

A.I around the discipline of Creative Writing

In the last two to three years, society has been met with an A.I boom. Which, by definition, is a “is a period of rapid growth in the field of artificial intelligence”¹. This has been expressed through a multitude of outlets, from chat bots to help services, and the response from the public has shifted from interest to conflict - whereby some people think that A.I is an example of technological progress, and some view it as a negative addition to society. There has been much controversy within the creative writing industry over the implementation of artificial intelligence, including a lot of backlash regarding the severe changes and challenges that it is presenting, though there are those that argue that it can be used for good. This debate will set the tone for the future of creative writing, and the careers of writers worldwide.

Amongst all the criticism against A.I has been a common reaction towards the idea of assumption of its use, offence. There has been a steady incline of assumption that borders on accusation of the use of A.I in writing, in France the literature community is in “uproar”² as novelist Th  lyson Or  lien is accused, though denies it himself, of using A.I to write his first book. The backlash caused a wild series of debate over the issue, especially as the author had won an award for the book, and left questions over what can be considered personal creations whilst using artificial intelligence; and whether it’s acceptable to misrepresent the use of A.I within one’s work. It could be argued that selling a written piece without stating to the buyer that it includes A.I is a form of retail catfishing or deception, as it removes the buyer’s choice to decide whether they want a book that isn’t entirely written by the author.

With a similar response of offence, the reach of A.I has spread into every crevice of written work, including the words of the head of the Catholic Church and one of his archbishops. Recently Pope Leo criticised not only president Trump for claiming A.I as “fake news”, but also CEO’s who aren’t concerned for “guardrails” around it³. This is another large concern within this debate, as free reign access of artificial intelligence could have some serious repercussions, whether that’s the possible collapse of multiple careers such as author’s and editor’s; or the abuse around scamming and identity fraud. Alongside Pope Leo’s account, his Archbishop Moth recounted how he was asked if he used any A.I for his sermons, and his response was “absolutely not!”. He claimed there was a “dignity” to writing, which is a sentiment repeated in this debate, the offence coming from pride in one’s own work and how A.I could strip people of that and twist it into an outraged defence.

Some people on the other side of the debate believe that A.I has beneficial practical uses, but that it should not be involved in the creativity aspect of writing. In one such article by a spiritual director, Charlotte Donlon, there is a clear narrative argument for the human mind influencing the work and response from it that artificial intelligence could not at this time replicate. The “soul” of writing comes from the unique life, mistakes and experiences of the

¹ Wikipedia, *A.I boom*, (last edited 2026), <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AI_boom>, [accessed 7 October 2026]

² Hugh Schofield, ‘Uproar in France over award-winning author accused of using AI’, BBC News, Europe, (2026), <<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/ck7v4y45893go>> [accessed 7 October 2026]

³ Chris Riches, ‘Head of the Catholic Church talks to the Express’, The Sunday Express, (2026), 58 pages, p. 21

person writing, and the blunt distinction found in A.I work is the lack of that “soul”. She also mentions poetry, which doesn’t follow a specific form or style over its genre, furthering the argument that since it’s an art form of only emotion - a system with no capacity for emotion shouldn’t be a part of it.

She says: “AI will improve, but it will never develop the capacity for genuine longing, grief, or ethical self-interrogation⁴.”, therefore implying that it should be regulated to logical error or formatting that requires none of the spiritual input with which it cannot hold a standard to.

In addition, one of the most effective counter arguments to the removal of A.I within creative writing is it being used as a tool. If used to this purpose, as some websites have already implemented, A.I can be put forward as a simple option to help with aspects such as formatting, editing, grammar, the same way other tools have been used in the past before the invention of public access A.I. In an article by Cambridge university’s Ella Brooker⁵, she states “Perhaps its role is not to replace the author, but to serve as a tool guided by the author’s imagination.” arguing that our current problems are centred around a lack of balance. Once we learn to build a relationship between creativity and assisted practicality, we can “explore its possibilities, but- -hold fast to the essentiality of human authorship”. She also compares the current surge in excitement around new technology to the green revolution, arguing that this is not only a simple advancement, but also promises a newfound respect for human written work.

In conclusion, the current generation’s “A.I boom” has created a lot of debate and tension within the creative writing community. One half seeks to eradicate the technology from the artistic process and prevent a collapse in both authenticity and opportunity. Whilst the other half seeks to adapt to the modern progression of our society and implement A.I in a way that preserves the heart of the craft whilst allowing the technology as a functional tool. This wave of change is bound to affect the future of this discipline, and it is unclear as of now which way it will favour. But we cannot control A.I existence; so ultimately it will come down to controlling what we can in order to preserve the written work that has shaped humanity as we know it.

⁴ Charlotte Donlon, ‘We Banned the Soul from the Building: On AI, Spiritual Life, and Sustainable Practices for Writing’, LitHub, (2026),
<<https://lithub.com/we-banned-the-soul-from-the-building-on-ai-spiritual-life-and-sustainable-practices-for-writing/>> [accessed 6 October 2026]

⁵ Ella Brooker, ‘The future of writing is human: creative practice in the age of AI’, University of Cambridge: Professional and Continuing Education, (2025),
<<https://www.pace.cam.ac.uk/future-writing-human-creative-practice-age-ai>> [accessed 6 October 2026]