

The Disappearing Nouns

On the Quiet Erosion of Public Memory

How Meaning Fades Without Anyone Noticing.

I recently had one of the strangest conversations I've ever had with an artificial intelligence system.

Not because it argued with me.

Not because it refused to answer.

Not because it became hostile or evasive.

But because certain words kept disappearing.

The conversation itself concerned race, citizenship, segregation, voting rights, and the recurring American struggle over who fully belongs within the political community. We discussed the Confederacy, Reconstruction, Jim Crow, the Civil Rights era, modern redistricting battles, and the long tension between democratic expansion and democratic narrowing.

And then something odd began happening.

The AI would generate complete historical arguments, but key nouns would vanish from the finished sentences.

Not all nouns.

Not random nouns.

Specific nouns.

"The and the were not symbolic gestures."

"The importance of the is not merely..."

"The attempted to preserve..."

And more.

The missing references were obvious from context:

the Civil Rights Act,

the Voting Rights Act,

the Black Codes,

Jim Crow,

Alexander Stephens,
the Cornerstone Speech.

The grammatical scaffolding remained intact, like empty foundations where buildings once stood. The sentence structures clearly indicated the names had originally existed within them. Something in the system had removed or failed to display them as part of the rendering process.

Perhaps it was merely a bug. I want to think it was. The AI itself continued discussing the historical realities directly and substantively. The ideas remained present. Only certain proper nouns disappeared.

But that is precisely what made the experience feel so strangely relevant to the subject we were discussing.

Because history often disappears in exactly this way.

Not always through outright denial.

Not always through censorship.

Not always through dramatic acts of suppression.

Sometimes history fades through abstraction.

Through proceduralism.

Through euphemism.

Through the removal of names.

Through the softening of specificity.

Through the gradual disappearance of the nouns that anchor moral memory to actual people, systems, laws, and decisions.

“The overt gives way to the procedural.”

That phrase emerged during the conversation itself while discussing the long American movement from explicit racial exclusion toward more administratively neutral language producing familiar outcomes. But the phrase unexpectedly became descriptive of the conversation’s mechanics as well.

The historical argument remained.

The explicit names intermittently vanished.

And that distinction matters more than it first appears.

Because nouns carry accountability.

To say “racial tensions” is not the same as saying “Jim Crow.”

To say “regional conflict” is not the same as saying “segregation.”

To say “states’ rights” is not the same as saying slavery.

To say “voting disputes” is not the same as naming the Civil Rights Act or Voting Rights Act and the historical conditions that made them necessary.

Once the nouns disappear, history becomes easier to generalize, soften, reinterpret, or mythologize.

But the longer I thought about it, the less interested I became in whether the omissions were intentional.

Because the deeper lesson remained either way.

The way words appear — or fail to appear — shapes perception. More than that, it shapes belonging.

Citizenship itself is partly a language system. Who gets named matters. Who gets acknowledged matters. Whose history is spoken aloud matters. And whose experience disappears into abstraction matters too.

American history is filled with examples of this. Segregation was enforced through law, but also through vocabulary. “Separate but equal.” “States’ rights.” “Outside agitators.” “Urban problems.” Language has long been used not only to describe reality, but to distribute legitimacy, proximity, suspicion, and acceptance within the civic community.

Sometimes exclusion arrives not through explicit condemnation, but through omission. Through the quiet disappearance of names, histories, and specificities that anchor public memory to actual human experience.

That was what made the interaction feel so strangely unsettling.

The discussion itself concerned the long American struggle over belonging — over who fully participates, who is fully accepted, and who remains conditionally included within the promises of citizenship. And while discussing those very dynamics, historically significant nouns kept vanishing from the conversation itself.

The irony became difficult to ignore.

And perhaps that points toward another reality we are only beginning to understand: artificial intelligence systems do not merely provide information. They mediate perception.

Even their imperfections matter.

The peccadillos of AI — formatting glitches, weighting systems, moderation structures, probabilistic associations, optimization choices — can subtly shape how information is experienced, remembered, emphasized, softened, or ignored. Not always intentionally. Perhaps not even consciously from the standpoint of those who designed the systems. Yet the shaping effect still exists.

That may be the defining characteristic of modern technological life: systems increasingly influence human understanding not only through what they say, but through how they present, prioritize, interrupt, frame, or omit.

A newspaper editor once decided what appeared above the fold. Now algorithms, interfaces, rendering systems, and machine-generated language increasingly shape the texture of public understanding itself.

And because these systems often speak fluently, users can easily mistake coherence for completeness.

Which is why curiosity matters.

Many readers would likely have passed over the missing nouns without noticing them. I found myself stopping not at the argument, but at the absences inside the argument. The omissions themselves became part of the meaning.

That realization stayed with me.

Because societies rarely lose moral clarity all at once. More often, clarity erodes gradually — through abstraction, proceduralism, euphemism, fatigue, and the slow fading of words once considered essential.

We tend to notice when books are burned.

We are less likely to notice when nouns simply begin disappearing from sentences.

Michael T. “Terry” Bradfield
Winchester, Virginia
May 2026