGPT (OpenAI) assisted with language editing and revision of wording based on the draft and analysis provided by the author. Research ideas and interpretations were developed by author who reviewed all revisions and takes responsibility for the final manuscript.

References

[1] C. Miles and T. Nilsson, “Marketing (as) rhetoric: An introduction,” Journal of Marketing Management, vol. 34, nos. 15–16, pp. 1259–1271, 2018.

[2] Y. Zhang and R. Gosline, “Human favoritism, not AI aversion: People’s perceptions (and bias) toward generative AI, human experts, and human–GAI collaboration in persuasive content generation,” Judgment and Decision Making, vol. 18, article e41, 2023.

[3] X. Dong and H. Zhang, “Can AI Replace Actors? Research on the Label Effect of Movie Actor on Audience Watching Intentions and Transportation,” International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, vol. 42, no. 10, pp. 7049–7066, 2026.

[4] S. Nishal, M. Sax and K. Kieslich, “Why AI Slop Matters, but Not Like That,” ACM AI Letters, vol. 1, no. 3, article 24, pp. 1–7, 2026.

[5] Z. Sharf, “Christopher Nolan Slams AI Slop and Disagrees With Matt Damon’s Defeatist Opinion That The Odyssey Is the Last Movie of Its Kind,” Variety, July 13, 2026. https://variety.com/2026/film/news/christopher-nolan-ai-slop-matt-damon-odyssey-defeatist-1236809705/

[6] M. Cripe, “The Odyssey Director Christopher Nolan Says AI Slop Is Being Utterly Rejected By Younger Audiences,” IGN, July 11, 2026. https://www.ign.com/articles/the-odyssey-director-christopher-nolan-says-ai-slop-is-being-utterly-rejected-by-younger-audiences

[7] D. Mohanna, “Christopher Nolan says young audiences are utterly rejecting AI slop ahead of The Odyssey,” Tbreak, July 12, 2026. https://tbreak.com/christopher-nolan-says-young-audiences-utterly-rejecting-ai/

[8] D. Mouriquand, “AI slop version of The Odyssey announced prior to release of Christopher Nolan’s epic blockbuster,” Euronews, July 15, 2026. https://www.euronews.com/2026/07/15/ai-slop-version-of-the-odyssey-announced-prior-to-release-of-christopher-nolans-epic-block

[9] D. Gillis, “AI slop version of The Odyssey seeks to appropriate Christopher Nolan’s publicity,” The A.V. Club, July 14, 2026. https://www.avclub.com/ai-slop-the-odyssey

[10] P. Hernandez, “Elon Musk is promising to make The Odyssey historically accurate with AI slop,” Polygon, July 22, 2026. https://www.polygon.com/elon-musk-the-odyssey-movie-grok-ai-christopher-nolan-historical-accuracy/

[11] Images Staff, “Elon Musk’s answer to Christopher Nolan’s The Odyssey is AI slop,” Dawn Images, July 23, 2026. https://images.dawn.com/news/1195579

[12] D. Mouriquand, “Elon Musk’s anti-Odyssey campaign backfires over threat to make AI version of Nolan’s epic,” Euronews, July 22, 2026.

https://www.euronews.com/2026/07/22/elon-musks-anti-odyssey-campaign-backfires-over-threat-to-make-ai-version-of-nolans-epic

[13] N. McCann Ramirez, "Musk Melts Down Over The Odyssey, Promises AI Slop Remake," Rolling Stone Canada, July 22, 2026. https://ca.rollingstone.com/tv-movies/tv-movie-news/elon-musk-melts-down-odyssey-ai-version/

[14] A. Webster, "The 2.5-hour AI-generated Odyssey movie is 2.5 hours too long," The Verge, September 17, 2026. https://www.theverge.com/entertainment/996499/ai-odyssey-movie-review

[15] A. Ohrvik, "What is close reading? An exploration of a methodology," Rethinking History, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 238–260, 2024.

[16] S. Beerends and C. Aydin, "Negotiating the authenticity of AI: How the discourse on AI rejects human indeterminacy," AI & Society, vol. 40, pp. 263–276, 2025.

[17] P. Formosa, S. Bankins, R. Matulionyte and O. Ghasemi, "Can ChatGPT be an author? Generative AI creative writing assistance and perceptions of authorship, creatorship, responsibility, and disclosure," AI & Society, vol. 40, pp. 3405–3417, 2025.

[18] W. Liu and W. Huang, "Authorship in Human-AI collaborative creation: A creative control theory perspective," Computer Law & Security Review, vol. 57, article 106139, 2025.

[19] S. Bender, "Generative-AI, the media industries, and the disappearance of human creative labour," Media Practice and Education, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 200–217, 2025.

[20] R. Zhang et al., "Generative AI for Film Creation: A Survey of Recent Advances," arXiv:2504.08296v1, 2025.

[21] S. B. Heimstad, A. H. Wien and T. Gaustad, "Machine heuristic in algorithm aversion: Perceived creativity and effort of output created by or with artificial intelligence," Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans, vol. 5, article 100190, 2025.

[22] H. S. Lim, B. G. Lee, Y. H. Sung and C. W. Jung, "Human-made vs. AI-generated: How provenance labels drive strategic curation via perceived effort," Frontiers in Psychology, vol. 17, article 1840483, 2026.

[23] F. Westbrook, "AI Slop's carnival of (im)possibilities: The trial of 'genuine' versus 'generated' visualities," Convergence, pp. 1–19, 2026.

[24] L. Morrison, "What Makes AI Slop (or Not)," in SIGGRAPH Talks '26, ACM, article 111, pp. 1–2, 2026.

[25] J. Tang, X. Yu, P. Wikström and K. Pappalardo, "Behind the 'AI slop': Exploring the AI-generated viral short video production in China," AI & Society, pp. 1–13, 2026.

[26] E. Shanfeld, "Doctor Strange Director Says Elon Musk Doesn't Know S— About Cinema After Musk Vows to Make AI Odyssey: His Opinions on Art Are Worthless," Variety, July 22, 2026. https://variety.com/2026/film/news/doctor-strange-director-slams-elon-musk-ai-odyssey-1236818552/

[27] R. Raycraft, "A tale of two Odysseys: Nolan's blockbuster gets AI-generated competition," CBC News, July 15, 2026, updated July 23, 2026. https://www.cbc.ca/news/entertainment/the-odyssey-ai-movie-9.7269663

[28] Guardian staff and agencies, "Christopher Nolan says people disdain AI and the idea it will replace humans is nonsense," The Guardian, July 13, 2026. https://www.theguardian.com/film/2026/jul/13/christopher-nolan-odyssey-director-comments-ai-artificial-intelligence

[29] S. Zeitchik, "What's Really In the AI Odyssey Film," The Hollywood Reporter, July 20, 2026. https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/business/digital/ai-the-odyssey-what-is-it-where-to-watch-1236652547/

[30] AFP, "People disdain AI, says The Odyssey director Christopher Nolan," The Straits Times, July 11, 2026, updated July 13, 2026. https://www.straitstimes.com/life/entertainment/people-disdain-ai-says-the-odyssey-director-christopher-nolan

[31] J. Walker, "Why Watch Christopher Nolan's The Odyssey When You Could Instead Sit Through 135 Minutes Of AI Slop?" Kotaku, July 14, 2026. https://kotaku.com/the-odyssey-christopher-nolan-odysseus-the-fall-ai-slop-movie-2000715809

[32] G. Radauskas, "The Odyssey is almost here, and Christopher Nolan has words about AI slop," Cybernews, July 13, 2026, updated July 14, 2026. https://cybernews.com/ai-news/christopher-nolan-ai-slop/

[33] A. Ha, "Odyssey director Christopher Nolan calls AI an obvious Trojan horse," TechCrunch, July 19, 2026. https://techcrunch.com/2026/07/19/odyssey-director-christopher-nolan-calls-ai-an-obvious-trojan-horse/