BEGIN TRANSCRIPT (REFINED)

Okay, this is a new dictation recording. It's February 16th, and I'm thinking about information and how it's perceived in this day and age. I'm considering the process of organizing one's desktop and the psychological landscape that comes with having a massive trove—an archive—of personal records on a computer's hard drive.

I demand a change in the conception of information and data itself. We have, as we know from the case of Ted Nelson in Herzog's "Low and Behold," only replicated a virtual mirror of the real world. In other words, the very language we use to interface with computers is dependent on a set of functions resembling the physical office space: documents, folders, bits of chicken scratch, numbers, receipts, pictures, and bills. It's a vestige from the transfer to the new internet that we still function under this paradigm. Or rather, we accept this user interface between man and machine as common and sensible when, in fact, there are many more dimensions to explore regarding how information is represented and how it relates to other information.

Using task management, synthesis, the scientific method, and creative practices within a digital platform, there must be an order that is both intelligible and useful for humans—especially regarding AI. It relies on a conversational format wherein the human prompts the computer via an initial stimulus, often text or language or symbols, but increasingly documents like images, audio, code, and so forth. In fact, AI writing editors are now built into native Apple iOS: ChatGPT can be enabled without creating an account if you have an Apple product capable of running "Apple intelligence." Much of the writing for this very project has gone through a pipeline that would have been entirely different twenty years ago. Back then, producing text documents might have meant transcription to physical paper using a typewriter or a rudimentary printer. The word processor used to be dependent on physical memory space and the need to manage documents relative to one another. Now, this has shifted into a new paradigm.

For me, it begins with audio: at this moment I'm speaking in an isolated booth, recording on my phone. I will airdrop this recording to my laptop

and transcribe it using an AI agent. Then I'll export a text file and put it into ChatGPT as part of a larger collection of transcripts that will ultimately form a single set of documents for future publication. In other words, the editor is now replaced by free and immediately available computational solutions worldwide—at least for those who can afford "Apple intelligence."

We see this phenomenon of the "null editor" in social media as well. If social media is an extension of what we saw on television—edited audio-visual content uploaded for a wide audience scattered across the globe—now that transmission is typically corporatized or capitalized. People can publish in small quantities to a digital "social sphere" that's very diffuse.

Back to writing and the role of a digital agent capable of computation: what role does this occupy in the artistic process? I use large language models every day for feedback. To my knowledge, they represent some average of the data they were trained on, essentially "the internet" or publicly available digitized information. Of course, companies such as OpenAI, Anthropic (for Claude), or even Apple's native tools decide what data to include in their models.

The friction between humans and published writing is now as small as the friction between a person and oration. What I'm speaking now may effectively be working text for a legitimate book that could be read or consumed by a large audience in audio-visual form, paraphrased or edited transcripts, or even published on paper. This concept of a digital "mental presence," in which the inhabitants of your mind—ideological or otherwise—can be accessed intuitively via a digital interface, is revolutionary on a larger scale than the invention of the blog.

As an example, I put all my daily text into a dedicated webpage or archive. This website was free to create, and I used ChatGPT's coding assistance to build enough of a front and back end to host it for free on GitHub. I'm working on creating a personal server with my own hardware so that I can host as much content as I'm physically capable of storing. This is done without relying on the frameworks of big companies like Meta or by paying a subscription.

However, consider the ideological “scum fuck” of our political administration and the Department of Governmental Efficiency. We have the scenario of “there will be blood,” with a main character named Elon Musk who purchased Twitter two years ago, and Mark Zuckerberg who owns a company that collects and sells user data—browsing patterns, device specs, location, school emails, file names, everything. It’s unclear how one determines the explicitness of any given engagement, because these files are handed to you in their raw HTML form, with titles and IDs. This “parameter God” dictates the content I receive every second I spend on Instagram, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, pornographic accounts, TikTok, Xiaohongshu—everything is accounted for by data in the vaults of very few companies led by very few men.

Our Constitution wasn’t designed for this. How can freedom of speech account for a world that’s serially traceable? I’m not sure. I feel compelled to note this question of humanity’s future. Are we expiring? Have we begun to rot, if you listen to the newer generations—or, God forbid, are one of them?

My dear human, you mustn’t let the tools overcome the wielder. That’s where we’ll go if we don’t make radical changes. Meditate not only on the severity of this tragedy but also on the weight of your profound role in it. Speak to your kin with the life that sustains you, and embrace the inevitable shift to a world where the dilemma between man and computer could mean the extinction of both parties.

I’d like to do a short reading from H. G. Wells’s *A Short History of the World*:

“…Or by their being swept out to sea and sinking down out of quick seas. This question of organic evolution, like the question of the age of the earth, has in the past been the subject of much bitter controversy. There was a time when a belief in organic evolution was for rather obscure reasons supposed to be incompatible with sound Christian, Jewish, and Muslim doctrine. That time has passed, and the men of the most orthodox Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and Mohammedan

belief are now free to accept this newer and broader view of a common origin for all living things.

“No life seems to have happened suddenly upon Earth. Life grew and grows, age by age, through gulfs of time at which imagination reels. Life has been growing from a mere stirring in the intertidal slime towards freedom, power, and consciousness. Life consists of individuals. These individuals are definite things. They are not like lumps and masses, nor even the limitless, motionless crystals of non-living matter. They have two characteristics no dead matter possesses: they can assimilate other matter into themselves and make it part of themselves, and they can reproduce themselves. They eat, and they breed. They can give rise to other individuals, for the most part like themselves, but always also a little different from themselves. There is a specific and family resemblance between an individual and its offspring, and there is an individual difference between every parent and every offspring it produces. This is true in every species and at every stage of life.

“Now scientific men are not able to explain to us either why offspring should resemble nor why they should differ from their parents. But seeing that offspring do at once resemble and differ, it is a matter rather of common sense than scientific knowledge that if the conditions under which a species lives are changed, the species should undergo some correlated changes. Because in any generation of the species, there must be a number of individuals whose individual differences make them better adapted to the new conditions, and a number whose differences make it harder for them to live. On the whole, the better-adapted sort will live longer, bear more offspring, and reproduce themselves more abundantly than the other, and so, generation by generation, the average of the species changes in the favorable direction. This process, which is called natural selection, is not so much a scientific theory as a necessary deduction from the facts of reproduction and individual difference. There may be many forces at work—varying, destroying, and preserving species—about which science may still be unaware or undecided, but the man who can deny the operation of this process of natural selection upon life since its beginning must be either ignorant of the elementary facts of life or

incapable of ordinary thought.”

END TRANSCRIPT (REFINED)

SUMMARY: This recording contemplates the evolution of how we interface with technology—specifically the desktop metaphor and how it shapes our conception of information. The speaker argues that our digital environments merely mirror physical office spaces (folders, documents) and that there is potential for more flexible, multidimensional methods of organizing and relating information.

They point to current artificial intelligence tools that radically shift the writing and editorial process. They observe that large language models and AI-powered transcription/editing have removed much of the friction between spoken thought and published text. The speaker also expresses concerns about data ownership and privacy, highlighting major tech companies and their sweeping data-collection practices. There is an undercurrent of caution about allowing tools to dominate humanity’s creativity and autonomy. They end with an excerpt from H. G. Wells’s *A Short History of the World*, illustrating how evolution, like our digital ecosystems, proceeds via adaptation and selection—concepts that should encourage critical reflection on the interplay between humans, AI, and the future of society.