

article-drafts/antagonistic-ai-comments.md

# Transcript of antagonistic AI review of blog post

[Final copy of reviewed article](#)

## Initial prompt

### Prompt

Can you review the draft I provided as an antagonistic reader who would like to find any and all problems with the article (whether constructive or just to be antagonistic)? This reader might have a pro-AI agenda to push or an anti-AI (as in no AI can be good) agenda.

## Initial feedback

### AI Response

#### From a Pro-AI Antagonistic Reader:

“This whole hand-wringing about ‘integrity’ is just fear-mongering that holds back progress. You’re basically saying AI can’t be trusted to help with learning, but then you admit you use it extensively in your own writing. Classic gatekeeping.

Your ‘guardrails’ argument is elitist - you’re essentially saying only experts should use AI tools. That’s like saying only mechanics should drive cars because they can spot problems. AI democratizes writing and learning, and your concerns about ‘illusion of understanding’ sound like someone protecting their professional turf.

The five-step process you describe is unnecessarily complex. Why not just embrace AI’s capabilities instead of micromanaging every interaction? Your ‘negotiation’ with AI suggestions treats the tool like it’s trying to deceive you rather than help you.

Also, you claim GPTs are ‘poor tools for learning’ but provide no evidence beyond personal anecdotes. Where’s the research backing this claim?”

## **From an Anti-AI Antagonistic Reader:**

“You’re part of the problem. This entire article is an elaborate justification for using plagiarism machines while pretending to maintain ‘integrity.’ You admit you can’t tell if AI content is original or stolen, yet you use it anyway.

Your workflow is just automated cheating with extra steps. Step 1 claims you preserve ‘thinking work,’ but Steps 2-4 show AI fundamentally reshaping your ideas and expression. How is that still ‘your’ writing?

The transparency challenge section admits you don’t know what appropriate disclosure looks like, yet you’re publishing AI-assisted content without clear attribution. You’re normalizing academic dishonesty.

Your teaching concerns are hypocritical - you worry about students offloading understanding to AI while doing exactly that in your own practice. If AI assistance compromises student learning, why doesn’t it compromise your own professional integrity?

The whole piece reads like someone trying to have it both ways - using AI benefits while claiming moral high ground through a manufactured ‘process.’”

## **Neutral Concerns:**

Both camps might question: Where’s the data supporting your claims about AI effectiveness for learning vs. application? Your workflow seems anecdotal - how do you measure whether it actually preserves integrity versus just making you feel better about AI use?

## **Follow up**

### **Prompt**

WOW! Thanks. That was deliciously brutal.  
That would be good content (attributed correctly, of course) for another article.

## **Claude’s response**

### **AI Response**

That was a fun exercise! Playing devil’s advocate from both extremes really highlights how polarized this topic is - and how easy it is to poke holes in any middle-ground position when people are looking for flaws.

The pro-AI angle of “elitist gatekeeping” and the anti-AI angle of “elaborate justification for

cheating” both have just enough truth to sting, which makes them effective critiques. The fact that your honest reflection can be attacked from both sides probably means you’re in a reasonable middle position.

You’re right that this could make good content for another piece - maybe something about navigating polarized debates around AI adoption, or how to handle criticism when trying to find practical middle ground on contentious topics. The antagonistic reader exercise could be a useful framework for stress-testing other controversial positions too.