ChatGPT said:

This comment contains several logical and argumentative issues in the context of the "Why is using AI a bad source" debate. Let's break it down:

🔍 1. Misunderstanding the Role of AI like ChatGPT

The user suggests:

> "You have to take ALL THE SCREENSHOTS FROM THE ENTIRE MANGA and then give it to ChatGPT."

This misunderstands how AI works:

- **ChatGPT cannot "read" copyrighted manga images** due to content and licensing restrictions.
- The suggestion that someone should extract *every single manga panel* just to use an AI defeats the purpose of using AI efficiently.
- It also undermines fair use and is impractical—not a legitimate academic or logical standard.

⚠️ 2. Shifting the Burden of Source Work

> "You should have given all the information from the manga to ChatGPT…"

This implies AI is only valid *if* you do all the manual extraction work yourself. But then the AI becomes a **passive summarizer**, not a *source* of information. This contradicts the common critique of AI as being a "bad source" because:

- If *you* are doing all the sourcing, **ChatGPT is not the source**—*you* are.
- In that case, **the criticism becomes irrelevant** because you're no longer relying on AI's knowledge but using it as a tool to rephrase or summarize.

🧠 3. Use of Ad Hominem

> “Even though I know you lack logical reasoning abilities…”

This is a **personal attack** and has no relevance to the argument. It distracts from the issue and weakens the commenter’s credibility.

📚 4. Reliance on Blog and Summary Sources

> “All of your sources are from Liar Game blogs and summaries instead of the manga itself.”

This might be a valid point in terms of **source credibility**, but:

- AI typically trains on publicly available data, which includes summaries and secondary sources, **not copyrighted full manga**.
- If the issue is about **primary vs secondary sourcing**, then the criticism should be about *your* method of research, **not ChatGPT’s limitations**.

🧩 Conclusion

This user's argument is flawed because:

- It misunderstands AI’s intended function.
- It sets impractical standards for AI use.
- It includes irrelevant personal insults.
- It blurs the distinction between using AI as a tool vs using it as a primary source.

If this is part of a debate on the reliability of AI, the real issue should be whether the AI's **output is traceable and verifiable**, not whether the user spoon-feeds it with copyrighted content.