

Aesthinema.

Making Cinema Under a Consistency Constraint

@jeffrey

Aesthetic Computer · Working Draft, July 2026

These tools cannot hide one smell on their own: continuity. A face, a garment, a prop drifts from shot to shot, and the drift reads as the machine. This paper reports how that smell is fought inside a working, released body of generative media — not with training or node graphs, but with three plain moves (canonical input imagery, descriptive text drawn from visual analysis, and director approvals), a small purpose-built “wizard” that keeps a human in the approval seat, and a set of ordinary hosted services stitched together in plain English. It also reports the uncomfortable part: right now the medium is shaping the story. What these tools can consistently produce quietly constrains what one can consistently tell — and a body of work made to survive that constraint has a recognizable, forgiving look. We name that look, trace how the pipeline was assembled over four months, catalog where its output is published, and mark the frontier where the constraint still binds.

1. THE SMELL IS CONTINUITY

Every generation is plausible in isolation. The failure is temporal: put two frames of the same subject beside each other and the small disagreements — a collar that changes weave, a pen that migrates across a pocket, a keyboard that becomes a typewriter — announce that no single thing was ever really *there*. That announcement is the “smell” of the tools. It is not removed by a better sampler or a larger model; it is removed by pinning identity to something real and refusing to let it wander.

The claim of this paper is narrower and more awkward than a method write-up usually admits. The consistency problem is not only a production obstacle to be engineered away. It is, today, an *authorial constraint*. The stories one can reliably tell with generative media are bounded by what the medium can hold still. Work made honestly inside that boundary — and the released body described here was made honestly inside it — inherits a look: soft, bulky, forgiving, a little cartoon. Section 5 names that look and argues it is partly a consistency strategy in disguise. First, the moves that buy back as much continuity as the current tools allow.

2. THREE MOVES

No LoRA, no fine-tuning, no node editor. The method is three disciplines applied in order, each one narrowing the space in which the model is free to invent.

1. Canonical input imagery. The model never invents the subject. Every generation carries a fixed set of reference images of the *real* thing — the actual person, the actual object — so identity is anchored to a photograph rather than to the model’s imagination. In the Aesthetic Computer portrait work this is a curated corpus of real photographs of the subject; in client work it is

the client’s own drawings. The reference set is not a suggestion appended to a prompt; it is the load-bearing element. Elements pinned hard to a reference hold across a whole sequence. Elements left to description alone wander (Section 5).

2. Descriptive text from visual analysis. One sits with the ideal image and writes the subject down in obsessive, specific detail — not a vibe, the actual read of what is present. A prompt in this practice does not say “a pen.” It says: “*a yellow Sailor Pro Gear fountain pen clipped into the shirt chest pocket, the clip hooked over the pocket’s top hem, the barrel tucked down inside so only the capped top stands above the pocket.*” The closer the words track a real reference, the less room the model has to drift. The description is authored against the canonical imagery of Move 1, so the two reinforce: the picture pins the identity, the words pin the read.

3. Director approvals. Options per beat, a selection pass, re-rolls on anything off-model, and nothing advances without a sign-off — the same loop one would run with a human animator. The difference is only that generation makes the iterations cheap enough to actually run every time. This is where the tooling lives (Section 3). The approval seat is not automatable; it is the point.

3. THE WIZARDS: APPROVAL AS INFRASTRUCTURE

Move 3 is only real if sign-off is fast. The practice therefore carries a small suite of native macOS applications — informally, the “wizards” — each a purpose-built station in the pipeline: a clip wizard for auditioning and picking motion takes, a shot wizard for laying out storyboards, a juke wizard for rating and annotating




Figure 1. ClipWizard (native macOS) auditioning a lane’s motion takes. Per section: the picked take in a scrub player, its generating prompt, and the keep / re-roll / assemble controls. Picking is free; only a re-roll spends money, and the old take is archived, never lost.

the finished track library, and further wizards for type and calendaring. They are real desktop apps, not web pages; they share one sign-in and read the same on-disk conventions the generators write, so approval sits in the pipeline as *infrastructure* rather than as an ad-hoc judgment made in a file browser. Figure 1 shows the clip wizard on one lane: the current section, its take in a scrub player, the motion prompt that produced it, and the keep/re-roll/assemble controls — the approval gate as a native window.

What the wizards operate on is a spread of candidates. Every beat is generated several times over; Figure 2 shows four takes of a single beat — the same moment, the same subject, four framings. The identity holds across all four (canonical imagery and description doing their work); what differs is the *read*, and choosing the read is the director’s job. The wizard is where one take is kept, the rest archived, and anything off-model re-rolled — the same loop one would run with a human animator, made cheap enough to run on every beat. When the row is right, the final cut is assembled *from the picks*, without re-spending on shots already owned.

The node-graph tools popular for this work (ComfyUI and kin) offer real capabilities the practice does not otherwise reach — region/spot treatment, painting a correction into one patch of a frame, and a visual board of the whole pipeline. But granular control and a legible pipeline do not require living in a node editor. The control that matters here is the approval gate, and it is a native app pointed at the takes on disk.

4. PLAIN ENGLISH AND HOSTED SERVICES

The working method is, deliberately, boring: plain-English description plus a handful of hosted services, stitched with a little glue code. Frames come from `gpt-image-2` (OpenAI); motion from Seedance 2.0 (via `fal.ai`); talking shots, when needed, from Kling AI Avatar; music, notably, from *no* model at all — it is Aesthetic



Figure 2. Four candidate takes of one beat (*amaythingra*, opening — the subject at his desk). Same moment, same subject, four framings; the likeness holds across all four. The wizard is where the director keeps one and re-rolls the rest — options per beat, made cheap enough to judge every time.

Computer’s own synthesis. There is no training step and no node editor in the loop.

Figure 3 makes a small point concretely. A director learning a node tool partly to *see* a pipeline can have that view for free: an LLM will emit a chart or a node board directly from the pipeline it already runs, shop the candidate services, and write the glue that stitches them — including, if one wants a starting point for something more elaborate, a ComfyUI board to build on. The picture is cheap. The disciplines of Section 2 are what is expensive, and what is worth keeping.

Where it goes out. A pipeline is only a practice if its output is published, and the surface here is broad and mostly automated (Table 1). Generative KidLisp source is minted to a short, QR-able `$code` URL; finished videos publish to two YouTube channels; spoken-word “readings” of Aesthetic Computer essays — voiced in a personal cloned voice — publish to Buzzsprout, which fans out to Spotify, Apple, and YouTube; the voice itself is a cached service (`/api/say`); papers publish as PDFs to a self-hosted index. Two surfaces remain deliberately manual: the final DistroKid upload of a finished track, and Instagram / TikTok posting. The through-line is that generative artifacts are not demos; they are shipped, on named channels, on a schedule.

5. THE SAFE REGISTER

Here is the honest part. The body of work a viewer sees first is the *safe* register — the “comfy” output — and its comfort is partly engineered against the tools’ failure mode. Three habits recur, and each one is, read cynically, a consistency strategy:

- **Soft, bulky materials.** Colored pencil on toothy paper, knit sweaters, needle-felted wool, gouache. A




Figure 3. The pipeline drawn as a node graph. This is not the practice working inside a node editor — it is a diagram emitted from the lane’s code in a single pass. The board is the easy part; the description and the approval seat are the parts that hold the work together.

Surface	Publishes	Mode
\$code	KidLisp source → short URL	auto
YouTube	videos, 2 channels	auto
Buzzsprout	readings → Spotify/Apple	auto
/api/say	cloned-voice TTS (cached)	auto
Papers	PDFs → self-hosted index	auto
Bluesky	posts	auto
DistroKid	finished tracks → Spotify	manual
Instagram/TikTok	reels, images	manual

Table 1. The generative-media publishing surface. Most of it is scripted from the repository; the two manual rows are marked as such.

hand-drawn, broken-edged surface *absorbs* the small spot errors that a crisp photographic surface would expose. The medium is chosen, in part, to forgive.

- **A cartoon space with familiar characters.** Cliché, legible figures in a warm, shallow set. Archetypes carry across frames on less description than a specific, grounded individual would demand.
- **Self-reflexive narratives.** Stories that are partly *about* their own making, or about two figures in a small room, tend to forgive inconsistency the way a straight, grounded scene does not.

None of these is a cheat — they are legitimate aesthetic choices, and the work stands. But it is worth admitting that the aesthetic is downstream, in part, of the constraint. To see the mechanism cleanly, consider one released sequence.

Case study: *marimbaba*. A lullaby; two figures at a late-night desk, nine sections, start to end (Figure 4). Across every section the elements pinned to canonical imagery and tight description *hold*: both faces, the



Figure 4. *marimbaba*, four of nine sections. The figures, cords, garments, and pens hold across the sequence (canonical imagery + description). The desk instrument — under-described — drifts toward a typewriter. *What holds* was pinned; *what drifts* was merely described.

red glasses-cords, the blue-shirt/green-sweater split, the pens, the warm lamplit study. One element was under-described — the desk instrument. The prompt calls for a specific IBM Model M keyboard, but the reference was leaned on less there, and the sequence keeps rendering it as a *typewriter*; the smaller desk props migrate shot to shot. That is the whole thesis in one image. The elements pinned hard to a real reference held; the one described loosely wandered. The fix is not a better model — it is more canonical imagery and tighter words, i.e. Section 2 applied harder.

Counter-case: *amaythingra*. The safe register is not the only place the method works; it is only the cheapest. A second released sequence pushes hard the other



Figure 5. *amaythingra*: the crisp, specific register. A named subject as a low-poly avatar; a single Meta-blue (#0668E1) color law over every frame doing double duty as satire and as a continuity device. The opposite of forgiving — and it costs more description to hold.

way. *amaythingra* — a deep-house setting of *Amazing Grace* — renders a recognizable individual as a glossy metaverse avatar and washes every frame in a single corporate brand-blue color law (Figure 5). Nothing here is soft or forgiving: the render is crisp, sharp, and deliberately blur-free. The continuity is bought two ways at once. The person is pinned to a reference corpus and described in tight detail (Moves 1–2); and the single monotone color grade does structural work — a lane-wide color law is itself a consistency device, fusing otherwise independent generations into one world. The cost is exactly what the thesis predicts: more specificity on the frame demands more canonical imagery and tighter words than the lullaby ever did. It is the same discipline run with far less slack — and it points straight at the frontier (Section 8).

6. A HISTORY OF STORYBOARDS

The method did not arrive whole; it accreted across a growing body of storyboards — roughly seventeen lanes to date — each a small experiment in how much continuity the current tools would grant. Every lane pairs the same four artifacts: a descriptive still prompt (*.illy.txt, often 500–1500 words of camera, light, material, and mood), a scene or beat script (*.story.txt), a per-section structure carrying figure and face bounding boxes (*.forms.json, *.struct.json), and a motion driver whose SHOTS table holds one 2–4 sentence choreography per beat. Crucially the motion drivers *inherit* the framing and medium blocks from the still prompts (via a shared mediums.mjs), so a single formal specification propagates from still to motion to release — one prompt genealogy per lane.

The consistency lesson compounds across the set (Table 2). The earliest lanes lean hardest on forgiving materials and faceless or from-behind staging; the later lanes push more identity onto the frame and pay for it with

Lane	Shape	Sections
<i>marimba</i>	24 pieces, 20 struct, 5 drivers	4–34
<i>momboba</i>	epic + 3 reel variants	8–186
<i>chillwave</i>	landscape music video	73
<i>americomputadora</i>	released single + canvas	~8
<i>comodiddies</i>	numbered product reels	per-beat
whistlegraph-seedance	video-to-video, one rule	per-clip
campaigns	47 projects, 95 image prompts	1–26

Table 2. A slice of the storyboard body. The most-developed lane, *marimba*, spans two dozen character pieces and five motion drivers; the marketing campaigns alone hold ninety-five image prompts across forty-seven projects.

more canonical imagery and tighter description. The whistlegraph-to-video work distills the whole discipline into a single enforced rule — *graphics align with sounds* — validated by frame sampling and stroke counts before any motion is paid for.

7. FOUR MONTHS OF WEAVING

The pipeline was assembled in the open, one capability at a time, over roughly four months. The trajectory is legible in the repository’s history.

- **March–April.** Music-first release tooling and the *jeffrey-platter* — the curated portrait/reference corpus that later anchors every stills deck (Move 1’s raw material).
- **May.** Storyboard and score-to-media plumbing; the first “wizard” audition loops (a sing-wizard, then a wave-wizard); Spotify Canvas and YouTube publishing for singles.
- **June 11 — the hinge.** The motion pipeline lands: descriptive illy storyboards → Seedance 2.0 motion, plus a clip wizard (pop/lib/motion-pipeline.mjs, pop/lib/fal.mjs). The same day, the first *comodiddies* product (the 2FA Brush) ships as a full-motion reel. Within days a whole macOS wizard suite follows — shot, juke, glyph, date — unified under a shared sign-in.
- **June (rest).** Reel pipelines mature (*marimbaba* 9:16, menuband promo, *kidlisp-reels* with real 60fps GL capture); likeness-driven cinema via *gpt-image-2* stills decks and Ken Burns moves; grant concept films assembled from generated beauty shots.
- **July — distribution and discipline.** A subscribable, personally-voiced podcast (essays → readings → Buzzsprout); the whistlegraph-to-Seedance workflow codified around “graphics align with sounds,” with cost-guarded storyboard validation before any video spend; and capture tooling (*av-reels*) for real audiovisual performance.

The overall arc is a single lengthening chain — *synth track* → *storyboard* → *generated motion* → *chromed vertical reel* → *multi-channel release* — growing more au-

tomated, more cost-aware, and more unified under one identity and one wizard toolchain with each month.

8. WHERE THE CONSTRAINT STILL BINDS

The safe register is a real place to work, not a failure. But the frontier is visible from it. The next demand is a story that will *not* forgive — specific, grounded, consistent characters in a set that does not absorb error, held across a long edit. That is where the marimbaba desk instrument's drift stops being a charming imperfection and becomes the whole problem. Nothing in the method changes at the frontier; it only has to be applied with less slack: more canonical imagery, tighter description, and an approval gate run on every panel before a frame is ever animated — sign-off first, motion second. The tools will keep improving underneath. The disciplines are what travel.