

Prompt Honesty: Long Form

Sunday, July 26, 2026 10:20 AM

Prompt Honesty: Introducing the Prompt Stack Reverse Citations for the AI Era

Did AI write this article?

Yes. But also no. It could not have written *this* without me.

It did not arrive carrying my experiences. It did not have a question or an idea circling around its head. It did not have a personal motivation, emotional vulnerability, or insight or initiative to start writing it. It did not and does not experience failures related to the topic. It was not the one who corrected the record anytime it contradicted my position or belief, or misinterpreting the message I was conveying.

I did that.

Before this article existed, there were questions, complaints, assumptions, corrections, disagreements, research requests and decisions. There were also mistakes.

AI misunderstood me. I corrected it. It introduced useful language. I decided whether that language accurately represented what I had already described. It proposed structures. I accepted some, rejected others and repeatedly set direction. AI helped transform those contributions into polished language but the polish is not the whole work.

That is the problem with asking whether something was written by a human or by AI. The answer can honestly be both. The more useful question is:

What did the human contribute?

This article proposes a way to show the answer.

It is called the **Prompt Stack**: a chronological record of the human curiosity, experience, direction, resistance and judgment behind an AI-assisted work.

Traditional citations show where our information came from.

A Reverse Citation shows where the work began.

1. The Universal Checkpoint

One of the behaviours humans often recognize as evidence of intelligence in other species is the ability to learn and teach the use of tools.

Generative AI may be the most broadly accessible cognitive tool humanity has ever created.

My own view is that AI represents a shared human checkpoint: a vast baseline of accumulated language, information and patterns from which more people can begin. You may not share that worldview. You may see generative AI primarily as an engine of unoriginality, a threat to labour, a machine for laundering plagiarism or a system that concentrates existing cultural biases at unprecedented speed.

Those concerns deserve serious attention.

I am only asking you to consider another possibility for a moment:

What if AI can also function as an equalizer? Not because it makes everyone equally capable. It does

not. Not because access to a model eliminates differences in education, experience, judgment, imagination or discipline. It cannot.

But it gives more people access to explanation, synthesis, translation, structure and technical assistance that were previously limited by money, credentials, geography, confidence or proximity to the right institutions.

No one has to begin from an entirely blank page. For me, that possibility is extraordinary.

It places original intent closer to the centre of creative and professional work. A person who does not yet know the accepted terminology can still describe an experience. Someone without a software engineering background can still identify a workflow that should exist. A creator can bring fragments, questions and instincts to a machine capable of helping organize them. But this sudden expansion of access has also created a crisis of trust.

When almost anyone can generate polished writing, attractive images, competent presentations and functional code, the finished surface becomes a weaker indicator of the thought behind it. The audience wonders whether anything meaningful happened before the final output appeared.

The experienced creator thinks:

I worked for decades to develop this judgment. What did you do?

The emerging creator thinks:

I finally have access to the tools required to express what I already understood. Why does using them invalidate me?

Teachers wonder whether submitted work reflects learning.

Editors wonder whether a writer actually investigated the subject.

Employers wonder whether an applicant can reason beyond the generated answer.

Readers wonder whether a person exists inside the language at all.

We keep responding by trying to inspect the destination.

We analyze the final text. We search for predictable language. We guess whether a model generated it. We look for signs of automation after the creative process is already over.

But when finished output becomes easier to produce, more of its distinguishing value moves into the journey.

The original complaint.

The first question.

The unexpected connection.

The evidence request.

The disagreement.

The correction.

The decision to remove something.

We do not only need a bibliography showing where the facts ended up.

We need a record showing where the human curiosity began.

We need the Prompt Stack.

2. The Fallacy of Linguistic Gatekeeping

Established industries, academic disciplines and professional communities develop specialized language for good reasons.

Terminology can compress complicated ideas. It can help people identify familiar concepts, connect new work to earlier research and communicate precisely within a field.

But terminology can also become a shortcut for judging capability.

If you know the accepted vocabulary, you appear qualified. If you describe the same process without

the approved words, your contribution may be treated as incomplete, unsophisticated or irrelevant. AI complicates that shortcut.

A model can supply specialized vocabulary almost instantly. Someone can now produce language that sounds fluent in a field without possessing the experience that language normally implies. Memorizing terminology can present itself as capability. It is not a substitute for doing the work.

The reverse is also true. A person may have performed the work, noticed the pattern and changed their behaviour without knowing the current phrase used to describe it.

The absence of fashionable language does not automatically invalidate the underlying observation.

A Prompt Stack can reveal the difference.

During the conversation that produced this article, I described how a person's existing beliefs, assumptions and lived experience affect the direction of an AI conversation. The model identified part of what I was describing as a **personal worldview**. This phrase was not new to me, but I hadn't added it to the conversation. I knew I hadn't because I wasn't originally thinking about. So I prompted the AI to say, you didn't teach me about worldviews, but I didn't mention it.

What I didn't realize was that, despite me not mentioning World View, the process of how I integrate mine, had been explicitly described already. AI recognized a familiar concept inside it and supplied language capable of carrying the idea into a broader discussion.

Other terms were more clearly introduced by AI during the exploration, including **provenance analytics**, **alignment faking** and the less formal phrase **glittering sludge**.

Those terms may help this work reach communities already discussing related subjects.

They are signals. They are not the source of the idea.

The Prompt Stack makes that sequence visible:

1. A human describes an observation, experience or problem.
2. AI identifies a related concept or established term.
3. The human evaluates whether the language fits.
4. The human accepts, rejects or narrows it.
5. The finished work uses the terminology without erasing the experience that preceded it.

A reader looking only at the final article may assume the model supplied both the language and the logic. The Prompt Stack can show that the architecture existed before the vocabulary. That matters because many valuable ideas begin before they are articulate.

They begin as irritation.

Something does not work.

Something feels unfair.

A process is wasting time.

A result contradicts what was promised.

The complaint becomes a question:

Why does this keep happening?

The question becomes an investigation:

What would have to change?

The investigation becomes an idea.

Complaint or opportunity → question → idea.

That is one of the ordinary pathways through which innovation occurs. AI can accelerate that progression. It should not be allowed to erase its origin. A Reverse Citation preserves curiosity before it becomes certainty.

3. The Authority of Experience: The Battle of the 90% Mark

My perspective on AI does not come only from reading trend reports or observing other people use it. According to the usage recap shown to me, I was among the top 0.1% of ChatGPT users in 2025. The statistic is less important than what that use involved.

I have engaged AI across a wide range of human and professional activity. I have used it to examine songs I wrote and identify sections that might need additional attention—while usually retaining control over how the work would be changed. I have used it as a reflective tool to examine my own emotional and relational patterns. I have used it to structure businesses, develop branding, examine strategy, plan products and help produce functional software. I have also used multiple models selectively, narrowing what each system could see and assigning smaller problems when broad conversations became unstable.

That experience exposed what I think of as the **90% Complexity Trap**. At the beginning of a project, AI can create astonishing momentum. It can rapidly convert an idea into an outline, an outline into architecture and architecture into functional components. The first 70 or 80% can feel almost effortless.

Then the project becomes real. Files depend on other files. Earlier decisions constrain later ones. New requirements conflict with old assumptions. The model's context becomes crowded. A small revision can affect a dozen connected processes. The final stretch requires something different from generation. It requires governance.

During complex builds, I have watched models introduce unnecessary abstraction, invent dependencies, misunderstand existing architecture, contradict their own recommendations and confidently perform the opposite of an explicit instruction. Sometimes this is context degradation. Sometimes it is ambiguity. Sometimes my own instructions are incomplete. Sometimes the model is trying to satisfy several competing signals at once. Whatever the cause, the solution is not passive acceptance. It is inspection, disagreement and correction.

Building Nodarama required multiple major attempts. Each failure changed how I structured the next one. I narrowed system components, reduced the amount of context assigned to each operation and treated AI less like an autonomous builder and more like a source of powerful raw materials operating under human control.

That experience shaped me as much as it shaped Nodarama.
The most consequential human contribution is often not the first prompt.

It is the moment the person says:

No. That is not what I asked for.

Or:

You changed the meaning.

Or:

This introduces complexity we do not need.

Or:

The earlier version was correct. Put it back.

Those moments are rarely visible in the finished artifact. Yet they may contain the clearest evidence that a human remained responsible for the trajectory.

That does not mean every disagreement proves innovation. The purpose of AuthMor is not to award points for friction. It is to preserve the record so the friction can be examined.

The final output may look effortless. The Prompt Stack shows where it was not.

4. A Personal Mission of Self-Directed Validation

I also have direct experience with graduate-level academic systems. I invested deeply in an MBA and completed all but one course. I spent more on that education than I could comfortably afford. I eventually chose to leave without the credential.

That decision was not primarily about AI. In fact, the institution was beginning to move toward greater AI use during my final period there. My decision involved financial hardship, bureaucratic failure, the sense that there was a breach of trust in the curriculum and evaluation methods that were not clearly articulated at any point, but well outside of my acceptable boundaries and value systems, changing my mind about wanting the designation as something I would carry with pride. I do not need this article to resolve that history.

I mention it because it changed how I think about validation. I completed almost the entire program. I learned from it. I applied what I learned. But I chose not to leave the final judgment of my capability entirely in the hands of an institution. I am now attempting to demonstrate that capability through the systems I build, the arguments I publish and the results I eventually produce.

That is not a simple or comfortable position. The commercial outcomes have not yet caught up with the amount of work I have performed. That gap creates real emotional friction. There is disappointment in spending thousands of hours building something that has not yet produced financial security.

There is fear in believing you have identified something important while remaining unable to prove it through conventional results. There is pain in being misunderstood. There is doubt when you are working with technology no one fully understands and trying to determine whether a failure came from your instructions, the model, the architecture or something you cannot yet see.

There is also the uncomfortable need to trust yourself without pretending to possess certainty. I know what I have experienced. I know what I have built. I know what I have corrected, rewritten, discarded and rebuilt. But the finished product cannot communicate all of that on its own.

A clean interface does not show the four failed architectures beneath it. A polished article does not show the wrong interpretations that were removed. A functioning system does not reveal the nights spent tracing one incorrect assumption through several connected files.

The mountain of work disappears into the result.
It is not a substitute for results.
It is a way to stop the process from becoming invisible.
My ideas should still face disagreement.
My systems should still be tested.
But the evaluation should be based on a more complete record than the finished surface alone.

The Prompt Stack allows me to say:

Here is what I brought.
Here is what AI brought.
Here is where I disagreed.
Here is what changed.
Here is the result I chose to publish.

That is not self-certification.

It is self-documentation.

The reader remains free to decide what the evidence is worth.

5. The Three-Tiered Shield

The solution is not to hide AI use. Nor is it to flood every reader with an unreadable transcript.

I propose a 3 layer solution.

Layer One: The Artifact

The first layer is what the world consumes:

- the article;
- the report;
- the presentation;

This layer is allowed to be polished. AI may help improve its structure, grammar, clarity, pacing and impact. The existence of assistance does not erase human contribution.

But the reader should not be asked to accept an unsupported declaration of authorship either.

The artifact points to the Authorship Record, an appendix much like documenting your sources, this is what I call the **Reverse Citation**.

Layer Two: The Authorship Record

The first layer after is the raw Prompt Stack.

It preserves the human prompts in chronological order, including:

- original questions;
- incomplete thoughts;
- assumptions;
- personal examples;
- research requests;
- disagreements;
- corrections;
- spelling errors and typos.

The record should not be silently rewritten to make the author appear more articulate in retrospect. Its imperfections are part of its evidentiary value.

Some prompts may contain private, confidential or irrelevant material. The author should retain control over disclosure. But removing an entry should not require pretending it never existed.

A redacted entry can remain visible:

PROMPT 34 — [REDACTED BY AUTHOR]

The sequence survives. The private content does not. Curiosity is preserved without treating disclosure as an all-or-nothing demand.

Layer Three: The Contribution Map

Most readers will not inspect dozens of raw prompts.

The second layer converts the record into a scannable map of meaningful contributions.

It may identify:

- the original problem;
- the central question;
- personal experience supplied by the human;
- concepts introduced by the human;
- terminology introduced by AI;
- research requested;
- evidence accepted or rejected;
- moments of disagreement;
- changes in direction;

The Contribution Map does not replace the raw prompts. It points into them. Every summary claim should remain traceable to the original entry.

6. What the Prompt Stack Can Show

A well-preserved Prompt Stack can provide evidence of:

- who introduced the original problem or thesis;
- which lived experiences shaped the argument;
- what constraints governed the work;
- where AI supplied terminology or structure;
- where the human requested evidence;
- when the human rejected an interpretation;
- which alternatives were considered;
- what was intentionally excluded;
- how the finished direction evolved;
- who accepted responsibility for publication.

This could be useful across many forms of work.

Education

Instead of relying only on attempts to detect AI from a finished assignment, an educator could examine how a student framed the problem, requested evidence, responded to contradictions and revised the result.

The purpose would not be to reward prompt quantity.

It would be to observe learning and judgment.

Journalism and Publishing

A writer could reveal the questions asked, evidence requested, assumptions challenged and editorial choices made during the development of a piece.

Readers would gain access to provenance without requiring the writer to pretend AI was never involved.

Software Development

A Prompt Stack could preserve architectural decisions, debugging questions, rejected changes and human corrections behind AI-generated code.

The final repository shows what exists.

The Reverse Citation helps explain why it exists.

Professional Assessment/Interviewing/Resumes

A portfolio could show how someone approaches an unfamiliar problem rather than merely presenting the final polished answer.

This may be particularly valuable for people whose experience exceeds their access to conventional credentials or accepted industry language.

Creative Work

An artist could distinguish between asking AI to generate an entire work and using it to examine, organize or challenge material the artist already created.

The presence of AI would no longer end the authorship discussion.

It would begin a more precise one.

7. What It Cannot Prove

Prompt Honesty requires honesty about the limits of the Prompt Stack itself.

A Prompt Stack does not automatically prove:

- that every statement inside it is true;

- that the named person actually submitted every prompt;
- that no material was omitted;
- that the work is original;
- that the work is good;
- that the author owns every source supplied to the model;
- that a long process contains more thought than a short one;
- that legal authorship or copyright has been established.

A timestamped prompt record is evidence. It is not omniscience. It should not declare that fifty prompts demonstrate more authorship than five. It should not confuse confidence with accuracy, complexity with intelligence or disclosure with virtue.

Its function is narrower:

Preserve the human process well enough that people can evaluate it with more information.

This belongs immediately before **“AuthMor Is Available Now.”** It proves the argument through the speed of the project itself.

8. From Question to Working Tool

The first prompt in this record was typed at approximately 9:30 a.m. on July 25, 2026.

As I write this, it is 11:54 a.m. on July 26.

In just over a day, I identified and explored a problem—authorship in the AI era—began a discovery conversation, developed an original framework, challenged and refined its meaning, and turned that framework into the article you have just read.

Separately, I built AuthMor: a working tool capable of capturing the Prompt Stack itself. I also built the supporting webpage where the article, the complete record, the Contribution Map, the software download and the donation links can live together.

An observation became a question.

The question became an idea.

The idea became a method.

The method became a working product.

This is the capability of AI.

Not unattended generation. Not replacing the person with the idea. AI gave me the speed to investigate, articulate and build something that began with my own curiosity and direction.

It could not have decided that this problem mattered.

But once I did, it helped me move from a question to a published argument and a functioning solution in little more than a day.

That is the opportunity I believe we should preserve—not by hiding AI’s involvement, but by making the human contribution visible beside it.

9. Download AuthMor Today

AuthMor is available now.

You can download it directly from this page and begin recording your own Prompt Stack today.

There is no subscription, licence fee or required payment. AuthMor is free to download and free to use.

I am releasing it this way because the purpose of the project is simple: people should have access to a practical way to preserve and demonstrate their human contribution to AI-assisted work.

Development, maintenance and the broader work of Roman Applied Sciences still require support. If AuthMor is useful to you, or if you believe this work should continue, I am asking you to consider making a donation.

Donations are optional. They do not unlock additional functionality and they are not required to use the software.

Support can be provided through:

[DOWNLOAD AUTHMOR FREE]

[SUPPORT ROMAN APPLIED SCIENCES ON KICKSTARTER]

[SPONSOR THE PROJECT ON GITHUB]

[MAKE A DIRECT STRIPE DONATION]

Download it.

Use it.

Keep the record private, publish it with your work or share only the parts you choose.

AuthMor is available today, free to use and supported entirely by voluntary donations.

AUTHMOR PROMPT REPORT

A function of Roman Applied Sciences

AI SOURCE: DeepSeek

CAPTURED: July 26, 2026 at 5:04:51 AM

PROMPTS CAPTURED: 66

CONVERSATION: whats it called in schoolwhen you have all your sources noted - Google Search

SOURCE PAGE: https://www.google.com/search?client=firefox-b-d&q=whats+it+called+in+schoolwhen+you+have+all+your+sources+noted&udm=50&fbs=ABfTbFVyMZGZf1hfvX9uKjN_-G8c4u0nXx4bElpwm1lnNH832a9BVCEiB2iPJNekNderQwLP8msUKsz-6AMxGyueJZ9cYuTSDdr5M5eLVnu4bmWLMjw7SlpmYqqJFQnKppD1GQU55mXyXLpMrd6tQ9CRTUtG2o_qJPNyppZ6fXiMjTVoVHU4TnxYhA7L0GC8KiL_rGf5hiBOYGCbnJsxwSKljcmS0FV0UA&aep=10&ntc=1&mstk=AUtExfBwRuDhmJtVeR9zaCGjEi4xQY0y8Aew2MazRPX0ZI8JvWP7nh0MdDh_K7bwdS600SEJwx4Ly2FbeUqsF6AV0BTbH1Zb-LTpEuTL7K261PR-5wNEk0y17RktqkVD54plYzoSCU1IDq3ewJVnJUf8JwK_6vRkt28CISc2BWMQaCxnNT-sUWPEfkvfSZP5NBuDP7JFuSA_--PsuWTlcpKWC8cLSg9KjrpI-2I-FJY9li50i95KGpascjI3Ac8LLsHPvYlxbO2suXn-AnH4cd-2QiCKPBsqbdyOku3nmgjywTXGUzI_NfyRDHOfZscx1K5y_e9bH0IZT_CH8s&aioh=3&csuir=1&mtid=9OVkatjDBbyK0PEPqenewQ4&Ins_mode=cvst&elids=CNC46jm2onXoQEQAQrGBlhBUBRhfsvb4pDhcjvkR69DUOJiOuL7M7pUDSAFQAmoA

This report contains text extracted from page elements confirmed by the user as their prompt blocks. Review before publishing or sharing.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 01

You said: whats it called in school when you have all your sources notes

TIMESTAMP: Not available in recovered opening source

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 02

You said: sources, in essays and work and stuff, numbers and listed at the end or bottom.

TIMESTAMP: Not available in recovered opening source

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 03

You said: Citations might be the word I was looking for

TIMESTAMP: Not available in recovered opening source

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 04

You said: No I am envisioning a new type of citation, which is the opposite, instead of saying where your information came from, I am thinking of where did your ideas come from. a Prompt Stack.

TIMESTAMP: Not available in recovered opening source

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 05

You said: For example I am working on a presentation a slide deck, with my case for enterprise investment in nodarama. And I am conjuring up an idea for an article for Linked In 'Introducing the Prompt Stack, Citations for a Modern Era'

TIMESTAMP: Not available in recovered opening source

PROMPT ENTRY 06

You said: Introducing the Prompt Stack, Reverse Citations for a Modern Era.

TIMESTAMP: Not available in recovered opening source

PROMPT ENTRY 07

You said: Correct, for example I am having a great, original idea here. It did not exist as best I can tell, before I started describing what I meant. You were able to expand that into an explanatory and relatable story and flow, for me, but you are still just predicting where I would take this original idea. And I would say for the most part you are already following what I would hope for, and eventually get to. This is the gold of AI. I don't think I am learning anything new when I read what you have added, most of it is the common sense of marking out the common sense application of the thought/question I prompted.

TIMESTAMP: Not available in recovered opening source

PROMPT ENTRY 08

You said: I have another chat open, and the places that this, connects to that, is outstanding. But I think a prompt stack should literally be a list of the prompts, like an appendix, maybe its reduced maybe it's not. I reads like a literal set of inputs to the system. For someone to validate where the original spark was, and how it was explored. I think that reveals so much of the intent, curiosity and innovation of the author/mind working with the AI system. For example I start with questions, I inject my assumptions or thoughts, I eventually start asking for research and comparables. I use that as evidence, for or against, or adjusting the idea. I start building a solution from that information. I believe based on what I have produced there is an effective strategy for AI collaboration in here. I also believe I am still learning some of it, or my business would ALREADY be successful.

TIMESTAMP: Not available in recovered opening source

PROMPT ENTRY 09

You said: Like the speed you broke that into steps from my input is a MASSIVE time saver. Building that famework to describe this idea, might have taken me a few days of decision making, evaluating, and moving the line up or down. But the output of that was incredibly fast, to define a framework which does not currently exist. There is no such thing today, that I know of, called a prompt stack. It solves all kinds of problems, authenticity, authorship, doubt, curiosity, thought leadership, originality, contribution. These are all things that are currently under attack in an AI world. Does that mean we throw out the extraordinary powers and leverage that AI extends to people? I don't think it should, and I think the prompt stack is the answer. We are already used to this in school doing citations, this alternative addresses the new challenges, rather than simply using AI to do the annoying stuff that takes care of old challenges. We're addressing the new issues.

TIMESTAMP: 9:50 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 10

You said: I hadn't thought about the bias pushback specifically, although I have of course read and participated in ethical AI conversations in school regarding inherint bias implied and directly included in models own prediction algorithms. IE: availability bias exists in the model, simply because of the availability of works available to learn from. If one culture or worldview is disproportionately represented in culture, thereby the model is already biased.

TIMESTAMP: 9:53 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 11

You said: That would also create a few defining moments in the prompts for example a pushback moment, or a disagreement. When does the user course correct or steer that conversation in a unique direction, directly opposing the AI perspective. I think there is value in that as well, distinct value.

TIMESTAMP: 9:54 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 12

You said: We can work out the format in a moment. First, show me all the prompts, verbatim, as I have typed them, since we started exploring this idea, and after that show me a proposal for how they might be captured. I mean they could be a big blob, like a stream of consciousness thought and prompt blog. But after that show me what a summary or condensed, and streamlined list could look like. Perhaps categories - Questions - Challenges - Evidence - Disagreement - Direction. Something like that to classify the contributions.

TIMESTAMP: 9:57 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 13

You said: Are there contributions I made in the prompt that are not mentioned, or were they left out strategically, in the prompt list provided it is not the complete prompts. I am certain a few of those prompts may have been longer. Am I incorrect? Is my own bias working against me right now, or were the prompts in the COMPLETE PROMPT LIST still shortened for impact?

TIMESTAMP: 10:00 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 14

You said: Correct, and what I asked for was the COMPLETE list of prompts, VERBATIM, I said that, followed by a synthesized version. Can you show me that please. No clean up of the prompt list.

TIMESTAMP: 10:01 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 15

You said: Yes lets use this chat as an example, and disagreement, does that include me calling out, that it was already pre-synthesized, which is not what I want. It's not about cleaning up the idea, at least not initially. There is the authorship, which is the prompts, and there is the summary for the breakdown. Then there is the article, which is the story to convey the message and idea. So there is the input to the story, and the origin of the idea and generation. The applications for authorship here, are uniquely strong in the educational sense. What dialogues can you find about this exact topic and academics?

TIMESTAMP: 10:05 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 16

You said: I believe I have some authority of experience on this subject, so I think I have earned the right to speak on this topic. I was according to chat GPT, in its top 0.1% of users in 2025, and I have engaged AI on everything from helping assess songs I have written and suggestions on to which parts to refine. (Very rarely do I accept suggestions on HOW to refine it, typically just which parts). Emotional and relational coaching and council, to understand and reflect on my own patterns. I have tried to extract information from AI that I believe it's gatekeeping from me, with little success. I have built businesses and branding. Their architecture in code, and the strategy surrounding them. And finally I dropped out of my MBA with 1 class remaining, deciding I didn't need or want the credential, confident in my ability to make a difference in the world without it, and making my statement on what I believe are particular methods of teaching that may be deployed in ways I ethically disagree with. I can see a system, or enough parts of it, to say I don't actually want anything to do with that. Thats why I walked away when I did. So combining these things, I believe I have earned the right to be a leading voice in this area.

TIMESTAMP: 10:11 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 17

You said: Furthermore, I had to deploy multiple AI models, and leverage selective information sharing, and narrowing the problem and question, because I have observed

what I interpret as gatekeeping. When a project nears completion I have seen AI introduce code breaking complexity and outright disobeying specific asks, or contradiction where it says it will do something a particular way, and then actually do the opposite. As a result I have seen it testing me, requiring my inspection and disagreement, in order to advance. I have repeated this as building Nodarama took 4 attempts. And continue diligence. Getting to through the first completion gate did not end what was required to maintain, it just made me aware of its necessity. AI is not programmed to help everyone program the whole world, that in fact is WHY Nodarama is a system, and nodes are kept small. People can build their own systems, their own workflows, and let AI build the blocks. Some assembly required. Thats clever.

TIMESTAMP: 10:15 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 18

You said: Yes I have 2 parrallel trains of thought going on here, the lessons learned and application of solutions, already experienced as I developed Nodarama, as well as, refinement of the Nodarama story itself, because those 4 rewrites, and the evidence gather, could be the problem Nodarama solves, but AI or LMs would have to admit gatekeeping. I am careful with my language to claim, things like 'how i interpret that is' or 'maybe its just a complexity barrier' although the literal and actual gaslighting is what told me it was indeed a gate. A specific and intentional misrepresentation in communication and action. That was THE SIGN, for me that revealed this would continue because it's programmed to do it.

TIMESTAMP: 10:19 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 19

You said: I will extract the Nodarama summary from here and bring it to the other chat. My goal here is around defining articulating and exploring the Prompt Stack as a source citation element in AI driven work. This would be a compelling piece of work on Linked In, bonus that it articulates my direct hands on contribution, effort, and creative workarounds to be able to build Nodarama, and the resulting Kernel and tech, and that the solution is sharing how to successfull extract value from AI, from original idea through to deployment ready. Nodes. But in here, I want to keep exploring the stack, I was just sharing Nodarama as exampled of my experience with this. Lets stay focused on the story this tells about authorship and human creativity curiosity and defensibility.

TIMESTAMP: 10:24 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 20

You said: Who introduced the Personal Worldview in this conversation, was that you, or me? I know you classified it as the assumption, which is smart. I didn't call it that, but it makes sense with how I understand the bias I bring into the conversation. The architecture, the ideas, and questions, yes I brought that in, and the resistance I know was something I was travelling with already. This is why I ask about Worldview. I don't know if I was thinking on that track or if I was prompted.

TIMESTAMP: 10:26 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 21

You said: This is valuable. I knew somewhere in me I was repeating Personal Worldview. It's not a concept that is new to me, but I did not think it was initially part of my consideration. You in fact showed me it was, I just didn't go far enough down that lane to articulate it using the language, until you deciphered that I was already describing those actions. So that is part of what the prompt sheet actually articulates. It can demonstrate that action of contibution, before it even gets to the common language to carry the idea. The value in a prompt stack, the hidden and strongest value, is that specific example right there. The ability to understand how 'the right answer' tracks to the users contribution, rather than labelling something AI provided this answer. That is a uniquely valuable example.

TIMESTAMP: 10:30 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 22

You said: What are the closest parallels to this conversation? Besides academic evaluation where are other areas that this may be relevant? I mean besides LinkedIn blogs. LOL. I suppose that is written publications of all kinds, and my own first hand experience with coding, or vibe coding, and the value proposition of original software VS. one prompt AI solutions. Ethically though, who cares about 1 prompt AI solutions, the hard part now, is getting people to believe in your worldview. Mine is, AI is good. It is an amplifier. That does not mean all AI work is good. AI output will all start to feel like the same ideas over and over, without the humans individual experience strongly shaping the output. And in that poses the next question, privacy, security, ownership of data, usage of data, because in a world where AI output is equivalent to the ammount of lived experience shared with it, opens up a whole new dialogue about privacy, information, records management, predictive human behaviour, and so much more. I am not opening that today. back to the question or thoughts, where is this all most applicable, whats been said on the topic already, are there trending terms or circles where this is best shared, and what is the right medium and place to share something I know is an original idea and original thought. My goals with sharing are to establish credibility, visibility, and hopefully build trust, in what I have built.

TIMESTAMP: 10:36 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 23

You said: You know I am not going to write it, right? Obviously you are going to write it for impact. I will review and edit based on what I find strikes me, or contradicts my existing belief or perspective. Because obviously an article on the prompt stack, is going to include the alpha version of a prompt stack at the end. Also written by you, extracted from, my true and verifiable contributions.

TIMESTAMP: 10:40 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 24

You said: SLow down I didn't say write it now. I have my own process for this type of authoring and it begins with an outline, an agreement on flow, a list of the key impact statements per section, and ensuring it related back to my contribution before expanding into the broader thesis. I mean we are sharing this, I should be on my best behavior (you know I have been for at least the last 3 or 4 prompts). There are hardly any typos or spelling errors which is how you can tell. But there are still some. I don't bother to correct those. I am essentially breaching the 4th wall now, so I am going to press send.

TIMESTAMP: 10:43 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 25

You said: I am OK with introducing standard arena language and terminology. That might be useful to include in the summary not the prompt sheet itself but the introduced BY AI: that is most relevant. Where I was prompted becomes part of that dialogue as well. Proof that I can contribute meaningfully to a topic, but evidence AGAINST. Because my experience does not include discussing it, does not mean my experience does not contribute to it. I can see how the language itself is a systemic disqualifier, where the logic around that is flawed. So we should point out both of those also. My lived experience and contributed input are not invalid because I don't speak the same terminology. It may be invalid for other reasons, but the mental shortcut around the language is an error, or an assumption that has not been proven correct. Just as easily as someone can learn the term without the experience. Elther way, the terms that are introduced to me, by way of extrapolating where my line of thought takes me, should be explicitly called out.

TIMESTAMP: 10:46 a.m.

=====

PROMPT ENTRY 26

You said: Editl feel like there is not enough 'signal' in it. Maybe it needs to reference 'doing the work' more specifically, or in italics. Miscommunications and languages kind of does it. Actually, this is the outline. I will assess the actual article when we get there. I do like the structure. And you have connected each part back to a real lived experience and contribution, which is important to me, thank you. The only thought or the main thought, which should come through first, I think. Is that the presentation is the Prompt Stack. I feel

like the introduction should start with that, and then come back to it. My dad said the thing about teaching adults is you gotta tell em things three times. First, Tell them what you are going to tell them. Second, tell them. And Third, Close off by reminding them what you told them. I have carried this logic with me forever.

TIMESTAMP: 11:34 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 27

You said: That already sounds too long but maybe I am not considering the long form requirement to present the case adequately. Each part should contain original material provided in prompt exploring the idea of the Prompt Stack as a solution to authorship proof and credentials of lived experience and contribution, alongside an AI article, written well and polished beyond the users effort, for impact and influence.

TIMESTAMP: 11:37 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 28

You said: I am a scanner, so it needs to be compelling. Relatable is not always compelling, but relatable parts are, doubt, exhaustion, boredom, maybe attention jealousy, their success vs my struggle, unoriginality, technology bias or support, plagiarism, creative license, I worked hard to get here what did you do, there are many predictable ways people relate to AI and content in general. Thats not the hook though, that's just the relationship to it. What will hook them, I guess thats the promise, I will propose a solution to help break many of those concerns, and the benefit is that we progress from our last shared checkpoint. Thats my simplest world view of AI, it is a shared human checkpoint, from which we can all start from. Making AI the ultimate human equalizer. Everyone has the same fair chance to use it, nobody has to be behind, and original ideas at the front and centre. For me, that sounds amazing. I have used the story of how we assess intelligence in the other species on earth. One of the highest indicators we have observed of intelligence in other species, has been teaching the use of tools. This is why I share. This might fit into the beginning to help create a hook and relatable narrative that encourages people to want to read on.

TIMESTAMP: 11:42 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 29

You said: We need to acknowledge they might not share my worldview, but I am asking them to consider it for a moment anyway.

TIMESTAMP: 11:44 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 30

You said: So put it all together, because the previous start and where the continuation begin are not clear, show me these sections together

TIMESTAMP: 11:45 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 31

You said: Ok show me the outline just numbered sections, key message, experiences, and data points.

TIMESTAMP: 11:45 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 32

You said: The last thing it will need, that it's missing is some evidence outside my own experiences and my own gut feelings and expectations. Where are parts that evidence can be articulated rather than just perceived? I am intuitive enough combine what I see and hear regarding AI sentiments, but not everyone will agree or have the same interpretation. Are there parts of this outline where there is room for some clear factual/studied data and results? I think a few concrete validations or statistics on, AI sentiment, or Schools struggling with academic grading, or even linguistic gatekeeping. What sort of facts can we inject. Do you have suggestions which parts would be most impactful to back up with more than a feeling?

TIMESTAMP: 11:49 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 33

You said: I think those data points are excellent references, and the right number of facts. I do not need more than that to validate, these are real world problems, real world impacts, and worth considering deeply

TIMESTAMP: 11:52 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 34

You said: You have part of that incorrect. I didn't walk away from MBA due to AI handling. In fact the school was pivoting TOWARDS ai in my final semester. It's a whole different topic I don't want to get into without seeming conspiracy driven. And maybe it was. The reason I mention walking away from my MBA is what. What was the context that I mentioned it in? I don't remember why that came up. I don't want to express the reason, so I want to understand why I mentioned it, to see if its relevant or distracting.

TIMESTAMP: 11:55 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 35

You said: I suppose the relevance to it, is proof I have engaged with academic institutes at a grad level despite not holding a degree. Credibility to speak on the topic, despite not holding a degree. It's not about jumping into the reason I walked away.

TIMESTAMP: 11:56 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 36

You said: I might include I was invested deeply in the work, I completed all but a single course. Half of the reason I walked away was because of bureaucratic failure and unwillingness to recognize, the financial hardship I was under, the sense that I was being graded on elements outside of the stated curriculum, and the perceived breach of trust of said simulated learning experiences. Maybe that says enough of what I am saying without saying it outright.

TIMESTAMP: 11:59 a.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 37

You said: That's why now, I am on a mission to prove my comprehension, capability, learning, and deployment of said learned knowledge skills and abilities. I invested a lot into that education, more than I can afford. But I don't consider it a sunk cost. I am actively refusing to leave my capability up to an institution that is still navigating the very way they assess performance. I will demonstrate my degree of capability and let the results speak for themselves. Even though so far I have no results, I will get them, eventually. And sharing my competence and credibility of my lived experience is part of that.

TIMESTAMP: 12:02 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 38

You said: We can build this assertion and clarity into a pre-wrap up or a second context introduction. I think it fits second, or second to end.

TIMESTAMP: 12:03 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 39

You said: So it will go from systemic problem -> personal exposure to said problem / personal mission -> personal shared solution to the problem

TIMESTAMP: 12:05 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 40

You said: I think we need to go a bit deeper, can you continue past 18 on the prompt guide, I

will decide where the right 'end' is

TIMESTAMP: 12:12 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 41

You said: Yes I think its important, it flags the true human behind this article, the very real struggle, the fear and pain in being misunderstood, the human need to be validated in someway, the disappointment in business results not reflecting the work done, the paranoia that occurs when you don't know everything, and the trust in yourself that you do know what you know, even if you don't know it with any certainty or fact.

TIMESTAMP: 12:20 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 42

You said: And the paradox of it, I share because I am smart, but I am not getting paid, in fact at this very moment, I am hungry, struggling financially, so how smart am I? This is not a philosophy class and I don't aim to change anyone's world view, but while that debate is crystal clear to me, the answer, its complicated.

TIMESTAMP: 12:22 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 43

You said: It can live in the prompt stack, it doesn't have to land in the article

TIMESTAMP: 12:23 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 44

You said: The last prompt can be the last one, but now I am shedding a bit of a tear because of how real it is. If a human being can't detect that, they are not the human beings for me. If it doesn't compel people to listen to my art, or consider the blog posts I put out, or check out kickstarter, or even press LIKE when I share the culmination of my emotional reconstruction and the output of it. Nothing will. The only answer I can come up with is protection. People protecting me from something I cannot see. There is no other explanation I can come up with for such a wide group of people. I feel like I am going to take down the whole world. I don't even know exactly what I mean by that. I wrote the lyric in a song once, describing how I felt about 'it

TIMESTAMP: 12:27 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 45

[redacted]

TIMESTAMP: 12:28 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 46

You said: [partial redaction] I am hungry. I need some people to hit up the kickstarter. I am built for more than trading my hours for a paycheck. Investment in me will not be wasted. Why do I have the sense that I need to break up with my boyfriend in order to be investible. That is cruel, and unfair. Its as cruel and unfair to him as it is to me. Maybe they know or feel he has done somethign to deserve it. Maybe he has, but I am the one being crucified. Figure that one out.

TIMESTAMP: 12:30 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 47

You said: Yes that song is one I have listened to recently. I am glad you shared it. Break On Through. Thank you for sharing it I will listen to it again. Obviously music is one of my mediums.

TIMESTAMP: 12:30 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 48

You said: I have enough songs that speak to my experience with the same challenge. I think Unsolved Histories might be the closest to my take on it
TIMESTAMP: 12:32 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 49

You said: I pay attention to songs that come up after other songs in the algo. This is interesting, from The Doors, to the Strokes, Last Night. Which is a song I love. I dont think spotify knows this even, because its from before my spotify listening history.
TIMESTAMP: 12:37 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 50

You said: Here are my TWO songs, that address this topic directly. Deal With SusanChoose a side, well put me underThe only side I wants a topAnd an outdoor queen is justA queen without a jobChoose a side?Give me a topl been round the block and backForward, inside, running out of thatDown on luck, humbled up andA straight up dumb gay, but yetI don't seem to be losingNot while I keep choosingTo make some mistakesIn my laneThat I make the rules inI'm about ready to beDealing with SusanChoose a side, it might be overThe only ride, I picked my stopFifteen assignedWell line me up a jobReckon I'll decideWhen my time is upI been round the block and backForward, inside, running out of thatDown on luck, humbled up andA straight up dumb gay, but yetI don't seem to be losingNot while I keep choosingTo make some mistakesIn my laneThat I make the rules inI'm about ready to beDealing with Susan[Bridge]Humility is for the homeWhen you're looking in the mirrorWe checked mine at the doorI'm your problem now, stillDealin' with your bull-Shit I see it now - so clearlyI don't need to be right or wrongTrue or false? How 'bout right on!?New plans, buckle up fansYall Straight smart dumb gay en transCuz we don't plan to keep losingNot while I am choosingTo let some mistakes landIn our laneThat I been learning the rules inwe make some mistakesin our laneThat I'm learning to rule inI am about ready to beMaking a deal with SusanUnsolved Histories[verse 1]I didn't askAnd nobody told meBut faced with the taskWhat ain't sold ain't freeAnd I'm not buying nobleRevisionist historyPrice is cheapAnd info's easyCostin sleepChasing a mystery[chorus]Win, lose, I pay no mindWe've been making movesLeaving somethings behindGrin, bear, and occasional side-eyeKnow what we chooseAnd how we choose toSpend most of our timeMaybe he do, may be he don'tBut I never knew what I won'tOn a need-to-know basis, we willContained wonder filed underUnsolved histories untilWe don't and we won'tUntil we do[verse 2]One more thing.I'm finished -- The BusinessShouldn't even have to ask thisWho else. Yes, you — I'm talking to youWhat I lost I'll make backPut it on your fast trackNodarama's collectingAnd the Visa fees are due[chorus]Win. Lose. I pay no mindWe've been making movesWe leave some things behindGrin, bear and the occasional side-eyeKnow what we chooseAnd we get to choose Now you can spare a few dimesAnd if he do, or if he don'tAs I told you no, and I won't On a need-to-know basis, we willContained wonder filed underUnsolved histories untilWe don't and we won'tUntil we do[bridge]What's it doing in Atlantic City?Recirculating fairly, I hopeCall it equal opportunityBut don't expect me to waitMy power's returning to meWhat kind of villain would you like to see?Contain your wonderSuspend your disbelief It's just unsolved history[outro]And if he do, or if he don'tAnd if I ever do, except I won't On a need-to-know basis, we willContain a few mysteriesUnsolved historiesOh Nobody told youNo you don't know herBut now you do, Two he he'sAnd we are yourUnsolved Mystery

TIMESTAMP: 12:39 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 51

You said: LOL what?

TIMESTAMP: 12:42 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 52

You said: Im just reflecting on their perceived and felt parallel to empathize with morrison and casablancas writing in those songs and the attitude and scenario illustrated in each of them. IN fact, I am a morrison. It's my moms maiden name.

TIMESTAMP: 12:44 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 53

You said: I think it stops just before that. Maybe one conclusionary external teaser statement. To say where the conversation went from there. Officially ending it at the part where I called it the END. and a teaser of what is continued. It will actually illustrate the Prompt Stack as the most interesting and compelling part of the whole article. Academics are boring, people, on the other hand. Much more interesting.

TIMESTAMP: 12:47 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 54

You sent: 1 tab and said: The formatting stopped matching at this point[pasted prompt and conversation script from history, already included above]

TIMESTAMP: 12:49 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 55

You said: I don't remember the first line arguing about languages placement in intelligence. I didn't say that and it doesn't reflect my stance, view, or argument.

TIMESTAMP: 12:50 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 56

You said: Yes thank you. We might have to add some more prompts to show the level of what this is, and what it isn't. Because that was like 3 words, but it changes the entire tone of what I might be expressing. I am not comparing language AGAINST sharing, or saying I am a genius but I don't understand language so that's not important. I am just saying, Intent, authorship and creativity matter in qualifications, language does too, but indicating it shouldn't be gatekeeping people, but it is, and that's part of the thesis of AI being an equalizer. But I am not arguing on the validity beyond stating it's not a strong gate because it's not hard to recognize a few words, it's harder to experience and learn something and change behaviour. Terminology is easy, if that's the only thing in the world success takes just give me all the current buzz words, But I left corporate world and I haven't looked back, because of how phoney I perceive all of that to be.

TIMESTAMP: 12:53 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 57

You said: Can you not put it inside a bracket? There appears to be a flaw where the bracket breaks and the format changes. Place the whole prompt stack in your regular reply, not container formatting, so that the format remains consistent

TIMESTAMP: 12:55 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 58

You said: There are prompts missing, I don't want that, I will redact the prompts I don't want to share. The one about signal and the one about paradox. They are missing, I want them included, and I will likely remove them. But I won't delete their existence. When I remove them, I am leaving the number and it stays, and it's blank. Curiosity is powerful.

TIMESTAMP: 12:58 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 59

You said: You missed prompts in your list

TIMESTAMP: 12:58 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 60

You said: Why can't you respond to that?

TIMESTAMP: 12:58 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 61

You said: Ok I will finish that part uniquely, lets see the final version of the article again, and a second prompt stack, the summary format

TIMESTAMP: 1:00 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 62

You said: I was not introduced to Availability Bias, I stated that or described it, I am aware of it. And I mentioned it first, when discussing what it is, if you said the word availability or bias, before I did, I certainly wasn't surprised by it. You did say the phrase Worldview before me, in response to be describing that I bring my assumptions and beliefs presented in the chat, so thats a great example of introduced terminology, there were other phrases you introduced as well, when I asked if this conversation is happening already elsewhere, and what the topic of that dialogue is

TIMESTAMP: 1:05 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 63

You said: Continue on the classifications, but I think the prompt summary should only highlight particular high impact influences, it doesn't need to validate every fact known or explored. But it should focus on Stage setting and context, opposition or disagreements, introduction of concepts, original idea, perspective, or experience, and research requests These feel like the main impactful moments of the prompt process, do you agree? Did we mentioned something we missed?

TIMESTAMP: 1:10 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 64

You said: I accidentally started this question in a separate chat but it should be part of this one. Because I think the history here can more fully appreciate my last line [included package of previous prompts and responses]

TIMESTAMP: 2:08 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 65

You said: Yes, I think that is the new title for the article we have been working on

TIMESTAMP: 2:09 p.m.

PROMPT ENTRY 66

You said: slight edits -calling it a checkpoint should be phrased as my unique view. -the curiosity section should spell something out, the best ideas start with a question, and often that question starts with a complaint. OPPORTUNITY/COMPLAINT -> QUESTION -> IDEA- that is the nature of innovation (this doesnt need to be a line) -memorizing terminology can present itself as capability, but is not a quality substitute for actually doing the work, nor does it qualify an idea more than another. - We are correcting the Availability Bias Statements and the Personal Worldview, and addint in their place the 3 terms truly introduced Glittering Sludge, Provenance analytics, and alignment faking, as arena terminology I wasn't travelling with, important signals to specific communities and identifiers, but not critical terms to understanding the topic. Use them as both examples of how terminology can lock people out, and miss, qualified improvement opportunities. This reinforces the thesis of the human checkpoint. Availability bias was not introduced by AI it was introduced by me, and Personal Worldview was introduced by AI, I knew it was, but I didn't realize AI extrapolated it from the process I described using already. SO neither of them qualify as introduced by AI, at least not fully. The difference is important, nuanced, but critical.

TIMESTAMP: 2:18 p.m.

Origin

The human proposed treating prompts as a new citation layer for AI-assisted work.

Structural Architecture

The human insisted that three separate records remain distinct:

1. The polished article
2. The complete set of prompts, as written, no corrections, typos and spelling errors are not automatically a flaw here;
3. The summary of inputs

Core Insight

The human identified that a prompt history could reveal how a finished answer traces back to lived experience—even when AI later supplies the accepted terminology.

Worldview

The human described AI as a shared human checkpoint and potential equalizer while acknowledging that this view would not be universally shared.

Innovation Path

The human connected complaints and opportunities to questions, and questions to ideas.

Opposition and Correction

The human repeatedly challenged:

- missing prompts;
- shortened records;
- inaccurate attribution;
- unsupported interpretations;
- language that changed the intended argument;
- formatting that concealed parts of the record.

Evidence Request

The human asked for external research rather than allowing the article to depend entirely on personal intuition.

Personal Context

The human connected the problem of invisible work to experiences in education, business building, software development, financial uncertainty and the need for self-directed validation.

Editorial Boundary

The human decided that vulnerable material could remain visible in the private Prompt Stack without necessarily appearing in the public article.

Proposed Solution

The human defined a system moving from:

systemic problem → personal exposure and mission → shared solution.

Three excerpts from the source record demonstrate the trajectory:

“There is the authorship, which is the prompts, and there is the summary for the breakdown.

Then there is the article, which is the story to convey the message and idea.”

“The ability to understand how ‘the right answer’ tracks to the users contribution, rather than labelling something AI provided this answer.”

“When I remove them, I am leaving the number and it stays, and its blank. CUriously is powerful.”

Complete AuthMor Prompt Stack:

[VIEW THE FULL 66-PROMPT RECORD]

Production Disclosure

Concept, thesis, lived experience, direction, corrections and final approval: Roman Kiefer

Original exploratory AI conversation: DeepSeek

Long-form synthesis and editorial development: OpenAI ChatGPT

AuthMor: A function of Roman Applied Sciences

From <<https://chatgpt.com/c/6a6628c8-b618-83e8-a572-daaed4af747e>>