

Typewriter AI

Juan Santiago Posada Abal

March 2025

Authorial style in the age of AI is found in the process of creation. In a world in which AI can replicate the style of artists with little to no effort, authorial style, specifically proof of authorship, lies more in how a piece is made, rather than the final object. The piece argues for this point by being a human deconstruction of how AI vomits out art. The base process of scraping, cutting and shuffling are quite comparable but the greatest difference is that machine learning models are a black box whereas the piece shows the whole process of creation, shows proof of humanity. Special importance is also given to those portions of the task that require active involvement by the artist, such as the pasting together of segments and the reading itself. Mistakes are prized as they are part of the process, part of being human.

The piece “I, Human” by Margaret Renkl was chosen as it advocates for the menial process of editing that is being replaced by quick-to-answer large language model oracles. By rejecting the computer’s superhuman ability to process words, the human aspect can flourish beyond it. Furthermore, by interacting with texts in a physical form the computer’s superhuman ability to process and mangle word is rejected. The mind reads portions of text as the hands slice them and tape them together at random. Renkl says that the “search for the right word to fill the right place can occupy a lifetime” and I believe that the slow and meditative effort behind this project can last a lifetime as well (Renkl 2025). This is reminiscent of OuLiPo’s hesitance to accept Dmitri Starynkevitch’s computer version of *Cent mille milliards de poèmes*. No matter how random it may seem, turning the reins over completely to a computer is a sure way of removing the human aspect.

The human aspect is shown by the slow process of scraping and cutting and organizing and pasting and reading and so on and so on. By showing the process, even if in a sped-up form, it honors the labor. While the computer can do the same task in milliseconds, there is a special value to the human, just for being human. By not modifying the original text – as in it could be reconstructed if something unshuffled everything – the new meaning of the deformance is in the process, is in the

glorifying of the menial tasks of copying, cutting, and pasting. Time is also very important. The least human parts, the typing and cutting, occur at night. The pasting and reading, something quite human, is done during the day. The night shows the solitude involved while the daytime shows the thinking required and the implicit connection that there is between the paster, the original author, and the general culture which results in the final texts.

At the same time, this project also pokes fun at what large language models can lead to. I have worried about in the past, and Renkl's article brought anxieties back to the surface. Modern life is a long process of streamlining tasks and the erasure of casual, meaningless interactions. For example, making a reservation at a restaurant or looking for a book at a library can be done through a personless website. Now, one does not even need to ask friends to proofread their papers. Everything is being put through machines that seek to "flatten the human mind, to homogenize human thought" (Renkl 2025). If people give themselves completely to AI writers, then most people's writing process will not look too dissimilar from the buffoon retyping papers through a typewriter.

It also looks at style. Since I did not edit the result cut-up, the resulting syntagma is still that of Renkl's. As Wolff says when writing about *Atelier de Littérature Assistée par la Mathématique et les Ordinateurs'* Rimbaudelaire, a project that mashed-up Rimbaud's poetic structure and Baudelaire's vocabulary, "texts produced through applicational methods still bear the mark of the inventor" (Wolff 2007). Since the style is maintained through this anthro artificial intelligence process, AI is not transformative. Cutting up random materials and sticking them back together is not enough to successfully evade plagiarism. Regardless, it does show another text within the text. Phrases like "message film" sound like some strange mid-century sci fi and Mr. Dickey is now some strange figure with no real meaning. It is difficult to recognize what the original text was about, but the resulting combination still deals with the theme of authorship and A.I. Just like real LLMs, there are unedited fragments of the original text strewn about.

I am not confident that the way in which the text is used would be considered transformative, in either the court of law or public opinion. That is part of the reason behind videoing the process.

Process shows intention, which is necessary for any creative aim. In today's age, process is the best proof we can have for authorship, and even if I am not the unique author of the final piece, I am honest in how it was made. As AI becomes even more prevalent in our lives and better at mimicking us, honesty will become ever more important. As it becomes a better assistant, community will become even more important. The answer to a world in which AI makes solitary creative processes easier and easier is to become collaborative and not allow ourselves to lose the human aspect of creation. Intention is also lost by using AI. It is incredibly easy to type a lazy prompt to get back a couple paragraphs of digital diarrhea and turn it in without thinking. The best way to ensure originality and a beautiful product is to accept the struggle, dissatisfaction, and frustration that comes along with the euphoria of creation. And that is exactly how AI changes authorship, as the final prize is ever easier to replicate with AI, the process will become more and more valuable, yet harder to attain, like a letterpress versus a Xerox.

## Works Cited

Renkl, Margaret. 2025. "I, Human." *The New York Times*, February 24, 2025.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2025/02/24/opinion/i-human.html>.

Wolff, Mark. 2007. "Reading Potential: The Oulipo and the Meaning of Algorithms." *Digital*

*Humanities Quarterly* 1 (1). <https://dhq-static.digitalhumanities.org/pdf/000005.pdf>.