

Testing ChatGPT with Epicurean Philosophy

Post by "Don" of March 3, 2023 at 8:25 AM

[Quote from Kalosyni](#)

Perhaps the biggest danger is that somehow any human being might be tempted to give ChatGPT some kind of "authority status" and to somehow think that it is smarter than any human being.

For example, if you had to "weigh" this:

-- Kalosyni says "xyz" vs ChatGPT says "xyz"

It is possible that some people out there would give more credit to ChatGPT?

This is an excellent point!! That "authority status" is a real problem, especially in people accepting a "good enough" answer and moving on, heedless that they've been given a response entirely void of intellect, human feeling, and introspection (and I use "void" purposefully).

I will always give more authority and respect to [Kalosyni](#) than any AI.

AI's real promise (as John Oliver shows) is in narrow applications where huge amounts of data need to be winnowed and organized. And I wouldn't call that "authority" just utility.

[Quote from Kalosyni](#)

And in some ways it isn't any different than asking the opinion of another human being. When I was attending a Buddhist Zen group, there would sometimes be new people asking questions that were very "simple" (almost cringeworthy) which most likely they should have just taken the time to answer for themselves (but the Zen teacher would answer anyway).

But at least they were asking questions and getting a human response.

As a librarian, I cringe when I hear other librarians making fun of patrons' "stupid" questions. If someone has a question, they have a void in their information environment that they feel needs filled. The allure of things like ChatGPT is that people can get "good enough" answers and may never know if it's reliable or even accurate.

[Quote from Kalosyni](#)

I personally think that this particular question that I started the thread out with: "What are the limits of desires?" to be a worthwhile question. And in some ways the ChatGPT maybe didn't fully answer it, so will need to think some more on it.

Oh, fully agree that it's worthwhile to ask that! I would add that ChatGPT didn't even in reality "answer" the question. It responded algorithmically with segments of text from its training data, mathematically splicing and dicing text that it predicted would occur adjacent to each other, and put it into grammatically comprehensible text. There was no consideration, thought, reflection, scholarship, etc. ChatGPT supplies text that the reader imbues with "authority" that is not present in the product itself.