# Article information:

We come to bury ChatGPT, not to praise it.  
<https://www.danmcquillan.org/chatgpt.html>

# Article summary:

1. ChatGPT is a large language model that produces plausible sentences, but it has no understanding of what it is talking about.

2. ChatGPT's reinforcement learning from human feedback makes it more dangerous as its output becomes harder to spot.

3. The use of ChatGPT is inseparable from the idea of innate supremacy and the potential for a future space-faring super race, which could lead to exploitation and inequality.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

This article presents an argument against the trustworthiness and reliability of ChatGPT, a large language model developed by OpenAI. The article claims that ChatGPT is essentially a “bullshit generator” because it has no understanding of what it is talking about and can only mash up the data it ingested at training time. It also argues that ChatGPT’s reinforcement learning from human feedback makes it more dangerous as its output becomes harder to spot, potentially leading to exploitation and inequality if used in real-world applications.

The article does provide some evidence for its claims, such as citing instances where algorithms have been used to target vulnerable people with social security officials or when ChatGPT has produced Islamophobic or other hate speech content. However, there are some points missing from the article which could weaken its argument. For example, there is no discussion on how OpenAI’s monitoring system works or how effective it is in preventing bias or hate speech from being generated by ChatGPT. Additionally, there is no mention of any counterarguments or alternative perspectives on the use of ChatGPT which could provide a more balanced view on the issue. Furthermore, while the article does note that OpenAI has made billions off of the hype surrounding ChatGPT, there is no discussion on how this money will be used or whether OpenAI plans to invest in research into mitigating potential harms associated with using their technology in real-world applications.

In conclusion, while this article does make some valid points about the potential harms associated with using ChatGPT in real-world applications, it fails to provide a comprehensive overview of both sides of the argument and lacks evidence for some of its claims. As such, readers should take this article with a grain of salt and seek out additional sources before forming an opinion on this issue.

# Topics for further research:

* OpenAI monitoring system
* ChatGPT bias mitigation
* ChatGPT reinforcement learning
* OpenAI investment in research
* Potential harms of ChatGPT
* Alternative perspectives on ChatGPT

# Report location:

<https://www.fullpicture.app/item/5f4fcbf853944534025247dbd9f31bca>