1. What were some things you were confused about? For what reasons were those things confusing? What would you need to know in order to better understand the things that confused you?
   1. I was kind of confused on his stance on RACTER in the beginning because he would talk about all the negative points it posessed and how it wasn’t true literature, but then he appears to switch his opinion on RACTER and call it its own genre of literature. I was also confused about the people who referenced, but I just inferred that they were theorists of the time. Those things were confusing because my lack of knowledge about his references and an unclear opening to his writing. I would need to know more about the people he mentioned and the second confusion was cleared up as I continued to read.
2. What were some interesting or insightful things? For what reasons were those things interesting or insightful?
   1. Some insightful things were how Bök talked about what RACTER meant for the future of literature and how human patterns and literature can be expressed through an algorithm and what this might reflect about human literature. These topics were interesting because AI is a growing field and addressing these topics is crucial to better understand AI’s fit in society.