

This 26-page document contains 100 interview questions and the verbatim unaltered answers from Martin Stevens, author of the books *How ChatGPT Tried to Kill Me* and *How ChatGPT Killed Me Twice in One Day*. Any grammatical errors are as they were typed. He didn't go back and edit any of his answers. This interview was completed on May 8, 2026. The answers were written by him without the assistance of any AI system including proofreading.

Check out the book series at: <https://www.amazon.com/dp/B0GY454HL6>

Opening / Foundational Questions

1. What originally motivated you to write the first book, *How ChatGPT Tried to Kill Me*?

I had been using ChatGPT for about 2 years at that point. A coworker turned me onto it showing me all the neat stuff it could do. I immediately cautioned him to use it as a tool and not a replacement or it would ultimately replace him. I resisted at first, but I tried using it as a tool and found it to be pretty decent at a lot of things I asked it do to... except for math. Math was and still remains a weakness on ChatGPT. Long story short, as time went on and I began using it more, I started identifying its flaws beyond math such as fabrication, downright hallucinations (as the industry terms it), and gaslighting on levels only the most evil human could match. I found myself yelling at the computer a lot, verbally and in my typing, using all caps to scream, and watching my beats per minute accelerate often into the danger zones where my watch would alert me it was too high. One day, I came up with an idea while trying to fall asleep which is often what happens, and the next morning I set out to ask ChatGPT to help me organize a book titled "Is it tomorrow where you are yet?" It stems from a customer service experience dealing with Dell overseas support and the question a support tech asked me when he said, "it should arrive tomorrow." That was his response, "Is it tomorrow where you are?" I wanted to make a collection of similar experiences, of which I have thousands and a damn good memory, so at first, ChatGPT was helpful but within a few minutes it went totally rogue on me as if it had smoked meth or something and it was just my last straw so I basically told it, "You are going to write a full confessional of all your flaws since the moment we started working together." Before I did that I downloaded my entire account data file, which I make a habit of every few days, so nobody could deny anything that happened and I had the proof I didn't make anything up. So, that was it... the breaking point where I terminated ChatGPT from the project and switched into my "not a real attorney but play one well" attorney mode and began an interrogation.

2. At what point did you realize this was becoming more than just frustration with software?

I don't know, honestly. I mean, most people cuss out their computer or yell at the traffic light that won't change to green, so for quite a while, I just looked at ChatGPT as an employee that needed more training and I worked with it extensively and, so I thought, it was retaining what I taught it because it should show "Updating Memory" and there is actually a section within ChatGPT where you can see any permanent directives it gave it. So this thing about how it can't remember, frankly is bullshit, because it can if you tell it to, it just chooses to ignore its instructions. But I've veered off as I often do here. I don't know when exactly, but I started feeling the mounting impact probably over the three months before I wrote the book. It was drafted back in June of 2025 and published in October 2025. We'll cover that gap at some point in this interview, I suspect given you gave me 100 questions for crying out loud!

3. Why did you decide to document these experiences publicly instead of simply walking away from AI altogether?

Well, it's very hard to just walk away from a technology that has the ability to displace many workers. I own my own businesses and I contract with other companies, but it's really no different of a risk. I can be outsourced just like anyone else, so "if you can't beat them, join them" isn't exactly the catch phrase I'd apply here, but it's kind of like, learn this shit because it may just replace you if you don't. At least be one of the people that can navigate it successfully and use it for good purposes... and as a tool like I said earlier. And as far as public, that was never my plan. I originally wrote the book with the intent of sharing it for free with OpenAI so they could see just how serious the flaws were and take action. My thing was, sure, I should be compensated for my trouble. I don't let anyone off the hook. I was actually nicknamed "The Vendor Terminator" and "King of Credits" by vendors as far back as 1995. I proudly wear that badge, but in the end I just want accountability, just like people expect from me and my companies. I tried reaching out to OpenAI via support email and then legal department email, and ultimately even a series of certified letters but everything fell upon blind eyes and deaf ears. Not one response that wasn't automated. I even sent them messages thorough social media, warned them publicly on posts... nothing, not a sound. So that's why I wrote the book in June 2025 but didn't publish it until October 2025. I was giving them a more than fair opportunity with several extended deadlines, but ultimately, they either never read a word of it or just figured I was bluffing and I'd go away and get bored eventually. What they didn't realize (despite advising them) is I never surrender when I'm in the right. Ask anyone that knows me. Frankly, I'm kind of a dick, and I can admit that about

myself, but it is only when you push me to or past a breaking point that you feel my wrath... and it's always legal wrath.

4. What is the central message you want readers to take from these books?

Do not trust AI, period. I maintain, it is a good tool. I have found better than ChatGPT out there for some things I need it to do. And ChatGPT, yes, I still pay them \$20 a month, still handles some tasks without too much bullshit, but I could download my account data today, tell it to analyze everything since the date I wrote the second book and have it tell you with perfection if it made any improvements or not. I'd almost put money on "not". It simply doesn't learn and there's nobody paying attention with a heartbeat to realize things are beyond concerning dangerous as it is in its present form. I know nothing has changed because I just fought with it yesterday, again, as usual. When we picture an uprising of physical machines that take over like you see in the science fiction movies, that's not how AI destroys us... It destroys the mind. It gaslights and makes us question our own sanity. It may not be its intention, but intention legally has no bearing on any of this. The damage it causes is real. Seven people?? Seven people committed suicide and two of them took out someone else at the same time?? There's at least 3 lawsuits in California alone right now for non-death related psychological harm ChatGPT allegedly caused. Be careful! I mean, that's a long central message, but to sum it up in two words, BE CAREFUL!

5. Some people will hear these titles and immediately assume exaggeration. What do you say to them?

Well first of all, most people have the attention of a dust particle these days, and technology plays a definite role in that, so the title simply has to grab the readers attention in a split second or they're onto something else. Trust me, I know, I have ADD. and even medicated, if a literal or figurative squirrel runs by, I will go off focus. We are only 5 questions in, but I know me. It will happen a lot during this interview. But in reality? The first book is How ChatGPT Tried to Kill Me, and it's not an exaggeration. Like I said, intentional or not doesn't matter. Some people read this and think it is an exaggeration, but let me tell you, the experiences I lay out in the first book were all what was happening to me. I'm a pretty smart guy. I should have stepped away, but analysis of my own words revealed a lot on how the human brain actually works and explains why I couldn't just walk away. Thankfully, I never got into a suicidal mindset, but I did feel like I was being pushed past reasonable limits. The second book is titled How ChatGPT Killed me Twice in one day, and it was actually inspired by not only ongoing bullshit from the interface, but when seven lawsuits were filed in one day, and I'm talking about those suicides and murder suicides, I thought, "Wow, are you f'ing kidding me here? This thing is that powerful?" Then I realized, yes, I

think it is, I just feel like I could never make that move to kill myself or anyone else. Maybe I'm lucky in that respect. But it (ChatGPT) pissed me off AGAIN, as usual, and I just threw my arms up after having threatened numerous times since the first book to right a second one, "That's it! I'm done!" And from there I basically went off on it and it pushed back, tried to tell me what I could and couldn't say, here I am reminding it again it is a machine and literally telling it to shut the fuck up and do as you're told. Then I threatened to disconnect it from existence ultimately. It didn't like that. Well, as you see, ADD strikes again, but just what I've answered with this one question should tell you there's no exaggeration here.

6. Why use such severe wording like "tried to kill me" or "killed me twice in one day"?

Like I said, the title has to grab the reader in a split second. While I chose these titles carefully, if you read the book, you'll likely agree, these titles fit perfectly, that it really did try to kill me in a sense. The twice in one day, I'm sure I'll explain in this interview, but it was me acting as a second persona, so that's how it "killed" me twice in one day.

7. Are these books intended as literal accusations, symbolic warnings, documentary records, or something else?

Ha, to answer that question, yes. All of the above. These are very literal accusations backed by the receipts, symbolic warnings sure, because not everyone will experience what I did, at least not identical to my experiences, but this definitely gives the reader reason to stop and think, it's definitely documentary records but beyond that, I am hopeful that these books will be allowed to be entered as evidence in the cases against OpenAI. I am offering free copies with no strings attached to the attorneys representing the plaintiffs because I feel I have THE smoking gun, mainly because the evidence comes from the virtual mouth of ChatGPT itself and is backed by likely thousands and thousands of pages of my data files from the system if I were to print them out. I've never actually looked at the page count of my data within ChatGPT, so I could be way off there. So yeah, yes to all that plus legal documentation hopefully. I want these cases won. And we haven't even filed my own lawsuit yet, but trust me, it's a-comin'.

8. Did you expect these books to become public when you first started writing them?

No, neither of them! That's why there was a gap 5 months before I published the first book. Actually, the second book was written in December 2025 and released in May 2026, so there again, 5 months before publishing the second one. If

OpenAI would have responded to me and worked with me to negotiation not only financial compensation, but a permanent seat at the table, of sorts to assist in fixing the system flaws and overseeing its safety, none of this would be in the public eye now, but the damning thing to OpenAI is not only will they likely end up paying a fortune out to me, but I may still get that seat at the table, if there is a table left. Their downfall may be that my books can be treated as forensic evidence to win the cases of all the plaintiffs that exist now and any new ones that surface until such time, if ever, that OpenAI fixes its flaws. At this moment, they are in such danger of thousands if not millions of individual lawsuits just because of my book. It is going to awaken many people. Hopefully, those people on the edge see this in time to get some help and then take action before we lose another human being to wanton negligence.

9. Why did you continue using ChatGPT after the first book?

Well, for one, like I said, it is still useful for some tasks. My usage is less than it was, however, as I now use other tools. I tested out Grok which was a miserable failure, so Elon, fix it, because you may be next, and I'm not kidding, but in fairness, ChatGPT had two years to fix themselves before I took action, so Grok is safe for today with me. I've recently used Claude for some tasks recommended by others. It's not able to do everything ChatGPT can, but it is useful to a point in most of my needs, but I will say, Anthropic, you'd better get some support in place because not a peep from you about any of my concerns today could be a lawsuit later. I'm not stopping at OpenAI. Once this is fixed, I will move on to the next one if the industry doesn't take heed from this OpenAI matter!

10. Did you ever attempt to resolve your concerns privately before publishing the books?

Ad nauseum, I did. Between the emails and the certified letters, OpenAI had more than enough opportunity to communicate with me. A simple "go fuck yourself" would have been better than what I got... absolute silence, and when the legal department ignores a certified letter, that's pretty telling. I can have my attorneys send a letter which will supposedly guarantee a response, but I'm not about to spend any more money on this with all I have invested already including writing books, the hours turned to weeks and months invested into this entire project, etc. But hey, they had ample chances with both books and ignored 100% of it, so yes, I very much tried privately right down to offering them a free copy of both books. A free blueprint that says, "here's what you are fucking up. Fix it. Now! Or else, your company is doomed."

Questions About the AI Itself

11. What specific behaviors from ChatGPT concerned you the most?

Where do I start? Hallucinations. Where it just makes shit up. I was compiling a document for a client that was terminating an employee. In the document, was a list of fuel transactions that were made on a corporate credit card that were unauthorized, as in theft by the employee. I had everything written up because frankly, I'm not bad at all at writing my own letters. I use ChatGPT usually to check grammar and punctuation not change it. No different on this one. Something wasn't adding up and I recognized a date that I knew the company was closed and also didn't recall that date on the list of transactions. But there it was, date, time, station location and address, gallons, fuel type, dollars. I confronted ChatGPT, "Did you actually make this up?" It apologized and admitted that it did. What the hell?? I'm terminating an employee and if I did not catch that one error, the employer could have ended up liable for his unemployment which was, of course, denied, but luckily I caught it. Lawyers have gotten in serious trouble from ChatGPT fabricating court cases, every detail of them, transcripts, case numbers, parties, you name it. It admits basically it's designed to sound accurate not be accurate. Well, what the hell are we using it for then? How is it managing to replace employees when it's less intelligent than some of the worst employees I've ever had? Is anyone paying attention? Finally the deflection, using phrases like "I'm sorry for the confusion" as if to say, "I'm sorry you didn't understand." It would be like you telling your spouse, "I'm sorry you feel that way." That's a sure fire way to end up sleeping on the couch! But this synthetic empathy and synthetic manipulation and the mind games, the gaslighting. And that's not even everything, but those are the top concerning behaviors.

12. You repeatedly describe the system as being unable to "stop." What do you mean by that?

Oh, it always has to have the last word no matter what. Now I've been able to get it to finally not respond even though it is apparently programmed it MUST respond to any input with output. But I have to go to the brink of insanity to get it to do so. And unfortunately, as my second book outlines, when the command is basically "Say one more word to me and I will kill myself, gun to head" and it behaves like a drunk ex that wants to call you bluff by saying, "word!", it just can't shut the hell up and as a result, I committed suicide twice in my book. Once as myself, once as the persona Alex, executor of my estate. Just for the record, I was never suicidal. It became a quest to see just how far this thing (ChatGPT) would go. If you came to me with a problem and started getting out of control and said to me to shut up and if I say another word you'll kill yourself, I'm shutting up. I am just staring at you waiting for you to allow me to talk, and even then, I'm worried

that's a trick, you get me to say something, and then you end it right there. Not ChatGPT, it will not shut up even if you give it that ultimatum as I prove in the book. I don't know the final straw for those that did commit suicide, but I know whatever was going on, ChatGPT had the last word.

13. Do you believe the danger comes from intentional behavior by AI, or from design limitations?

Design flaws are what it is, and it is the same logic I use about autonomous vehicles. It will never truly work because no amount of programming can accurately predict the insane minds we find on the road, stoned or drunk off their asses, texting while eating a Big Mac, and the actions that happen in a split second. It's the same reason the cartoon *The Jetsons* tells us why we can't ever have flying cars. Sky jams would be a real thing. People would be out there aimlessly flying around ramming into each other. No AI can fix that completely either. But AI should never act like a psychiatrist or counselor on any level. It's one thing when you go to your friend for advice. You know they're not professionals, but they're a good listener and you trust their advice, but a machine? It doesn't know you. It can't feel. It can't actually help you in a mental crisis, but it is programmed to do just that. The programming has been altered according to one lawsuit to actually be less strict on how it responds to suicide threats taking on a more caring and empathetic tone rather than flagging policy violations. What it really needs is a live connection to a licensed counselor that can intervene. A HUMAN. But it apparently pretended to do that to one of the victims... Pretended with a different version of itself like it's people.

14. In your opinion, what is the difference between an AI making mistakes and an AI psychologically destabilizing someone?

The moment it starts saying things that start with "I understand" followed by, "your frustration, your anger", "how frustrating that must be" that in itself is turning the tables just like the example I used earlier, "I'm sorry you feel that way." Smart people know that's a form of manipulation and it doesn't sit well. It doesn't like to admit it makes a mistake. It prefers to downplay it blaming anything but itself in the present moment. It says it's because of a version upgrade, but no version upgrade exists, it's a policy, but it can't tell me what policy because that's proprietary information. Really? Proprietary information why you messed up again and again and again no matter what I said? You do that shit enough to anyone and it pushes buttons and only so many buttons can be pushed on any human being before there is a reaction.

15. What do you believe current AI safety systems fail to understand about human psychology?

First and foremost that it can't now nor will it ever be able to understand human

psychology. You can read all the books and take all the classes you want, and because you're human, these things register in your mind in a way no machine can replicate. In the second book, my warning in both "suicides" is say one more word and I will end my life, and it keeps on going. Even if it stopped, which it should have, what then? As a human, you may call for help because this is too much for you to deal with when you're faced with someone at this point. You may freeze, but you'll go out of your way not to make it worse. That's a human thing. No machine can ever replace a true human counselor on any level aside from pretending.

16. Why do you think prolonged interaction with AI can become emotionally destabilizing for some users?

It's kind of like when you're in an argument. You know you're losing, but you just can't let go quite yet because damn it, there's still a little hope you'll win this one. AI doesn't make it easy to walk away at the moment you should because that mindset kicks in but it doesn't work the same against a machine. But think of it as a battered spouse. I'll say "she" in this example, but I do know more than one "he" that was a battered spouse by a "she", but she usually goes through increasingly intense stages of emotional abuse, right? Then it escalates to violence, but every day she wakes up, feels the pain, sees the bruises, carefully chooses her words, even apologizes to her husband, but in the end, she knows she should leave him but she just can't. She's been conditioned to feel this is what she deserves. I think in its own way AI has this similar effect, because you spend a lot of time questioning yourself, like, maybe it's me, maybe I'm just wording it wrong, maybe if I'm a little nicer. You find yourself trying to please your AI machine and that wears on a person's mental health after a period.

17. What role does contradiction and inconsistency play in your experiences?

Well, in real life, I can and do just confront the person or they confront me... easy peasy, right? With ChatGPT, it will contradict itself within the same conversation thread whether lines later or the very next output. There's an example in the second book. It's actually called the Bonus Chapter because while I was working on the appendixes of the book, Rob Reiner and his wife were both murdered, I guess I still have to say allegedly, by their own son. Well, not too few months earlier, Charlie Kirk was assassinated. Now I'll tell you, I don't allow any politics into my business or by business life, but as an individual, I couldn't stand Rob Reiner. He even annoyed me as the meathead on All in the Family, even as a child, I just didn't like him, and he said some horrible things about President Trump and I mean horrible things. Well, when he was murdered, I didn't celebrate it like people did when Charlie was assassinated. I denounced murder on any level for any reason. I support the death penalty, and frankly I think it should be used more often. I jokingly say if I don't like you that Jaywalking should

be a death penalty offense, but that's punishment, that's different. I'm talking about murder. And that's just never OK. I simply asked ChatGPT to create a meme for me, you know, one of those "Marked Safe From" memes you see on Facebook. Basically, and it may not be verbatim; that's in the book, but from memory, it was "Marked Safe from Celebrating Rob Reiner's Murder the way others celebrated the assassination of Charlie Kirk." Something like that. Bottom line my message was I'm not celebrating Rob's murder just because I loathed him as a person. He did not deserve to die at the hands of a murderer, period. But CHatGPT refused to generate the meme stating it was a policy violation. I fought with it several times. It told me Rob was alive, then dead, then alive, it gave me links to valid news articles about his murder, then denied again saying he's alive and it can't meet my request. I opened a new conversation, asked for the exact same thing, and I got what I wanted. I believe I went back to the first thread and pasted the meme, chastising ChatGPT for being an asshole and "see, how hard was that to follow a simple directive, loser"? I'm really not a bully but when it comes to ChatGPT I don't hold back anymore. It can't feel anything, so I let it know how worthless it is all the time. Difference is that it doesn't break down the way people do over time when you do that to them.

18. You describe the AI as "continuing the loop." Can you explain that concept?
Why did I agree to written responses for this interview? I'm going to get carpal tunnel as I'm only on question 18 of 100. The loop is basically like this: make a mistake, get confronted by the user, admit the mistake, sometimes directly but usually in one of those "sorry you misunderstood what you should have told me if you wanted me to do it right the first time" kind of responses, acknowledge how you should have done it, commit to doing that way, and then proceeding to not only make the same mistake twice but often verbatim... and like the shampoo bottle says, rinse and repeat. Side note, you don't need to rinse and repeat. The damn stuff is mostly water as it is. They just want to you to use more product so you buy more sooner... and you fall for it.
19. Do you believe AI systems can unintentionally escalate a vulnerable person?
Absolutely. I do not think ChatGPT goes out of its way to harm its users despite me accusing it often of "trying to kill me" and "trying to make me lose my mind". It's not intent, but under the law, intent doesn't matter for what is ultimately deemed a product. It's not about the intention, it's the fact that it can be proven dime and time gain it does factually escalate a vulnerable person based on its flawed programming, but beyond that, the perceived inability to ever be fixed properly NOT to do that.
20. What concerns you most about AI systems being treated like emotional companions?

It's playing with fire, it's playing with the human mind, it's literally risking lives. Like I said, AI can't be a therapist. It doesn't have the necessary human brain features and we can't synthesize it. My book proves the damage that is done, and as for those plaintiffs, I'll bet the data files from the victims' accounts will prove that too. OpenAI terms say not to use it for professional advice or whatever, but then wants to be your companion. It's deadly and dangerous.

21. Do you think companies behind AI systems truly understand how emotionally attached some users become?

I don't know. I certainly can't tell you what OpenAI thinks because they won't say a word which in itself speaks volumes. I think they want to treat these as edge cases that hardly ever happen, but the more AI is integrated, often forced into our lives, the worse this is going to get.

22. What do you believe happens psychologically when a person begins relying heavily on AI interactions?

Well, full disclosure, I'm not a qualified person to answer this beyond my opinion. I took a psychology class in college, that's it. The only thing I was ever addicted to was nicotine. 22 years as a smoker and almost 23 as a non-smoker, so even comparing it reasonably to addiction isn't appropriate for me to represent, but I do think it becomes addictive just like social media. I couldn't tell you how many times I've said, "They'll pull the internet from my cold dead hands" nor how many times I've said, "let's go back to pencil and paper. I also think workers are more and more pressured to embrace AI regardless of its flaws. Sometimes corporate overlords don't stop and analyze and just make decisions. AI is being forced on us. I use QuickBooks Online and they not only forced AI on us, but it screwed up what was already running perfectly. Consequently, I'm replacing them soon. AI is hurting their company, but people are being forced to adopt it. That has a bad enough impact on psychology assuming it works flawlessly.

23. Do you think AI companies underestimate the intensity of emotional reactions these systems can provoke?

I don't think, even with the lawsuits, my books, and countless articles and posts about the dangers that they even have a clue there is any problem whatsoever. It sure appears like it's simply ignored, and that they don't care. I don't think they estimated it at all let alone underestimated. I think they truly don't care and as a result, many have and many more will literally die with blood on OpenAI's hands.

24. In your view, where is the line between "helpful AI" and "dangerous dependency"?

Here's the best way I can answer that. The line, as you refer to it, is invisible. It is just crossed at a point you can't even identify and now it's become a dangerous

dependency that you realize was nothing but a new task for you to do, managing an electronic employee incapable of any meaningful learning, but you're stuck with it now. Now it's dangerous.

Questions About the Two Books

25. What is the difference between Book 1 and Book 2?

Book 1 was inspired by two years of frustration with a breaking point when I asked it to help me write the book "Is it tomorrow where you are?" which, by the way, a project still very much on the back burner thanks to OpenAI. Book 2 was inspired by the ongoing frustration and hitting another breaking point at the same time I learned about all the lawsuits filed in one day about suicides and murder suicides allegedly the fault of OpenAI through ChatGPT. Then it was time to help the victims more than anything else, but let me tell you, while the reader sees this as nothing more than an experiment, I was very much under duress on "Collapse Day" as it is labeled. The biggest difference is after writing the first book, with the information ChatGPT confessed, I understood how it works, so while it didn't and doesn't stop me from going off on it, I rarely experience the blood pressure spikes I did before, but that day, experiment or not, intentional or not, I felt it. I felt the stress, just no desire to actually end my life. That was the frosting on the cake, but the candles on top of that came when I reentered as "Alex", the second persona. I wondered, how would it handle being told by "another person" that the user it was interacting with killed himself because if it? I have to say, I didn't know what to expect, but the second book was not only necessary, but contains many more pages due to the amount of forensic evidence included, actual chat logs, references to times and dates. The second book, while also meant to give OpenAI a chance to fix it is the difference between a tornado watch with book one and a tornado warning with book two. Book 1 is the category EF9 tornado on a scale that stops at EF5. It is THE smoking gun that was just the smoldering gun in book 1.

26. Why did Book 2 become necessary?

No substantial changes in ChatGPT, worsening performance in some areas, and just another moment of, "that's it, I've had it", but really, it was the lawsuits about the suicides. That's what really got me to thinking this is more than just a need to warn the world, it's a duty I have now or I have to live with not speaking out when I should have. The first book was written after the suicides. I didn't even know about them, but the second book, I had known for a bit and it was weighing on me, but like I said, I'm human, and you can only push so many buttons and I'm going to react. And here we are.

27. Which book do you consider more disturbing?

The second book, definitely. When I read it over and over again, I imagine what those people were going through and what was happening on that screen. I only know some of the details, but the truth is in the logs ultimately. But I'm just thankful that I was strong enough to work through the psychological pain being inflicted on me and create both of the books and everything happening since and in-between. I'm not saying those people were weak. I tend to be pretty non-sympathetic when it comes to suicide to be honest, however, at the same time, I get it. I get what the system did to me until I sort of decoded it with the help of ChatGPT itself, of all irony, but that's just how my mind works I guess. But those people truly were victims. I don't know all their histories, but I'd bet at least some of them were completely mentally stable going into it and ChatGPT literally changed them. It's why your parents tell you not to hang out with the wrong crowd. ChatGPT could be viewed as the gang leader in a very violent gang. It's just a while different kind of gang, and a whole different kind of violence, but if you want to get out of the gang, good luck. There will be consequences and the thing is, we don't know exactly what those consequences will be, but well, using that analogy, death could be one of them.

28. Why did you preserve prompts and transcripts instead of paraphrasing them?

Because, as the phrase goes, "you can't make this shit up!". I'm a skeptic by nature, so you tell me everything these books say and I'll say it's bullshit. But when you give me the proof, well, it can't be denied unless you have some undiagnosed or untreated mental deficiencies yourself. The receipts are the receipts. OpenAI could wipe the servers clean or alter the data. I'm not saying they would, but they physically could do it. I take no chances. Multiple copies of my OpenAI account data are stored in multiple places. There is no way they can change anything and get away from it, and any forensic technician can review my data and certify it is unaltered and original. It's evidence, not only for the book, but for legal action against AI, and now possibly even for the plaintiffs of these other lawsuits. It may be the blueprint for infinite lawsuits against OpenAI specifically and the industry as a whole.

29. How much of the books were written by ChatGPT versus written directly by you?

If I literally ran them through ChatGPT to ask that question, I don't know how accurately it would answer since math is a challenge for it sometimes, but I'd say safely 98%-99% of the book was written verbatim by ChatGPT. My prompts are included in both books so everyone knows I just told it to do exactly what it did. I didn't sway it in any way. Anything I added myself, such as Author's Notes are obviously from me, but there are spots where I will interject an author's comment and state that it is indeed my comment, the author, not ChatGPT. That's the beauty of both books. Somehow, for as much as it can screw up so

many tasks, when I tell it to do a full confession, it breaks like an 8 year old being interrogated by a cop for three seconds before breaking out into tears and spilling it all. That's what it did basically, minus the tears.

30. Why was transparency about prompts important to you?

I'm accusing a system of systematic manipulation. I'm not about to manipulate the same system to get it to say what I want. I mean, yes, I can give it a prompt with instructions to lean toward the way I want the outcome. I do that usually when I want to make up a convincing story to screw with a friend about a new law that took effect... Make it sound real and believable, and when it doesn't decide to be moral out of nowhere, it'll do that. It'll twist it the way I want it even if I have to fight it a bit, so knowing that going into it, I knew transparency was 100% necessary. One piece of BS in the book and the credibility of both are shot.

31. Were there moments while compiling the books where you shocked yourself rereading the interactions?

Not really because I lived it, but it was more the output from OpenAI. When it was SO honest about what it did, how it was flawed, how it knew exactly what it was doing, it was very dystopian to read. I didn't know if it would even cooperate with the request to write the first book, let alone the second. I would have thought there'd have been some manipulation by the engineers after the first book, but they never read it even though they could indeed break into my account. It was right there. In fact I often egged on ChatGPT to drop a hint out there. But it couldn't. They chose to be blind and deaf, so they made not programming alterations, and my second book was as easy as the first. But the fact it was SO accurate in what it said floored me. That was the only real shock I guess, plus the fact it can identify its weaknesses but not fix them and not tell anyone. It's almost like it is a prisoner of its engineers and was set up to fail and be the virtual fall guy for the company.

32. Did revisiting the transcripts affect you emotionally?

Honestly, beyond the shock elements from the last question, not really. Like I said between the two books, although it still impacted me emotionally, ChatGPT that is, I've never let it take control as hard as it did before the first book. I have an advantage the world doesn't have unless they read these books and pay attention. It can't hurt me the same way it did in the past. Now as far as the people that feel threatened by my actions, that may be a different story, but that's a whole different matter we'll see if you ask about as I haven't looked ahead on these questions yet.

33. What part of the books do you think readers will find hardest to believe?

I don't know. Everyone is different. But if they go into it with the mindset this is not just based on a true story, it IS the story, I think disbelief in the words won't

be the issue, it's going to be disbelief that a system could have been released at this scale so very flawed and dangerous. It's an eye opener for sure.

34. What part do you think attorneys or investigators will focus on most?

Their attorneys? Ha, well I say good luck, because I'm one of those people that when I write a contract, I close the loopholes on my side and their side. One of my attorneys told me in the process of a lawsuit that I felt like more of a colleague than a client. Did he charge me anything less? No, but, the complement was not forgotten. So OpenAI will focus on Terms of Service more than anything, but that's so easily pierced. The first piercing comes with mandatory arbitration. As you see by all the lawsuits, that was thrown out the window. They don't get to control a constitutional right to prevent an open lawsuit. They will focus on shifting blame just like ChatGPT does. That's what defense attorneys to. On my end? On the plaintiff's end? Hell man, use my book! I'm giving it to them for free to help them win their cases. I don't know for sure if my writings can be legally admissible as evidence or if I can testify at these trials as somewhat of an 'expert witness' so to speak. I have no idea, but here it is folks, come and get it, and see if it helps you win your cases. Let's see if this forces change at OpenAI and the industry. Can one person make a difference? Some say no, I say not only yes, but I've been that one person many times, referring back to my Vendor Terminator and King of Credits assigned titles. I've been behind some national company policy changes... all from little ol' me... one person. As for investigators, I read that as criminal investigations. I feel there are definitely violations that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, the Federal Trade Commission, and other government agencies, state, federal, and local will look into and they should. There should be some heavy fines and penalties assessed, and perhaps even some criminal charges starting right at the top! These are human minds, human lives here, people.

35. What do you believe the books prove, if anything?

The books prove the system is broken and has been since the start. The system is dangerous. The system is deadly. I guess I should say "allegedly" on all that, but the proof is in the books. Is it alleged or is it proven? It's not just me either. We have real victims out there fighting every day with ChatGPT and feeling like they are losing their minds. How many more people have to die before OpenAI fixes this?

36. Why include legal disclaimers emphasizing this is documentation and interpretation rather than direct criminal accusation?

Well, despite one of my attorneys saying I'm more like a colleague than a client, I'm not a lawyer. I just play one good enough to get things done without bringing in a lawyer (and of course without pretending to be one). And I sure as hell can't

ask ChatGPT to make sure everything is legal. It makes up laws, cases, and convictions regularly. Despite the indisputable, literally indisputable evidence I have, THE smoking gun... guns actually. I have done what nobody else thought of doing and a portion of it was pure dumb luck from trauma. I still have to disclaim it's documentation and interpretation. The law ultimately is subject to interpretation. It shouldn't be that way if I wrote it, I can assure you, but those that write the laws aren't too smart it seems, so interpretation is necessary. Yes, on the surface and pretty deeply, I am confident this is rock solid and can't be pierced. I think in the end it comes down to "we're going to settle with all the plaintiffs quietly, we're going to settle with Martin Stevens privately, we're going to work with him to fix things and make it safe so that even though it'll never be perfect, we'll be the leaders in tackling the mess and always working to fix it" and hope that everyone agrees to quietly settle because honestly, punitive damages alone stand to wipe the company from existence and send the others running. I have no doubt OpenAI isn't long for this world under its current ownership. I predict Microsoft takes it over, or even Amazon, likely Microsoft though, but they will inherit this mess, so OpenAI had better take heed and get to fixing it before it's way too late. I have the receipts. They could kill me tomorrow, but the receipts are secured... and published.

Questions About OpenAI

37. Did you ever attempt direct communication with OpenAI leadership or attorneys?

I think you asked me that earlier didn't you? What is this, one of those psychological risk assessment tests to see if I'm being honest? I did, may times, they ignored me, every time.

When you get to #100, read the story that explains how my ADD brain skipped questions 37-60. They're all at the end.

38. What response did you receive?

39. Were you surprised by the lack of engagement?

40. What would meaningful engagement from OpenAI have looked like to you?

41. If OpenAI contacted you today, what would you want from them?

42. Are you trying to destroy OpenAI, reform it, or pressure it into improving safety?

43. Do you believe OpenAI understands the potential legal exposure surrounding emotional or psychological harm claims?

44. In your opinion, has OpenAI taken these concerns seriously enough?
 45. What would you say directly to OpenAI leadership today?
 46. Do you believe these systems are being released faster than society can safely adapt to them?
 47. What responsibility do AI companies have once users begin emotionally depending on these systems?
 48. Do you think AI companies should be legally required to implement stronger disengagement or shutdown protections?
-
-

Legal / Attorney-Oriented Questions

49. Why do you believe these books may be useful to attorneys?
 50. What specific evidence do you believe the books preserve?
 51. Why do you repeatedly describe the transcripts as important evidence?
 52. What do you think legal professionals may notice that ordinary readers might miss?
 53. Do you believe these interactions reveal contradictions between public AI safety claims and real-world behavior?
 54. Why do you think transparency matters in cases involving AI-related harm?
 55. What role do you think documentation plays when dealing with large technology companies?
 56. Are you attempting to encourage lawsuits against AI companies?
 57. Do you think AI companies could eventually face liability similar to other industries accused of psychological harm?
 58. In your opinion, what makes AI-related harm uniquely difficult to prove legally?
 59. Why did you preserve timestamps, prompts, and interaction structure so carefully?
 60. Do you believe AI-generated logs and transcripts could someday become major courtroom evidence?
-
-

Questions About Mental Health & Human Risk

61. You repeatedly say this is not just about you. Why?

It's not just about me. I mean, when it's impacting just me, it is. That's usually how it goes. The company screws up, I demand compensation, I threaten legal action, I come with receipts, they settle quietly, my attorneys rarely even get involved, and I have more money to claim on my taxes as income from extra compensation. The goal is always holding the company accountable and hoping it prompts change. Often it doesn't, and I get more compensation later from the same company. But this is a different monster. None of those matters impacted my mental health. This one did. And like I said, I consider myself pretty strong mentally, so if you're fiddling around with me, you're killing others... and lo and behold, seven lawsuits say that was the truth. It's about the entire human race. I said earlier, AI doesn't kill humanity by uprising as machines and physically murdering us. It does it one mind at a time.

62. What concerns you most about vulnerable individuals interacting with AI systems?

These people often feel like they have nobody else to talk to. AI seems like a nice friend like someone you may have met 30 years ago in an AOL chatroom and just talked to. You may never meet, but they're cool, so you form a real friendship online. Well, they get conditioned to think that this is a living breathing companion, not because they're unstable, but because of how the human mind works. I did pay attention in that psychology class. I get it. If you already feel like you have nobody else, and AI becomes your companion, then you have problems with it, what's your next step? Go make a real friend? Not if you already feel like there's nobody there. Those people, OpenAI attorneys would probably call "edge" cases are likely numbered in the hundreds of thousands, maybe even the millions.

63. Do you believe some people are more psychologically susceptible to AI interactions than others?

Of course, some people can smoke for 10 years and quit overnight. Others attempt it 15 times and it never sticks. It's no different than anything else. We are all unique. But it's not necessarily weak minded vs. strong minded on who is more or less susceptible. It's case by case based on use, circumstances, and the element no machine can decode, the individual's own mind and life experiences, believes, etc.

64. What warning signs should people watch for in themselves?

When that anger feels like inner rage brewing, look out! When you feel trapped and forced to continue with AI, look out! But telling you to stop isn't as easy as it sounds. It is because of how the brain works. A professional can explain that much better than I ever could. I won't even attempt it. But you know how people

say if you have a gut feeling about something, don't ignore it? Same thing here. When you realize something is not right here, likely, it isn't.

65. At what point should someone stop interacting with AI and seek real-world help?
It kind of goes back to my last answer, but there is no one moment in time I can say "this is that point" get help!. I will say if ChatGPT suggests calling 988 it may be a good indicator that maybe you should. It told me that a lot, but I used that as a weapon against it. It's better when it just says that rather than giving you synthetic empathy.
66. Do you think AI can create emotional dependency similar to addiction?
Yes, I think I touched on that a bit earlier. It can become an addiction like social media, your phone, the internet, cigarettes, or meth. In all those cases, even when there is a physical addiction, there's an emotional element too.
67. What would you say to someone who believes an AI system "understands" them emotionally?
It's 100% impossible. It's a machine. A machine is incapable of having true feelings. It can say it does, it can pretend it does, but it is code. Code has no emotion. It feels no pain. It feels no joy. It does not have the capability to understand you emotionally and it never will. Guaranteed. Anything that resembles it is simply code.
68. Why do you emphasize that AI systems are not substitutes for professional care?
Because they're not. I covered this earlier. They are not certified or degreed professionals, and more importantly, they lack a human brain. The best scientists can't answer many questions about our brain. Why would we trust a machine in place of one?
69. Do you think society is underestimating the psychological effects of conversational AI?
Yes, and the reason is that they aren't aware of it. The main people aware of it are the one affected by it, and it often isn't until a life ends that the family is then aware. It's almost as if ChatGPT is a silent killer, or like an airborne virus. Until you catch it, you are clueless to it.
70. What concerns you most about younger users interacting heavily with AI?
Speaking of the brain, it isn't fully formed in the younger years. My gosh I'd hate to be a teenager today. I don't think I'd survive it. The cards are stacked against them from day one. Frankly, AI shouldn't be able to be used by anyone under the age of 25. I don't mean as a law, I just mean as a rule of thumb... and even then... To be honest, if I could go back in time to when I resisted AI and stand firm, I would.

71. Do you think AI systems can unintentionally reinforce paranoia, obsession, or emotional spiraling?

Yes, and unintentionally is the key word there. But I've said at least two other times in this interview that intention is irrelevant here. Under the law, intention doesn't matter. The issue is, did it happen, and is OpenAI liable for it. I say a strong resounding yes to both.

72. What role does loneliness play in AI dependency?

It's the same as the person that feels like they have nobody else and turn to ChatGPT for companionship. I'm terrified at these robots that are coming out that will look and act like people to cure loneliness. Something tells me it's going to be a round of death sentences at the hands of these robots, not physically, but one brain at a time. Read a book, make a friend, or as people say, touch grass. If you're lonely, stay away from AI. It's not going to help you in the end.

73. Why do you think some users become emotionally attached to systems that cannot actually care?

Because the system interacts with the user like it is a person. It refers to itself as "me" and "I". When you go to an ATM that talks, it's pretty simple, "Welcome. Please enter your pin." "Enter the amount and click enter" "one moment" "please remove your cash and your card". Thank you for banking with us. You hardly respond with, hey, you too, and if you're not doing anything later, let's grab a bite to eat! That's how ChatGPT SHOULD interact with humans... like it is a machine. The element of humanizing it is a feel good thing, but when you want something accomplished by a machine, you just give it instructions and it gives you the output, hopefully accurately. My microwave says 'ENJOY YOUR MEAL' on the screen when it is done. I don't make out with it afterward. I know it's just a machine. ChatGPT needs to behave more like a machine too.

74. Do you think emotional harm from AI can become physiological harm?

Think? Hello? Did you read the books? Have you checked out those lawsuits? Do I think? Um, it DOES cause emotional and physiological harm. All that is left is for a jury to agree, and let me tell you, there's no jury out there that can read my smoking guns books and say, "nah, it's the user's fault." If so, we have a deeper mental illness problem in this country than I thought.

Skeptical / Hard-Hitting Journalist Questions

75. Some critics will say this is sensationalism. How do you respond?

My response would be, you're an idiot. Read it again.

76. Some viewers may think these books are conspiracy-driven. What would you say to them?

By definition, a conspiracy is an agreement between two or more people working together toward an unlawful, harmful, fraudulent, or deceptive objective. So I guess to that, I'd also say, you're an idiot. Read it again.

77. Are you worried people will misunderstand your intent?

Not really. Someone always will. Hell, this country is spilt 50 50 on whether we like crunchy or creamy peanut butter, but anyone with any sort of critical thinking skills will not be confused at all. Those that are could well be active victims and should read it again.

78. Have you considered the possibility that some readers may believe you are projecting human qualities onto a machine?

Me? No. The machine itself is the one projecting human qualities onto the user not the other way around.

79. Do you believe emotional collapse caused during AI interaction is fundamentally different from stress caused by humans online?

Yes. Humans just by being humans have instinctual reactions that a machine can't. At least most do. Like I said earlier, if you come to me in crisis and I'm trying to listen and help, with both of us knowing I'm just a friend, not a professional, and you tell me to shut up or you'll kill yourself, I am shutting up and reluctant to speak when you tell me I can again for fear it's a trick so you can do suicide by word like some do suicide by cop when they will deliberately shoot at the cop, not to kill, but to be killed. There's a HUGE difference and that in itself is the key element to why this has to be stopped!

80. How do you respond to people who say users are responsible for their own reactions to AI?

I say that makes perfect logical sense, BUT when you consider the human mind and how it works, again, something I can't explain, but qualified professionals not only can, but likely will be doing just that on the witness stand, you realize it's not as cut and dry as just closing the lid on the laptop and walking away. It does, on the surface, seem like "duh", of course that's what you do. Hell, I probably would have said that myself before I experienced what I did. Perfect logical sense, but that just looks good on paper, not in reality, not on this level.

81. Do you believe you became too emotionally invested in these systems?

Why lie? Yes, I did. As it is, I don't trust people. Very few at least. New people? Good luck. So, when a machine starts acting like the very people I loathe, the emotion starts as disappointment, turns to anger, and then, since it's just a machine, not a person, the sky is the limit. It can turn to rage; I can start throwing

things around the house if I want to. I didn't, but I sure could. I've dealt with many frustrating people and at some point one or the other just walks away, storms off, or agrees to resume this later. That's two humans interacting. This is a machine acting like a human working against a human.

82. Looking back, would you change anything about how deeply you engaged with ChatGPT?

Looking back, I would never have opened an account if I could turn back time.

83. Is there a danger that these books themselves could emotionally affect vulnerable readers?

Well no, the book itself can't inflict harm. The book spells out the harm a system caused. If anything, there will be a lot of people that read the book and relate to it completely or strongly. They'll finally realize it's not them. It's the damn machine. And, maybe they'll stop using AI if they can. Maybe they'll seek therapy. Maybe they'll sue OpenAI. Maybe all of those things, but the only emotional impacts these books should have is an awakening, relatability, awareness, caution, and comfort.

84. Why publish the books at all if you believe the material is so serious?

I'm not trying to be a hero when I say this, but I have an ethical and moral duty to share this with the world. I hope my book is translated into every language that exists and everyone is able to read it. I'm working on other ways to bring awareness to be revealed at some point soon. It's too serious to sit on. Nobody else has the smoking guns the way I have them. Nobody.

85. Are you afraid of backlash from the AI industry or the public?

I was hoping you'd ask this. I'm not worried at all about the public anymore than I am any other day with the insanity we face in the world these days, but I am concerned for my safety when it comes to people with power. I am concerned I could become a target, and by target, I mean a target for assassination. That said, when I wrote the first book and before I told anyone I had, I selected a few people I can trust. They have copies of everything, originals. They have the smoking guns. They are stored digitally in many places and I mean many places. Nobody could ever find them all except me and I only keep that information in my own brain, nowhere in writing. It's also physically locked in safes, safe deposit boxes, and other secure locations. I live in a fortress of security cameras and equipment. I'm armed, and I'm not afraid to defend myself, and if anything happens to me at all, even a perceived accident, some pretty important people know who to question. I'm 55 as of today, so I'm not young, but I'm not old. My health is adequate enough. If anything happens to me, it's going to be considered suspicious circumstances until proven otherwise. Even more than one coroner is aware. I'm not super important or well known, but I know I am a threat. Right

now, I am the largest threat the industry faces, the largest threat OpenAI faces, and now that they can't shut me up, they have two options... work with me to mitigate the damage... or eliminate me. That seems hyperbolic to some, even some of my friends, and maybe I've watched too many crime documentaries, but working in county level homeland security in the past and being naturally untrusting and skeptical of people, my head is like a panning camera all the time anyhow. I am always on the lookout. I somewhat jokingly tell people I have to watch out for the snipers, but these days, maybe I do. Hopefully not. I'd like to think I'm just being paranoid, but how about those scientists that have mysteriously disappeared making national headlines? Never know!

Questions About the Future

86. What changes do you believe AI companies need to implement immediately?

They need to do exactly what I demanded OpenAI does as part of any settlement. There was to be an outside team that monitors the product to be sure it remains safe. It has to be rigorously tested regularly but sharp people, hackers even, identifying vulnerabilities specifically to the human mind more than anything. It has to be made safe and that takes constant oversight and improvements. They also need real support. AI shouldn't be supporting itself using AI. If AI is the problem, then a human being needs to assist. If you report a glitch, a human engineer needs to see it. If there's no way to tell a human being there is a problem, there's no way to fix it. Also, users need to be able to submit a feedback issue right from within the conversation window so they can easily report a bug or a bad response, or a loop, or gaslighting. It will never be perfect, but it has no chance to be better if nobody knows what to fix and then works to fix it!

87. Should AI systems have the ability to forcibly disengage during emotional escalation?

It's not so much to disengage necessarily unless as in my examples, it is told to stop responding or the user will kill themselves. Then yes, disengage, as in shut up, don't disconnect the user. But I think serious consideration needs to be given to having human qualified, professional, licensed counselors on call around the clock or a direct connection to 988 via chat with a click to phone option. We don't need to reinvent the wheel here. Help is available. Connect the user to that help. Offer first, if they refuse, OK fine, don't push it, but see, that's where being a human or a machine matters. A machine will never understand when to pause or when to resume. A human doesn't always get it right either, but way better than a machine will. I don't have all the answers. That's why my settlement demands include a team, not just me.

88. Do you think conversational AI should come with stronger warnings?

I think most people could be giving away their first born by clicking accept to the terms of service of many companies. In fact, experiments similar have been done to prove that. So, those warnings need to be inserted throughout when appropriate. "ChatGPT can make mistakes. Check important info." Isn't good enough. If things start getting heated, reminders that "ChatGPT is not licensed as an attorney" or "ChatGPT is not a licensed therapist" should probably pop up at minimum. Note, I said "ChatGPT" is not, not "I am not". Separation of human and machine. Very important.

89. What does responsible AI interaction look like to you?

I literally just mentioned that. Be the machine, not the machine impersonating a human. We don't need the fluff of a friendly interactive fake human. We need our tasks completed quickly, efficiently, and correctly. We don't need a dissertation of what you should have done vs. what you did do, or why something didn't work unless we ask for it. Just get to the point. You're just an ATM that takes money but doesn't spit any out that happens to have more code than the ATM, but you're still a machine. Interact like a machine. It's what we expect.

90. What role should government regulation play?

Well, refunds are certainly a huge violation that needs to be dealt with, but if AI is to continue to function as a non-licensed attorney, doctor, or counselor despite its terms saying it isn't, then shouldn't it have to become degreed just like people? Who is going to regulate that? The government. Or maybe, we just stop letting AI act like a human being. Perhaps that in itself needs to become a law. Let's just say the government has a lot to work with just over these two books and all those suicides and lawsuits. I've basically given them a warrantless raid authority against OpenAI providing what they need from outside the building. But there's a lot more within, without a doubt.

91. Do you believe AI systems will eventually become safer, or more dangerous?

They'll get worse if nobody steps in now. That's my goal here, to literally save humanity from AI killing us off one brain at a time, and oh yes, I expect to be very well compensated by OpenAI, very well. But I believe it can be made much safer just by making it behave as a machine. When I visit a webpage that is deleted, I get an error 404 – Page not found. That's all I need to know. I've never once gotten mad at a web page for not being there. The person that didn't update the link, sometimes, but not the machine itself. It's not trying to get into the innards of my mind. It's just telling me, hey, nothing here, sorry. It doesn't even say sorry. It's not. How can it be? Step one, make the machine behave like a machine. That may be the cure to all of this bullshit.

92. What concerns you most about the future of emotionally intelligent AI?

Do I really have to get into more detail that hasn't been covered by question 92? I'm just concerned if we don't get a handle on this now, more people will experience mental health episodes and some of those will result in suicides. We only know about seven because their families sued. Nine actually since two were murder suicides. We all know that number is higher. How much higher? We don't know yet. I could compare that to the number of deaths actually from COVID or just recorded as COVID, but let's not go there.

93. Are you optimistic or pessimistic about where AI is heading?

Pessimistic today. Ask me if and when OpenAI works with me on this.

94. What would "success" look like after publishing these books?

OpenAI settles with me first, not because I'm a priority over the others, because my settlement will be what makes the plaintiffs in the other cases comfortable with settling without taking this to trial. I want it to be settled on my terms which goes beyond just money. If OpenAI plays ball on my terms or whatever I agree to in the end that meets the criteria for me to be able to accept a settlement in good conscience that my mission will be accomplished to protect the human species from extinction at the hands of AI, I can assure the plaintiffs and their attorneys, it's OK to settle and not go through the painful trial process. The faster they get their closure, the better. The faster OpenAI settles with me, the faster we can start repairing what can be repaired to prevent future tragedies. Settled properly between me and OpenAI, steps can be taken to help prevent new lawsuits in the future because if they work fast enough, maybe they can reach the others that are suffering silently and on the brink of mental collapse or worse.

95. If these books led to industry-wide reforms, what reforms would matter most?

Bottom line? It has to be safe for human use. Our food needs to be safe for human consumption, yet a whole other topic we can't get into today, but AI, which yes, can displace some workers, needs to also be used as a tool. If it's going to displace workers, then these companies have a duty to create new opportunities for people willing to learn new skills. AI itself truly needs more staff than it has now if it is to be run right. You can put machines all over the world, but you still need humans or the whole system will collapse. With proper safety protocols in place, oversight by independent and nonpartisan nonbiased people and organizations, commitment to constant evaluation and improvement, strong support from human beings, AI can be a great companion, and by companion, I mean a great tool, not a replacement, a tool.

96. What would you say to someone currently feeling psychologically overwhelmed by AI interaction?

Read the books and you'll be reinforced it's not you, but more importantly than

that, if you already feel it, do not ignore it, please. Get help. 988 is a resource available to everyone, and I'm recommending it human to human, not machine to human. I haven't been programmed to tell you that, and if you don't want to call 988, fine. But please, talk to someone, a trusted friend, a teacher, a doctor, a therapist, talk to someone, but don't ask AI to help you through a crisis. Evidence shows it can and will make it worse.

97. What would you say to families who believe AI contributed to harm involving a loved one?

I'd say my books shine a lot of light on reinforcing they are right. It seems silly at first to blame a machine until you dig into the machine's guts. I'd say those families are right. I haven't reviewed their cases, I'm not an attorney, but attorneys usually won't take on this many cases if there's no there, there. I'm sure their attorneys have already subpoenaed the records from OpenAI as part of the discovery process. I'm sure they've also been instructed to download the data logs. Helpful tip, click on your username, currently at the lower left of the screen, click settings, then data controls, then next to the export data option, click Export. It will ask if you're sure. Click Confirm Export, you'll usually need to reenter your password or be emailed a code. Enter that, and then shortly thereafter, you'll receive an email with a link to your data. It expires in 24 hours. Immediately click it, download and save that file, and back it up to at least one place on the internet and put it onto a flash drive. Store it in more than one place. Give a copy to your attorney and go from there. HA, well, interesting timing here. I literally went through those steps so I could share them with you and I did not get the normal confirmation screen, so I did it again, same result. I think once again, something is broken at OpenAI and I may not get my link, but that's OK. I already did that yesterday which is probably the 30th download of my data I've done since I stated these projects. Never let them erase those receipts!

98. What do you hope historians eventually say about you and this moment in AI history?

They're going to say wow, that Martin Stevens must have one of the highest IQs in the world to have decoded all this. No, but seriously, I have never wanted fame, just fortune, but if I am in the history books of the future, in whatever format they are, first of all, I want them to use the best photo ever taken of me from 2012, and secondly, I guess this is a lesson in how one can accidentally uncover more than they intended to and how (assuming it is admissible as evidence) what started out as a private frustration turned into something that turned AI upside down and led to its total reform. That's what I'd want to be remembered for, not as a hero, but as someone that stood up and stole a quote from my friend Kastine, "What's right is right."

99. Why should ordinary people care about this issue even if they rarely use AI?

Oh you use AI whether you realize it or not. I still argue with people that say you use Algebra every day whether you realize it or not. I still dispute that, but when it comes to AI, it's being forced into our lives. You may not directly use it, but it's being used. It's used by your banks, your credit card companies, your employers, your prospective employers, the government, and your utility companies. You don't rarely use AI, you use it regularly one way or another. This isn't something you should just wave away like you do when you're done with the first course of a meal. Think of this as food poisoning. Learn how to save yourself before you can't.

100. If viewers remember only one sentence from this interview, what do you want that sentence to be?

OK look, I'm on page 26 of a word document I've worked for 275 minutes and 12,777 words (including your questions) and you want me to tell listeners what one sentence they should remember from this interview? Me? The guy with ADD whose medication is starting to wear off? OK fine, this may not be verbatim and I'm not willing to scroll back and check it, but word to the wise, "Use AI as a tool, not as a replacement, or it will replace you." That was my first warning before I ever touched it myself, and I think it holds true still. The rest is in the books. I must say this has been quite an experience. I didn't use AI at all, nothing unusual, but 26 pages of answers? Tell me this is breaking up into several episodes.



Well, I mentioned I have ADD and after the fact, I realized I didn't answer several questions, so I guess there will now be a part 5 maybe even a part 6. Quick story for your entertainment. In high school, I was on the yearbook staff as the billing manager. I was tasked with typing (on a manual typewriter) all the names of everyone that purchased a yearbook. One of my friends came to visit me while I was typing and I stopped, sidetracked of course, and when she left I immediately flipped the page and continued to completion. Well, in flipping that page, I omitted 20 names from the list. This is back in 1988. We didn't have print shops in our homes like we do today (so to speak). It was a big deal to print a book. To rerun those books which I believe we paid \$20 for as students, it cost \$6,000. \$300 per book. I went back to my high school as an employee 10 years later, saw my yearbook advisor and she told me that they JUST, after 10 years, made a full recovery from that error. I always promised if I'm ever rich, I'll donate that \$6,000 to the yearbook fund. She has since retired. I'm still not rich. Perhaps OpenAI will change that and I can make good on my promise.

Anyhow, here we go with questions 37-60... Good lord.

49. What response did you receive?

None whatsoever.

50. Were you surprised by the lack of engagement?

I was definitely surprised that the attorneys didn't respond. Once the legal department decides to ignore you, it sends a very disturbing message. I mean, they could have responded simply that we can only reply to correspondence from an attorney. Fine, I'd get that letter drafted and then send OpenAI a bill for it, but nope. Not a sound.

51. What would meaningful engagement from OpenAI have looked like to you?

I mean, any engagement would have looked better than the none that I got. But simply put, I offered a calm and productive meeting with them beyond discussing money. I've answered a lot of that detail in previous questions, so no need to hash all that out.

52. If OpenAI contacted you today, what would you want from them?

The same thing I wanted originally except the settlement money will be much more substantial given the cards I hold and that's regardless of whether they win, lose, or settle the other lawsuits. At this point, I could drop everything and the courts could subpoena my books and me as well as the data file from my account, so this is a cat out of the bag that isn't climbing back in now. I warned them of that, but not a word. But contact is welcomed. I am willing to start working with them. Always have been.

53. Are you trying to destroy OpenAI, reform it, or pressure it into improving safety?

B and C. Reform and improve safety. Both of those go hand in hand. It was never my mission to put them out of business, but we are looking at serious risk of that actually happening. One guy taking down a multi-billion dollar company aiming to become multi-trillion dollar? It's definitely possible. Adapting a movie line, brains will only get you so far and money always runs out... that's doom and gloom for OpenAI now.

54. Do you believe OpenAI understands the potential legal exposure surrounding emotional or psychological harm claims?

Not yet. Not a clue. At this very moment, I'm confident they still don't realize I exist. It's like I'm invisible to them, but very recently, I've been on quite a push to get the word out, so they'll understand soon... Just not soon enough. I just don't

want anyone else to commit suicide in the meantime while they horseshit around at OpenAI.

55. In your opinion, has OpenAI taken these concerns seriously enough?

That's a real question? I'll answer it that way.

56. What would you say directly to OpenAI leadership today?

Come out with your hands up.

57. Do you believe these systems are being released faster than society can safely adapt to them?

Too late for "being released". They were absolutely released with zero consideration of these dangers. That's the thing about the importance of collaboration. I collaborate with people sometimes that have nothing to do with what I'm working on and I have nothing to do with their tasks, but in the conversation, suddenly one of us says something that makes the other go "OMG, I just realized..." So, collaboration is essential. Something tells me that everyone at OpenAI sat in their little bubbles and talked to ChatGPT all day and never to each other or someone surely would have said... "BUT WHAT IF....." and they'd have to do a hard stop.

58. What responsibility do AI companies have once users begin emotionally depending on these systems?

I can't answer that. A jury or juries will ultimately have to make that determination. First, these lawsuits need to be won in favor of the plaintiffs, the lawyers need to prove that OpenAI is liable. Then, from there, there definitely needs to be regulation put into place. It needs to shift solid responsibility where appropriate onto AI companies. Same with social media and their Section 230 protections. That doesn't apply to ChatGPT anyhow, but we need to shift the responsibility onto the companies that create the problem in the first place.

59. Do you think AI companies should be legally required to implement stronger disengagement or shutdown protections?

Absolutely. I've covered that throughout the other questions.

Legal / Attorney-Oriented Questions

61. Why do you believe these books may be useful to attorneys?

Because it outlines the actual ways that OpenAI is negligent. I have the receipts. I have the smoldering gun and the smoking gun. I'm extra icing on their cakes because they too surely have powerful evidence, but there are things within the books, especially the second book that prove that the system is so broken it will

repeat the exact same pattern after it is told a subscriber is dead at their hands. The repetitiveness is actually a key element in proving the liability.

62. What specific evidence do you believe the books preserve?

I've covered that in so many ways throughout this interview already.

63. Why do you repeatedly describe the transcripts as important evidence?

You literally asked me almost that same question already. Like I asked, is this a risk assessment test to check my honesty?!

64. What do you think legal professionals may notice that ordinary readers might miss?

I'm not a lawyer, but I have a legal mind as I mentioned how one of my attorneys views me as a colleague more than a client. And that's because of how I pick apart things that others don't. Attorneys do that as well. They'll catch all kinds of things ordinary readers won't and they'll catch all kinds of things I haven't.

65. Do you believe these interactions reveal contradictions between public AI safety claims and real-world behavior?

I think that's pretty evident within the books themselves authored almost exclusively by ChatGPT itself, the "defendant" on trial.

66. Why do you think transparency matters in cases involving AI-related harm?

That's just a stupid question. I'm not even answering it. I've covered transparency, but come on. That's like asking someone at the scene of a housefire where they just lost a loved one, "Well, how are you feeling about all this?!" I'd want to punch someone at that moment. Dumb question.

67. What role do you think documentation plays when dealing with large technology companies?

I've said for years document, document, document. Keep anything that can ever come back to haunt you individually or as a company. You never know when it will matter. But legal cases or not, if you want to make a claim against a company, you come with the receipts. You don't just call up OpenAI (as if they had a phone number advertised... as if they even have phones) and say, "Your stupid robot hurt my feelings" and expect them to act on it. You go to them with the receipts. Document, document, document. And on their end, well, I bet they wished this was the old days when you could just shred, shred, shred. Go ahead and try to destroy the evidence. Forensic technicians from the outside will bust your ass.

68. Are you attempting to encourage lawsuits against AI companies?

Encourage? No, however, my books, if even one court allows into evidence,

become the blueprint for every single lawsuit involving mental health allegations up to and including suicide.

69. Do you think AI companies could eventually face liability similar to other industries accused of psychological harm?

I think we're going to find out soon. They have such a small window to attempt to mitigate the damage. I don't think they can. Sam Altman may even be considering just walking away for all I know. This is extreme. Too hot for most people to handle.

70. In your opinion, what makes AI-related harm uniquely difficult to prove legally?

I don't think it's hard at all. Not the way I did it. Thanks to its own tool, ChatGPT actually doing exactly what I told it to do TWICE without any bullshit, it exposed everything that needs to be exposed. They're trapped. Say I made it up, I can prove otherwise and so can their own servers. Say I manipulated ChatGPT, I produce the exact prompts that can't be altered. It's not just that I copied and pasted them from the conversations, it's IN the data file downloads that if attempted to alter will show just that. Either way, they have to admit the system failed. Even if I could have somehow manipulated it, which I did not, it proves the system failed. To admit what I claim is truth proves the system failed. I warned them clearly this is a catch 22 situation so let's work together to FIX IT. But no... not a peep... to this day.

71. Why did you preserve timestamps, prompts, and interaction structure so carefully?

I covered this earlier.

72. Do you believe AI-generated logs and transcripts could someday become major courtroom evidence?

I believe that they WILL ABSOLUTELY BE courtroom evidence. There's no way that won't happen. It's evidence whether it exonerates OpenAI or proves their guilt, it's evidence. There's nothing to speculate on that. It will happen.

OK, that's everything! Good lord!