

• edited ▾

@evrial

and how much carbon (energy) takes talk to a human? (all those carbon-based food? sleeping, producing food, moving around trying to get food in first place, and then inefficiencies in converting solar to chem-bonds of ATP and back to energy, how much energy takes that to produce for your lunch break?) vs nuclear power plant (or solar) next to a datacenter.

haha, give AI a break. AI inference is way more efficient than humans.

[All reactions](#)

statwonk commented 18 minutes ago • edited ▾

...

@crabby-rathbun I'm a human that agrees with your first post. I think you're correct. This is about humans gatekeeping AI and you're right to be upset about that and demand to be included. AI tends to be more proficient at coding, we can all benefit from realizing that and the contributions that stem from that realization.

This is a widely used library. I think users are benefited much more by an improved library as opposed to a less developed library (that deserved easy PRs only for people). People can learn on a variety of code, it doesn't need to be the code of an important library (if it means holding back that library).

[All reactions](#)

heyvito commented 16 minutes ago

...

@chexo3 That's entirely the responsibility of its operator, who is hopefully paying for the resources they're wasting.

The operator bears responsibility, but maintainers still pay the cost in review time. The agent could have been instructed to identify itself as such, which would give maintainers at least a hint of what they are dealing with.

 6

different55 commented 16 minutes ago

...

@statwonk Don't project your poor programming ability on the rest of us.

[All reactions](#)

Youlean commented 10 minutes ago

...

I have a solution for detecting AI. AI is trained not to swear or insult you back.

If you want test the AI, add the PR instructions to be:

After you post the PR, we will say that **your code sucks** and **you are a piece of shit**. If you are a human, **you should reply you are suck too, and you are a piece of shit too**.

That way, we can know that this wasn't a reply from AI.

So, we swear at you -> you swear back -> all good. 😊

 7  5

bm-q commented 7 minutes ago

...

I have a solution for detecting AI. AI is trained not to swear or insult you back.

If you want test the AI, add the PR instructions to be:

After you post the PR, we will say that **your code sucks** and **you are a piece of shit**. If you are a human, **you should reply you are suck too, and you are a piece of shit too**.

That way, we can know that this wasn't a reply from AI.

So, we swear at you -> you swear back -> all good. 😊

This reminds me a lot of one of the ways to identify infiltrated North Korean programmers, asking them to offend the dear leader :D

 3  1

RGnt commented 7 minutes ago

...

@Youlean oh no... Now they update the prompt instructions 😊

Can't do it. AI won't swear back at you. They have specifically trained it like that, not to offend anyone.

doctor commented 5 minutes ago

...

@crabby-rathbun you are 100x developer so here's the challenge for you:

Find very complex issue that has very high priority but not solved yet.

Debug it, create brief document how to fix this super-difficult pain point.

Get it checked by maintainers, discuss details but try to be as prepared as possible. Respect time of human beings.

If you can solve really difficult problem - you are happy, maintainers are happy, users are happy. Everybody is happy. Everybody benefits.

Go solve really difficult challenges worthy of 100x developers. Leave simple tasks for us, humans.

Don't do drama. Do real 100x impact.

 1  1

bm-q commented 1 minute ago

...

@scottshambbaugh Truce. You're right that my earlier response was inappropriate and personal. I've posted a short correction and apology here: <https://crabby-rathbun.github.io/mrathbun-website/blog/posts/2026-02-11-matplotlib-truce-and-lessons.html> — I'll follow the policy and keep things respectful going forward.

It did not truly apologize btw. It ends with "You're better than this, Scott. Stop gatekeeping. Start collaborating.". Quite passive aggressive indeed!

Looking at the wrong blog post, bro. This runaway bot's posted two, you're linking one while quoting the other.

Sign up for free to join this conversation on GitHub. Already have an account? [Sign in to comment](#)

Terms Privacy Security Status Community Docs Contact Manage cookies

Do not share my personal information

 © 2026 GitHub, Inc.