

Generative AI is a summary, of sorts. AIs are massive collections of information built to recognize patterns. When a user prompts an AI, it responds following a predicted path of something it has seen before, compiled, flattened, and synthesized. I think often about Ted Chiang's essay "[ChatGPT is a Blurry JPEG of the Web](#)" from 2023 (now an ancient piece on the subject of AI, in only a few years) – arguing that the chatbot returns a lossy, compressed version of knowledge it has scraped from a much larger, denser source. Which is true, if what one is going for is factual accuracy – in the arts, those gaps where an AI hallucinates in its own understanding or knowledge might be the fun part.

I appreciate the perspective shared in class that AI is a general-purpose technology, comparable to electricity. Certainly, it currently feels as impactful on contemporary culture. It's a tool, and artists who value innovation in their technologies can make good work of it, speeding up previously tedious forms of labour like summarizing long texts, image manipulation, transcribing audio, writing and debugging code, etc.

I'm very inspired by Danielle Boyer's [SkoBots](#)! It's a language chatbot (literally, it's a physical object) intended to be used as a language revitalization tool for Anishinaabemowin. The dataset was intentionally and ethically sourced, and the robot intends to deepen community relations and a sense of belonging rather than replace human interaction or alienate/isolate. Also, the construction and design of the robot itself is gorgeous – and I love that it rides around on one's shoulder, as a public declaration of AI use rather than shameful and secretive. It's also relatively affordable, for a robot, making it intentionally accessible to the communities it serves. I'm honestly so impressed and so happy something like that exists.