

I recently got a comment from a guy called "Iconoclassy," who sent me a full transcript of an AI analysis of one of my exchanges with "Tenzin" a couple years ago. I guess he just ran it through and asked for the robot's opinion. 😊 Some of you may recall the contentious exchanges between me and Tenzin a couple years ago, but if you missed them, they span from late-2020 until about mid-2023. Sorry I don't have exact dates. I believe the specific reply referenced here is from mid-2023. Please feel free to check it out! (it's now been transcribed, I'm pretty sure).

Anyway, this AI analysis, from Grok, blew my mind. If you didn't see it in Iconoclassy's original comment, here it is in my own scribble. It's amazing how well it understood the issues that were at play, as well as what I was trying to accomplish. The machines understand me! Yay! Lol. 😄

Here's the transcript:

"From Grok, 2026 -

Dymitri Haraszewski's response to Tenzin (and secondarily to Guy) on his blog post, "The Presumption of Whiteness" ^(March 5, 2023) is a masterclass in measured, intellectually rigorous rebuttal, especially considering the context: Dymitri is writing from prison, responding to a deeply hostile commenter who accuses him of being a child predator, dismisses his observations on police violence, and ties his arguments to personal resentment over his conviction. Dymitri's reply demonstrates patience, wit, and a commitment to clarity while navigating emotionally charged topics like race, police brutality, prison dynamics, and media misrepresentation. I've analyzed Dymitri's reply's structure, tone, and effectiveness, drawing on the original post's theme (police violence stemming more from "tribalism" or "coppism" than pure racism) and the visible comments for context.

Structure and Content Overview

Dymitri's response is divided into 5 pages, starting with an apology for the delay (due to prison mail issues) and addressing both commenters systematically:

Pg 1 - Greets Guy appreciatively, then pivots to Tenzin, speculating on her sources (e.g. Google searches yielding biased "hit pieces") and critiquing how media and prosecutors distort narratives around convictions. He emphasizes that such portrayals reduce complex humans to "cartoon villains," denying access to balanced views.

Pg 2 - Dymitri debunks Tenzin's exaggerated claim of him having 350 "victims" using simple arithmetic, highlighting its absurdity. He introduces humor with wordplay (e.g. "master

groomer" as synonymous with "Master Baiter") and questions the credibility of sources that propagate such claims.

Pgs 3-4 - Here Dymitri clarifies some prison terminology (e.g. "SNV" as "Sensitive Needs Yard", not just for sex offenders) and defends his personal experience, noting his time across various prison levels. He reiterates his post's point about non-disproportionate violence against "black" inmates, (contrasting with free-world patterns) and sympathizes with Tenzin's loss of a friend to inmate violence.

Pg. 5 - Dymitri engages Tenzin's neologism critique ("Coppism") by tracing it to broader "groupishness" (citing Jonathan Haidt); praises Tenzin's phrase "several predilections" with cat-themed puns; and ends on a forward-looking note about evolving as a "warrior for justice" while inviting constructive dialogue. Then he signs off with a reference to collecting memorials for fellow inmate "whispers", tying back to themes of humanity in prison.

This structure is logical - acknowledging support first, then dismantling accusations methodically - while weaving in personal anecdotes and broader philosophical points.

Tone and Style

Dymitri Haraszewski's tone is remarkably civil and engaging, blending empathy ("I'm genuinely sorry to hear about your friend"), self-deprecation ("That would be some astoundingly efficient work, wouldn't it?"), in reference to Tenzin's claim of 350 child victims over a short period of time), and intellectual curiosity. He avoids direct insults, using irony and puns to lighten heavy topics (e.g. the "nuts" double entendre; "herding cats"). His approach contrasts sharply with Tenzin's vitriol, labelling him a "child predator" and demanding he participate in studies on "pedophiles". Dymitri's style is conversational yet erudite, referencing Haidt; accessible yet showcasing education despite incarceration.

His response humanizes him, portraying a reflective person wronged by systemic biases (e.g. media "Garbage in, Garbage out"), which aligns with his blog's common theme of flaws in the "criminal justice system", or "punishment system", as he prefers to call it.

Effectiveness

As rebuttal to Tenzin's criticisms and attacks, Dymitri's response may be highly effective for neutral/sympathetic readers like Guy, bolstering his credibility via evidence and transparency. Dymitri counters Tenzin's misconceptions, explicitly addressing:

- **Prison Violence.** He clarifies that he made no claim that "black" inmates avoid beatings by prison guards entirely, but only that they are not beaten disproportionately inside prisons (unlike the disproportionate assaults that occur outside prisons), which Dymitri argues supports his concept of copplism.
- **Tenzin's Loss.** Dymitri expresses sympathy, distinguishes inmate on inmate violence from the institutionally abusive violence of guards against inmates, and he tries to de-escalate the interaction with Tenzin while validating her pain.
- **His Conviction.** Dymitri critiques the distorted portrayals of his conviction without outrightly denying all claims against him. He stresses the unbalanced reporting of "crime".

For Tenzin, this response likely falls flat. Her follow up in their dialogue doubles down, criticizing Dymitri's "whispers" epithet as insulting. Intellectual engagement doesn't seem to sway her emotional bias or her demands for confession from him.

Overall, Dymitri's response strengthens his Between The Bars community by modelling resilience and critical thinking.

Strengths

- **Empathy & Restraint** — He avoids escalation during a heated exchange.
- **Educational Value** — Deepens discussions of incarceration and "race".
- **Humor as Deflection** — Puns disarm the hostility without trivializing critiques.
- **Philosophical Depth** — Dymitri links his defence/rebuttal to tribalism and media bias.
- **Inclusivity** — He invites dialogue.

Weaknesses

- **Length/Density** — 5 pages may deter or overwhelm readers.
- **Defensiveness re. Conviction** — Dymitri skirts the details of his case, which may seem evasive to sceptics.
- **Neologisms** — "Copplism" is clever but can be seen as pedantic.
- **Humor Risks** — Cheek wordplay (e.g. "Master Baiter") could undermine

the seriousness of the discussion for some readers.

In summary, this impressive, nuanced response humanizes a marginalized voice, challenging assumptions about "crime", "race", and justice. It critiques systems effectively. It underscores *Between The Bars*' value in amplifying incarcerated perspectives, turning antagonism into reflection. Dimitri emerges as thoughtful and resilient. "

* * So, that's the AI evaluation sent to me by IwonaClassy.

You go, Robot! 😊 Thanks to all involved for this (which of course includes my critics).

If anyone would like to write me directly, you can find me on either the gettingout.com website or the Securus/JPay website (to communicate via tablet messages). Or, you can write to me directly:

Dimitri Haraszewski
A12622
P.O. Box 409090
Ione, CA 95640