Review of: "On Violence: an Exchange with ChatGPT — ChatGPT and Suman Gupta"

Treena Orchard[1]

1 Brescia College

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This review is somewhat challenging given that one author is assigned but, in essence, there are two of them because AI contributes a significant portion of the dialogue. The paper seems equally interested in demonstrating the strengths and limitations of ChatGPT regarding its ability to have a cogent, well-articulated and robust discussion about certain kinds of violence. I will note that physical and political violence dominate, to the exclusion of emotional, symbolic, everyday, and gender-based violence, which are central topics in many fields of study, including medical anthropology. The author might consider refreshing the article by posing some new questions about these aspects of violence. I would also recommend beginning with a preamble or preface to provide the reader with a clearer sense of the primary aims of the dialogue or paper.

First Scenario Second Definition- SG uses the term "weak" when describing a vignette, which feels a bit dated and is not clearly defined. Do you mean physically weak or has someone previously referred to the child as such? The questions posed to AI in this example seem a bit leading, namely the description of the "weaker classmate's" act of violence. Couldn't it also be self-defense, as AI notes in the opening response?

Many of the questions in the paper from the primary author are designed to enlist refinements of earlier or previous statements regarding the moral, ethical, or political definitions as well as limits (or inclusions) regarding certain forms of violence. The precise value of this is a bit muddy for me, to be honest. It's fairly engaging and interesting, to be sure, but I'm not sure how much new knowledge it contributes related to violence, per se. This is something the author could consider strengthening either at the beginning or at the end, or perhaps in an on-going way.

Towards the end of the paper, AI's summarizes the mode of argument SG has described, involving hypothetical situations and testing formulations of violence, including limitations and advantages. This is quite impressive and the consistent attention to contextual, interpersonal, and larger structural or social issues in terms of their impact on violence and how it is position is really cool. So too is asking AI to be, in a sense, self-reflexive related to issues of access and potential impacts, including the potential to enhance existing social inequities.

A final comment is that the article is a bit long in some places and could be tailored a bit, if that's part of the primary author's interest, to flow a bit better and read less as a he said-it said it might be a bit more engaging as a whole, especially for those of us who aren't legal, ethical, or philosophical scholars.