NOTES

Experts chat about ChatGPT Roundtable

June 12 2023

Biographies and links to suggested resources here:
https://www.acpd-calt.org/expertchatchatgpt

Video here ▶ ACPDCALT Experts Chat about Chat GPT

These notes were produced by CALT, using the transcript of this Roundtable and liberally editing.

Q1: *Misunderstandings*: How well do we think that the capabilities and incapabilities of ChatGPT are understood by our students or by us as their teachers - or maybe both?

Prof. Katie Szilagyi, University of Manitoba Faculty of Law

1. "Moral panic": the idea that "oh it's going to change the world we're all going to fall off a cliff" and that's the tenor of the conversation and it gets a lot of clicks and it gets a lot of attention .
    a. Ian Kerr wrote a great paper in 2004 called Bots babes in the Californication of Commerce (https://ssrn.com/abstract=705002) which includes a bit about chatbots and how we have this illusion of moral thinking and participation when we're engaging with a quasi-smart bot or some kind of learning or language model. That paper is from 2004 and previews some of the issues that we're thinking about now with ChatGPT.
2. "Mimicking form but not content" : we really need to remember that generative AI systems, like gpt3 are generative pre-trained transformers.
    a. Generative: it's able to take from the collective, from the world of words that's out there on the internet and produce something new.
        i. It is trained on online repositories things like the Books Corpus data set things like Wikipedia there are some large language models that are trained on Reddit or other forms of social media,
        ii. Mimicry like this brings many concerns about bias & discrimination - what is entrenched into that data set?

      b.   These systems are "Stochastic Parrots". They can mimic but not say new specific things.
3. "Misinformation and hallucination":
      a.   because it is generative, ChatGPT is getting a little bit better **but**
           i.   The GPT4 technical paper still talks about how it hallucinates - makes things up - that needs to be addressed, needs to be fixed .
           ii.   But when you're in the thick of it interacting with something that feels like intelligence it can be hard to remember that what it says could be completely made up!

Prof. Jon Penney, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University

A lot of sensational media coverage about the capabilities the possibilities
What's important as Educators as professors as teachers is
1.   Be concrete about the capabilities of these technologies
2.   Understand what it's good at and what it's much less good at.

ChatGPT is a large language model. And a language model essentially what that is - it's a statistical model that produces probability estimates.
It's not actually thinking .
it predicts what the next word will be in a sequence of words, having trained on a massive data set and it also trains using a subset of AI and that is natural language processing.
Based on that reality about the technology we can talk about

I.   **Things that ChatGPT tends to be good at**
- combining information, synthesizing information especially being attentive to form and style for example
- summarizing and telling you things about things well represented in the training data (as Katie mentioned earlier there's obviously going to be limitations with the training data set right so things that are well represented and the data that the model trains on it's going to be very good at but other things that it's less representative
- um it's going to be quite biased

II.   **Things that it's very mediocre at**
- some critical legal skills that we as teachers are concerned with in evaluating our students so it's not going to be very good at identifying key issues
  - for example in case um it's going to have a pretty superficial approach to legal reasoning beyond simply applying rule statements the facts a
- it's not good at sticking to course material
- It's not good at doing what lawyers are often good at doing - providing sort of a hedging answer (because what the system is doing is that it's simply predicting a good answer - if you ask it a question it predicts what a good answer will be)
- tends to hallucinate and make things up r
  - It may "know" that in this particular area of scholarship this person this figure is a leading authority, but it will make up sources uh along the way

As the technology advances some of this hallucination will be minimized but the training data set (although it will expand) that's not going to advance as quickly.
Some of these limitations are baked into the model itself

Prof. Wolfgang Alschner, Hyman Soloway Chair in Business and Trade Law, Ottawa Faculty of Law

A little bit more optimistic about the progression of technology and how it will make GPT style applications much better over time, so that some of these things it doesn't do very well at this point they may not be big concern in even six months.
1. The strength of this technology is taking ideas and turning them into products: Implementation is being automated.
2. That makes me a little bit worried about us as law teachers because we really teach our students to *implement*:
- we give them prompts in the form of exam questions or or class assignments
- write a contract about this
- write an essay about that
- apply this legal test to these factors
3. These are the things that are going to be automated to some extent as the technology gets better
   a. In legal practice, Associates are drafting contracts, they're following the prompts or the instructions from Partners
   b. We must think about how we can train our law students as Partners rather than Associates.
   c. Idea Generation is the important thing and Students should think more about
      i. how do we frame this problem
      ii. what other types of questions should be asking
      iii. We can now farm out some implementation to the technology
         1. Then look at output to validate and refine the output
         2. spend a little bit less time writing and maybe more time editing

Q2: How would you recommend helping students to understand the potential or pitfalls of this particular technology early in their development as lawyers?

Prof Alexandra Mogoryos, Toronto Metropolitan University, Lincoln Alexander Faculty of Law

I find it helpful to start with myself and interrogate my own views towards this tool and any tool like ChatGPT

- Recognize resistance
- Get ChatGPT and play around with it a bit.

It's a tool and it's a tool that's certainly different than other technologies (I really defer to my colleagues here on the ways that that's true) BUT
Like all tools it's for us to teach ourselves and our how they're going to use it and how to make that decision critically

I rely on the critical theorists who have done so much great work on this: Ruha Benjamin and Neil Postman are favorites of mine
- like all tools there are benefits and there are drawbacks
- there are philosophies embedded in the tool,
- The tool will change the environment around us ecologically and not additively

Prof Valerio de Stefano, Canada Research Chair in Innovation, Law and Society, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University

it's very important that we teach students that there are many shortcomings in ChatGPT shortcomings that have already been mentioned.
ChatGPT was not conceived to provide legal advice and any AI system that is based on machine learning and neural network has narrow band of tasks it can perform
- if something was not conceived for a certain task then it shouldn't be used for that task.

ChatGPT is a language model which can be used to polish a draft but from time to time it hallucinates even when it is just copy editing.
Sometimes you input something and ChatGPT writes something that will make you think " whoa what is this where it come from?"
ChatGPT
- is a technology that cannot be used or taught for tasks that it was not designed for
- can hallucinate
- can make up cases i
- can pick up biases and discrimination that exist in the training models.
    - ChatGPT gives those biases a sort of technical gloss so that we don't noticethe text that GPT produces only reflects a certain viewpoint and in many cases this viewpoint can be quite flawed or outright racist discriminatory uh sexist

We have to flag to our students that this tool is **not infallible**
It is **not an existential threat now** - but at the same time we don't need to wait for existential threats to be posed to to be wary of what comes out of of this technology
LLMs (Large Language Models) are **not to be feared in themselves but must be used very carefully.**
The **discrimination risks are currently present** and even if they don't lead to the destruction

of humanity we we still should fight them
The **job of a lawyer cannot be outsourced to a machine** not conceived to replace you and your thoughts

Audrey Fried Director, Faculty & Curriculum Development, Osgoode OPD, York University

Teaching students how to do problem setting:
- " how do you formulate the questions that need to be answered?"

Move away from curriculum design based on surveillance and concern about cheating
- we should not be designing our assignments with those overriding concerns
- we may not have the tools to prevent this and
  -it is certainly harmful to the spirit of curiosity and learning that we want to foster in our students especially if we want them to do that higher level thinking

Instead, lean into meaningful assessments
engaging relational and interactive and if possible creative
- use a series of assessments that are iterative and cumulative where each assignment builds on the previous assignment
  - for example if students are writing a paper
    - have them begin by discussing possible topics and thesis statements in small groups
    - if they do it online they'll create artifacts and records of their thinking process and discussion which is useful for them to go back to
    - if they have a thought later about what might be useful to a classmate they can add it in
- alternatively you can ask students to keep research or writing journals about coming up with their topic and their thesis approach
- students can create an annotated bibliography for their paper and write a draft of their paper and get feedback either from peers or from the instructor
- In addition to writing the final product have students write a very short reflection or explanation of how they incorporated or didn't incorporate specific pieces of feedback they got during the process
- These ideas aren't foolproof: they could ask ChatGPT to do each of those steps but hopefully they wouldn't and they would see the benefit of doing it on their own

- Try Grounded Assignments: (see James Lane, Cheating Lessons: Learning from Academic Dishonesty 2019 (Harvard University Press)
  - students are most motivated when they're answering questions they care deeply about, topics that are personally interesting to students or their own personal experience or that move in conjunction with an experiential learning

component so the assignment is to integrate their new knowledge and understanding
- Oral testing/evaluating- should not be dismissed out of hand
    - one-on-one interactions and discussions with students
        - if the meetings with students are relatively brief the fact that you're marking them simultaneously you may find that actually it is a reasonable amount of time
    - allows for probing questions an exchange of ideas and interaction with students, can be a learning experience for students and also help you get a sense of where they are
    - Or, have an oral component to written assignment and submissions so maybe they submit something in writing but they also meet with you for five minutes to talk briefly about their process or their thinking around how they came to their conclusion.

Prof. Jon Penney, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University

Bring the creative element into assignments whether it's take home whether it's exam based I think thinking again about more complex applications more complex legal reasoning
- adding more sophistication in evaluation
- focusing less on form organization style because these are things that AI generative platforms chatGPT are going to be very good at
- Focus less on exposition
- Focus less on regurgitation of rules
- Focus on more complex application sophisticated application reasoning through a requirement of a formulating perspective, backing it up and being creative about argumentation
- Use recent happenings/cases: these models are going to be training on data sets, constructing questions based on more recent events or cases, these won't be (well) represented in the training data.

Q3. Can you tell us about a kind of a longer or shorter form of evaluation that's designed to teach students about ChatGPT. How could we expose students to this technology in a structured way?

Audrey Fried Director, Faculty & Curriculum Development, Osgoode OPD, York University

Two categories of assignments about chat GPT .
1. First : we have to teach our students how to think critically about all new technologies and in particular the ethical implications of using chatGPT
   a. in a professional responsibility course: there's an obligation of tech competence so what does that mean in terms of knowing how to use chatGPT is there any obligation to use chatGPT what are the limits of chatGPT what are the implications of using chat GPT and other generative AI tools right now given all of the ethical problems
   b. inevitable that every student who finds themselves practicing law going forward is going to be asked to use chatGPT or other similar tools
2. Second, we have to give them some opportunity to try out chat GPT and see what its limitations are , so for instance:
   i. allowing students to use chatGPT for a first draft and asking them to submit a final draft that has track changes and that's annotated
   ii. generate a chatGPT draft of something and ask students to work together to annotate it
      1. then we can ask them to build on that by trying to improve on the product through things like Chain of Thought and other types of prompt engineering
   iii. using chatGPT as a thinking companion (an idea from Ethan Mollick https://www.oneusefulthing.org/p/thinking-companion-companion-for) by asking ChatGPT to critique an argument that we've made, to check for specific cognitive biases that might be in our writing
   iv. you could have them writing proposals for Law Firm policies on the use of chat GPT
   v. you could have them proposing regulatory frameworks or approaches or assessing existing proposals
   vi. can have them doing papers or presentations or other types of assignments about legal tools that are specifically designed for law that are based on these tools

Prof. Wolfgang Alschner, Hyman Soloway Chair in Business and Trade Law, Ottawa Faculty of Law

ChatGPT can play an exciting role in Simulation exercises
Example: creating a negotiation exercise providing some guidelines for students who would then create their own prompts to generate some kind of legal path (could be a contract it could be a summary could be a another type of legal document)

1. They iteratively work through this document either by going back to their prompts and refining
2. Maybe producing 10 different versions of it, workshopping it and then again focusing on getting it getting it right
3. Asking students to do something more like what marketing people
   a. bounce around ideas in a collaborative environment
   b. to generate text and
   c. then working through these texts in order to create the best product that we can possibly have

Benefits: Makes law school less lonely, makes assignments less individualistic. ChatGPT and technologies like it actually provide an impetus for us to be a little bit more collaborative and to think about teams working together.

Q5: What are the ethical and legal concerns related to the development design and use of generative AI tools. How can students engage in critical assessments that they might use of these tools when they're using them or in light of the fact that they might use them in their future careers?

Prof. Kristen Thomasen Allard Faculty of Law, UBC

2 Critical Things for everyone (students all the way to sr. lawyers)
1. technology literacy
2. tech critical capability: the ability to to understand and place technology within the broader systemic or social impacts that it will have

Ask the ethical question:
- "how do our individual choices around our use of chat GPT scale up at the collective level?" Iif a lot of individuals are making those individual choices what does that

mean on a more collective level - who is positioned to benefit and who is positioned to lose out because of that individual to systemic interaction

Ethical Reflections
- Garrbage in garbage out: biased data that systems are then trained on and might replicate in some of the outputs
- Part of what makes chatGPT in these large language models possible =availability of these enormous data sets - so enormous that they are very difficult to go through quote unquote clean it up
- (speaking of garbage and cleaning up) OpenAI doesn't wantI ChatGPT spitting out sexist or racist comments but in order to prevent this:
  - questionable labour practices
  - underpaid labor from workers positioned in the global South
  - Who benefits/who loses? a global North Global South divide
  - parsing out certain terms from the data set can lead to erasure so communities that might want to engage with a particular term from within their community might actually lose access to it because of shortcuts which simply eliminate that content to avoid unwanted outputs.
- How have the data sets been put together for large language models in particular chatGPT
  - Privacy Commissioner in Canada are currently investigating chat GPT for possible violations or open AI for possible violations of privacy laws in Canada
  - concern is around the lack of consent and lack of awareness of how personal information that's up on the internet has been potentially adopted and used in the creation of this tool which profits others
  - **Indigenous data sovereignty** (scraping event information from the internet without awareness or consent like that violates Indigenous data sovereignty). Obligations under CTA 28 (Call to Action, TRC) mean law professors need to think seriously about how to grapple with these questions
- Environmental toll d/t the computing power that's needed to use and operate these systems. Discussion in this is discussed in the "stochastic parrots" paper (see: https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3442188.3445922) an accessible introduction

ChatGPT in particular is a tool that was created by and for cutting corners i through taking information off the internet without consent.
- An extractive model, a belief that "if it is available it's free for me to use for my own profit"
- The tool itself then used for cutting corners for instance to write a factum without proper legal research to make sure that the information is correct.
- Accuracy *is* going to improve but some of these ethical concerns are potentially going to become deeper and more entrenched

Teaching Plan
Teaching a seminar on Law and Robotics and artificial intelligence
- Will collaboratively work with students to develop a class policy on how chat GPT can be used in class

- - try to empower students to bring their own perspective
  - The ethical issues are not simple or straightforward
    - very complex because students will be expected to have some understanding of these tools and how they work when they enter into the legal practice

We need a way that we as a collective can think about how we want to engage tools that have these societal concerns but also have individual impacts

Prof Valerio de Stefano, Canada Research Chair in Innovation, Law and Society, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University

the labour issue
- job displacement at this moment is over emphasized and that conceals uh some of the other important labor issues that ChatGPT raises
- ChatGPT, compared to other Bots, is pretty good at avoiding extremely racist or sexist language
  - because it has been trained by workers by human beings in the global South to weed out such language
  - These workers deal with disturbing material for pay as low as one cent per hour

This component is quite hidden in the global discourse about chatGPT
- When we spend time on ChatGPT we work for Openai because we train it
  - we allow it to get better we prompt new things and that is unpaid work that society gives to Open Ai
  - These companies benefit from a huge amount of unpaid work uh that they don't necessarily give back to society.
  - one of the things that Altman (CEO OpenAI) said to the United States Congress is a lot of jobs are going to be displaced and governments have to step up.
    - yes governments probably will have to step up
    - but there is a huge problem of redistribution of the value that society is creating for these companies, that is extracted by the companies and not given back to society.
    - We are left to cope with the potential damage, by paying people that are unemployed

Mass job displacements d/t ChatGPT?
- Some professions will be affected more than others
- For Managers, ChatGPT means an excuse to increase the productivity expected from workers.

- ○ Managers and CEOs or employers are already saying to their workers we know that some of these jobs can be done through Chat GPT so now you have to produce 30 more of the output 50 more of the output
- ○ **Technology is never neutral. In firms where it's large managerial prerogatives exist it will help to to augment those managerial priorities.**
- ○ This increases stress and may increase problems of reliability because
  - ■ forced to use the system that you maybe not trust or maybe you shouldn't trust.
  - ■ Maybe you spend even more time using ChatGPT and checking that it doesn't hallucinate than you would if you weren't using it at all
  - ■ Partners or the Senior Associates may not know that the systems are not reliable in many cases and so we also have to alert everyone - students and lawyers - about these risks .

Q6: What's the next thing we need to think about?

Audrey Fried Director, Faculty & Curriculum Development, Osgoode OPD, York University

Critical assessment is what we do as law professors and where we can really help our students White paper from the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC) suggested by Prof. Thomasen includes a framework using a taxonomy of algorithmic harms and typology of privacy harms:
https://epic.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/EPIC-Generative-AI-White-Paper-May2023.pdf

Introduce students to these kinds of taxonomies & frameworks, then have them assess
1. the frameworks and
2. use them to assess different types of tech.

Do this across all kinds of classes
- ● In a professional responsibility or ethics courses,
  in law practice type courses like legal research and writing, moots and clinical courses
- ● in substantive law courses for instance criminal law could look at algorithmic harms and sentencing; privacy law; intellectual property courses, labour law; torts (can tort liability help us with misinformation types of harm). Also what different types of regulatory regimes might be appropriate for new technologies

Prof. Katie Szilagyi, University of Manitoba Faculty of Law

More and more bots will appear purporting to offer legal help or advice.
Communications with lawyers protected by strict solicitor client privilege but when you're simply chatting with ChatGPT or one of these other services there is no such thing. Unless the Privacy commissioner suddenly develops enforcement Powers, definitely something to be worried about
They will have that data and can parse and use that data to further develop the technology going forward, which will inform different sorts of developments

Prompt engineering:
You can find information online about how to really exploit the full functionality of chatGPT and other generative systems by being specific with the prompts that you give it,
- giving examples and asking it to emulate the way that you speak or the way that you usually write
- Wolfgang's not wrong there's a lot of potential I just think the potential is bad, not good

Limits & Learning
The data set that OpenAI uses right now only goes up till September 2021. so if you ask it anything more recent than that it doesn't know
It offers a very nice disclaimer that this is a limit of its training.
At the same time the more we engage with it and the more we use it the more we teach it how to do things how to do things better there's
Luciano Floridi in Europe posted
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4358789
thinking through philosophical issues. Gives GPT a riddle which confuses GPT because of syntax of the sentence. It says "insufficient information" (but humans can solve this riddle). Since Floridi first asked, the model has learned and is better able to answer similar questions.

Questions that ChatGPT cannot Answer:
We need to be thinking about sort of what are the edge cases of where the technology is able to be really useful? What are the things that aren't in the data set so that we can get students into that gray area in assignments?

Where are we going ?
The functionality of this technology may be even now drastically underestimated.
What I'm really interested in: What are the impacts of this kind of automation on law's efforts as a storytelling exercise or as a collective fiction
Law works via storytelling. If LLM's are participating and telling the stories, whose voices are these stories in and are they the voices of these big corporations? Are they going to start to take on a quasi-judicial role in our society

Prof Alexandra Mogoryos, Toronto Metropolitan University, Lincoln Alexander Faculty of Law

So much is still unknown to us today in terms of the impacts.
My experience reading future studies scholarship says you know it's better not to try to predict not because it makes you vulnerable to being wrong
Prediction efforts are a claim that the future is already set and your job is to figure it out.
- But that is misguided- there are so many possible Futures, and there are multiple drivers
- One driver is "the legal Community broadly construed" .
  - To the extent that we think legal institutions and legal profession are responsive to the world around us we know that things might change.

Advent of online databases of case law from other jurisdictions:
the common law changed dramatically as a result.
Chat GPT and LLMs will drive some sort of change but what?
We can see multiple futures unfolding in front of us .

As teachers we shape the way the technology is going to be used and unfold.
We need a story of what we want legal education to be.
I think we need a story to anchor ourselves in a future that is not for lack of a better word terrifying
I would love to see a future of law that we all part of buildingwhere technologies and chat GPT could be used in a in a version of legal education that everyone's proud of

Prof. Wolfgang Alschner, Hyman Soloway Chair in Business and Trade Law, Ottawa Faculty of Law

Regulation in Legal Services
A window of opportunity here of maybe three to five years where two things are happening concurrently:
1. Incredibly fast improvement of the tech, but:
2. Legal Regulation is slow: "some people say lawyers are going to be replaced BUT we have the beauty of living in a self-regulated profession"

WA normally critiques slow self governance but " in this case I actually applaud it because we have a lot of control over where the law (legal profession) is going"
More pressure from outside the profession but we have this window of opportunity where we can take a step back and think about the change we want vs this exponential change.
BUT. If we miss the window of opportunity, technology will just rule over us and
the self-regulated legal profession will disappear. We have to take the reins

Prof. Jon Penney, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University

The importance of teaching students to be thinking critically
about these Technologies is not just about the particular capabilities of chat GPT but the the broader context of surveillance capitalism, information capitalism. These are for profit businesses.
In March 2023 Microsoft (owns OpenAI) laid off its Ethics and Society team. Google has been bleeding leading ethics experts since 2020 2021 and these are the leading AI companies developing these technologies
Students who need to think critically and want to move towards being great lawyers in an era of ChatGPT and AIs might draw important lessons from Science and Technology Studies critical thinking about technology and society and systemic challenges beyond the specific

- Julie Cohen "Between Truth and Power: The Legal Constructions of Informational Capitalism" (2019) a work that speaks to information capitalism more broadly and although it predates chatGPT
- Lessons about the law and political economy of these tools that can help students understand that broader context of what's happening and will happen:
- increasing automation
- the automation of law itself and the combination of automation and AI Technologies with surveillance tools like facial recognition technology
- environmental impact
- impact on labor and human rights uh both in the legal profession
- Implementation in a broader range of private public law contexts

Prof. Kristen Thomasen Allard Faculty of Law, UBC

Resist Tech Determinism!
None of this has to be sealed

<mark>Questions from the Audience</mark>

Doug Harris: "the most serious academic offense is to represent someone else's work as your own. How do we incorporate the use of large language models in a scholarship ours and not of our students when it's impossible to know the extent to which and the specific instances in which we're relying on the work of others and presenting it as our own. A general disclaimer does not seem sufficient.

Kathleen Lahey: "Ethically we as law profs have an obligation to make sure students are learn all the existing methods of engaging with learning to read learning to reason on specific fact situations as the first layer of learning how law is done. The crucial learning is

done and nuanced at the individual level. If chat GPT is in any way made available in that phase of teaching usually the first term of of year one it risks losing focus on those foundational tools. It may be a good idea to have upper year electives or short courses designed to teach best practices re GPT as the versions evolve but offering shortcuts on how to make winning legal arguments still have to be treated as the ground from which all students can learn effectively. I train students in substantive first-year courses on how to use all the earlier forms of electronic assistance but GPTs go beyond what lawyers ethically are responsible for doing
for their clients."

> **Valerio**: ChatGPT can't produce scholarship.
> You can run a draft through GPT to polish - you're not committing plagiarism you're just copy editing your your draft.

> **Sonia**: I have heard discussion at my Faculty as to whether *any* use of chat GPT edges towards plagiarism or other kinds of offenses against academic Integrity.

> **Wolfgang:** Re, foundational tools I don't necessarily see the distinction.
> We should not use ChatGPT to supplant other types of critical thinking but I wouldn't wait until upper years in order to make use of it

> **Katie**: We need to ask what is law school? That's always the question that is at the heart of this:
> - is it learning what the laws are or
> - is it learning to tell a story or
> - is it learning to make sense of the body of case law that came before is it or
> - is it foundationally philosophical or
> - or is it designed to be a practice ready lawyer

and there are a lot of diverging views!
According to many, Chat GPT can produce essays, not great ones but essays.
A lot of people *are* worried about whether it will supplant intellectual exploration in a law school classroom
I would perhaps be asking them not to be using chatGPT particularly in that first semester but I also acknowledge that you might not know or be able to stop it.

Audience Questions

Alberto Salazar: Could we use chat GPT as a robot law student to promote discussion amongst students?

Sean Rehaag: "human decision making in my field immigration lies hopelessly biased non-transparent and harmful and human lawyers in my field are all too frequently

incompetent and abusive of their clients and key institutions(law societies and legal aid programs) are indifferent to that.

Large language models offer a way to process vast quantities of legal text in ways that can help us expose biases by decision makers abused by human lawyers and offer opportunities to design improved processes so while we should be critical of many of the problems of this Tech we can do so in a context where we're equally critical of this status quo and we want how can we help students explore both critiques simultaneously"

> **Kristen**: That's an excellent comment.
> Some of the critiques of ChatGPT are reflections of the status quo so to critique systemic issues from some of these systems *is* to critique the status quo.
> Developing that skill as a law student and future lawyer is fantastic
> Students need to work with the idea that not all large language models are flawed or wrong but ALSO able to identify the distinction between one that is built to try and address or make visible the inequities of our status quo legal system, and then to contrast that with another that actually takes advantage of the inequities of our society and our legal system in order to concentrate profit and power in the hands of the few.

.fin.