

Why They Disagree:

Decoding Differences in Opinions about AI Risk on the Lex Fridman Podcast*

Nghi Truong (Sasin School of Management – Chulalongkorn University)

Phanish Puranam (INSEAD)

Özgecan Koçak (Emory)

Abstract

The emergence of transformative technologies often surfaces deep societal divisions, nowhere more evident than in contemporary debates about artificial intelligence (AI). A striking feature of these divisions is that they persist despite shared interests in ensuring that AI benefits humanity and avoiding catastrophic outcomes. This paper analyzes contemporary debates about AI risk, parsing the differences between the “doomer” and “boomer” perspectives into definitional, factual, causal, and moral premises to identify key points of contention. We find that differences in perspectives about existential risk (“X-risk”) arise fundamentally from differences in causal premises about design vs. emergence in complex systems, while differences in perspectives about employment risks (“E-risks”) pertain to different causal premises about the applicability of past theories (evolution) vs their inapplicability (revolution). Disagreements about these two forms of AI risk appear to share two properties: neither involves significant disagreements on moral values and both can be described in terms of differing views on the extent of boundedness of human rationality. Our approach to analyzing reasoning chains at scale, using an ensemble of LLMs to parse textual data, can be applied to identify key points of contention in debates about risk to the public in any arena.

* We thank Defne Apul, Jiaqi Jin, Jungmin Lee, and audiences at Bocconi University, HEC Paris, University of Lausanne, Strategic Management Society Annual Meeting, and American Sociological Association Annual Meeting for helpful feedback.

1. Introduction

The emergence of transformative technologies often creates deep societal divisions about their implications. Nowhere is this more evident today than in the stark differences in opinion expressed about artificial intelligence (AI). While some (“boomers”) see this as an extraordinary opportunity to improve the human condition, others (“doomers”) are concerned about the existential risk that the technology poses (Helfrich, 2024). A striking feature of these divisions is that they persist even though opposing parties presumably share fundamental interests in ensuring that AI benefits humanity and does not lead to catastrophic outcomes. This highlights an idea that is well recognized in organizational science- namely that differences in cognition (information, attention, and problem representation) can be consequential for conflict, even if there is alignment on ultimate goals (Cronin & Weingart, 2019; Dearborn & Simon, 1958; Greer & Daniels, 2017; Jehn, 1995; March & Simon, 1958; Simon, 1947).

Several research programs have made advances in representing cognitions and disagreements that arise from their divergence, with the assumption that diagnosing sources of conflict can help parties evaluate the merits of diverging opinions and reach an agreement. Tools that have been developed include structured guides for eliciting cognitions from interviews (Özesmi & Özesmi, 2004) or text (Santagiustina & Warglien, 2022), techniques for facilitating discussion among multiple parties (Tegarden et al., 2009), visualization / mapping tools (Ackerman et al., 1992; Hall et al., 1994; Laukkanen & Eriksson, 2013), and analytic software to derive and compare causal paths (Hall, 1999, 2002; Hall et al., 1994). However, fragmentation in terms of the dimensions that characterize cognitive conflicts, as well as lack of scalable methods to empirically measure sources of conflict, have impeded progress.

We think it is especially important to analyze conflicting views on risk to the public (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1983), as is often the case with new technological developments. Studies find that people are generally not satisfied with the way that market and other regulatory mechanisms have balanced the risks and benefits of various technologies (Slovic, 1987). For instance, under-investment in nuclear power, with a corollary over-investment in fossil fuels (and acceleration of global warming) is arguably a consequence of poorly resolved differences in perspectives about risks expressed in public debates. In recent years, technologies such as vaccines and water fluoridation have similarly become grounds for contention about the risks

and benefits of such technologies. When opposing perspectives on risks to the public are poorly articulated and understood, the resulting resolutions may be based more on politics and expediency than on public welfare. The debate over AI risk is similarly at risk of becoming a locus of fruitless contestation, unless the root causes of disagreement among the “boomers” and “doomers” are widely understood.

This paper develops a novel approach to analyzing reasoning chains in public discourse and a method to do this at scale, using textual data. We proceed in two steps. First, we build on the theory of cultural codes (Koçak & Puranam, 2022, 2023)- different types of fuzzy mappings between constructs- as a basis to analyse differences in the reasoning offered to support an opinion. We conceptualize an expressed opinion as the conclusion of a (possibly branching) chain consisting of five kinds of premises (*factual current*- what is believed to be true, *factual forecast*- what is believed will be true, *causal*- why something happens, *definitional*- how something is defined, and *moral/evaluative*- what is desirable) and three types of operators linking them (*implication*- leads to, *evaluation*- has positive or negative valence, and *combination*-taken together). Under assumptions of intended coherence (not necessarily honesty) of the speaker, we can also identify enthymemes (i.e. arguments in which crucial premises have been left implicit). The framework helps us to describe and compare differences in expressed reasoning chains to identify why opinions diverge in terms of a set of mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive factors. This approach to deconstructing arguments in terms of types of premises extends prior theoretical work on argumentation (Toulmin, 1958; Walton, 1996) and conflict in organizations (Cronin & Weingart, 2019; Greer & Daniels, 2017).

Second, we build on computational methods for analysing arguments in text form at scale (“argument mining” - Lawrence & Reed, 2019; Mochales & Moens, 2011; Stab & Gurevych, 2014) to develop Premise Extraction using Ensemble of LLM’s (PEEL). PEEL is a multi-agent Large Language Model architecture that can reliably extract reasoning chains from text to identify sources of difference in premises across actors. We apply the PEEL architecture to analyze the differences between the pessimistic and optimistic perspectives on two specific forms of AI risk- for human existence (“X-risk”) and for employment opportunities (“E-risk”) - using opinions expressed by leading critics and proponents of AI on the Lex Fridman podcast (<https://lexfridman.com/podcast/>). These are not a random sample of lay individual views on AI

risk. However, the corpus has the merit of including highly influential public figures whose opinions shape those of vast numbers of the lay public.

We find that the disagreements about X-risk and E-risk in expressed arguments are qualitatively different. Disagreements about X-risk arise from divergent causal premises and forecasts about the extent to which advanced AI systems can exhibit emergent properties (i.e. that human designers cannot anticipate). The expressed forecasts almost always represent enthymemes- they have implicit causal and definitional premises lying upstream in the reasoning chain. Disagreements about E-risk are primarily anchored in explicit causal premises- specifically on the applicability of past models of technological change and the effects on employment, to AI. Whether AI technologies are like many predecessors that destroyed many jobs but also created many more, or whether past models do not apply because AI can create opportunities that AI can fulfill without requiring humans, is a key point of contention. At a more abstract level, the disagreements on both types of AI risk, at least in expressed opinions, appear to share two properties: neither involves significant disagreements on moral values, and both can be described in terms of differing views on the extent of boundedness of human rationality (Simon, 1947).

2. Related Work

Prior work recognizes that disagreements and conflicting opinions can be rooted in different *types* of cognitions. People may construct different understandings of the same policy issues based on underlying 'frames' or 'perspectives' - tacit structures shaped by knowledge, values, experiences, and worldviews (Cronin & Weingart, 2019; Schön & Rein, 1994). For instance, they may have different preferences because they emphasize different moral priorities such as care, fairness, or loyalty (Graham et al., 2009). Even where values and interests are aligned, differences in knowledge or beliefs can create conflict over appropriate courses of action (Dearborn & Simon, 1958; Hall, 1999; March & Simon, 1958; Simon, 1947).

Cronin and Weingart (2007, 2019) argue that representational gaps ("rGaps" - inconsistencies in individuals' understanding of goals, assumptions, elements, and operators) cannot be mitigated by filling in information because rGaps cause individuals to interpret and evaluate incoming information in divergent ways. Rather, addressing conflict that arises from rGaps requires cognitive integration (whereby individuals learn to comprehend each other's

perspective) and affective integration (created through liking, trust, and respect). The first step in moving towards this direction is to reveal rGaps. For instance, "...if a person asks another "What are you trying to do here?," the answer will likely be a conclusion that emerges from the other's perspective. Asking about the functional roles—"What role are you taking, and how do you classify this situation? What are you intending to change? How will that achieve your objectives?"—is more likely to elicit the assumptions that supports a conclusion, thus giving insight into the source knowledge. Such knowledge will not suddenly yield new solutions, but it does provide raw material with which to explore new possibilities built from combinations of knowledge that individuals would not have conceived." (Cronin & Weingart, 2019: p. 7645).

Koçak et al., (2023) further this argument and posit that if different *types* of cognitions are amenable to change or revision through different methods (and at different rates), diagnosing the source of differing opinions in a particular disagreement or conflict can help develop suitable interventions. Building on Koçak and Puranam's (2022) typology of cultural cognitions, they argue that distinguishing sources of disagreements rooted in *causal* codes (associations of causes and effects) from those rooted in *moral* codes (evaluations of events, actions, or outcomes as good or bad, right or wrong) can be useful. In vignette studies, they find that participants can distinguish these sources of disagreement and anticipate different interventions to be suitable for each. They propose mediation as a potential mechanism for resolution when causal code differences are involved and research/statistics as a potential mechanism when there are no moral code differences.

Studies of moral judgment also show that understanding the moral pillars of someone's preferences can enable "moral reframing", whereby an action that an individual would not normally support is re-framed as being consistent with that individual's moral codes (Feinberg & Willer, 2013, 2015, 2019; Howard-Grenville et al., 2017; Kahan & Braman, 2006). Where this is not feasible, goal conflict may be resolved through bargaining (making concessions and compromises) or by finding novel actions that might satisfy the different goals (integrative negotiations) (Walton & McKersie, 1991). Finally If misunderstandings stem from differences in *lexical* codes- associations between objects and concepts and their labels (Koçak & Puranam, 2022), these can be repaired through translation (Bechky, 2003; Tushman & Katz, 1980).

Given this work, we aim to reveal root causes of disagreements so that this information can be used to help disagreeing parties converge or at least for helping observers make more informed judgments about which party's arguments to accept¹. We take advantage of current capabilities of large language models (LLMs), which open the door to diagnosing sources of disagreements and to designing interventions at scale. Studies show that recent models like GPT-4 can summarize opinions (Fish et al., 2023), integrate diverse viewpoints into consensus statements (Bakker et al., 2022, Tessler et al., 2024), suggest interventions based on conflict resolution strategies (Govers et al., 2024; Tan et al., 2024), and nudge opposing parties to maintain a cordial conversation despite their differences (Argyle et al., 2023; Claggett et al., 2025). Koçak et al. (2023) demonstrate that state of the art LLMs can diagnose sources of conflict from a vignette description of a situation nearly as well as humans do, though with a tendency for over-attribution to differences in causal codes. We extend this to diagnosing sources of difference in expressed opinions captured in the form of text.

Textual records allow for large scale analysis, and increasingly, publicly expressed opinions leave a textual record. Previous studies have developed multiple facilitation methods to surface the underlying assumptions, beliefs, values, and frames that generate disagreements. Applications to negotiations (Fisher & Ury, 1981; Fisher et al., 1991), policy deliberation (Fishkin, 1997; Gutmann & Thompson, 2004; Schön & Rein, 1994), and conflict mediation (Folger & Bush, 1994) share common techniques including structured questioning, perspective-taking exercises, and facilitated dialogue designed to reveal the deeper cognitive and normative foundations that drive conflict. However, these are all limited by requiring access to individuals whose viewpoints are to be analyzed, a challenge that analysis of textual records does not face.

On the other hand, a challenge that is more acute when working with text data is identification of implicit content. Becker et al. (2025) point out that explicit content may not be sufficient for understanding organizational decision-making and call for research on the interaction of explicit and implicit content. However, empirical derivation of implicit content is

¹ This assumption is not uncontested. Guilbeault et al. (2024) find that informing participants of the cognitive dissimilarity of a disagreeing other makes them less open to opposing arguments. We suspect this is due to an identity-based reaction, as the cognitive dissimilarity manipulation has been used in other work to create what is known as a “minimal group”.

difficult. Cronin and Weingart (2019) note that it may not be easy to discover representation gaps, because these tend to be implicit and to motivate reasoning unconsciously. Ackerman et al. (1992) find that speakers often regard their goals as “good things per se” and fail to articulate them, making it especially harder to work with archival data. In this study, we aim to extract not only explicitly stated sources of disagreements but those that might be left unarticulated and implicit in archival text data by assuming that expressed opinions are chains of reasoning that can be expressed as a series of premises; what is left unsaid can be deduced on the assumption that the overall chain is coherent. This is a reasonable assumption when the data arise from sources where the speakers are striving for coherent articulation of their viewpoints.

We build our approach on two research programs, one that focuses on eliciting, representing, and analyzing mental representations of decision-makers, and another that has focused on dissecting arguments into their component parts.

2.1. Mental Representations and Cognitive Mapping

Explicit mapping of individual cognitions is often dated back to work by Axelrod (1976) in political science and Bougon et al. (1977) in management science. By the time Walsh (1995) reviewed the literature, dozens of theoretical and empirical studies at the individual, group, organization, and industry level had been published on the content and structure of (such as diversity, breadth, complexity) of managerial cognitions. In a recent review of the literature that developed since then, Becker et al. (2025) find 206 articles on managerial mental representations. Among the many approaches that these reviews illustrate, we are interested in those that have focused on understanding how managerial cognitions inform decision making.

The bulk of this research uses “cognitive mapping” (also known as “cause mapping”), which Axelrod developed as a tool to represent a person’s causal assertions with respect to a particular policy domain and generate consequences that follow from this structure. In the edited volume “Structure of Decision”, Axelrod (1976) applied this technique to depict and analyze arguments recorded in archival documents. Since then, cognitive maps have been used for analysis of strategic decision making in organizations (e.g. Bougon et al., 1977; Nadkarni & Narayanan, 2007; Porac et al., 2002; Priem & Harrison, 1994) and for risk analysis in management, engineering, medical and biological sciences as well as in industrial applications (for a review, see Bakhtavar et al. 2021). Most relevant for our intended use, cognitive maps

have also been used to examine the perceptions of different stakeholders where there is conflict, aiming to surface and analyze cognitive diversity (e.g. Tegarden et al., 2009 analyzed a management team) or facilitate the development of a consensus (e.g. see Özesmi & Özesmi, 2004 on environmental conflicts).

Despite significant conceptual and methodological advances in this field, there are shortcomings to cognitive mapping for our purposes. First, this method primarily depicts causal paths, whereas arguments also feature non-casual steps (e.g. value judgments, axiomatic statements asserted as facts or forecasts, or definitions). This is crucial since how (intermediate) outcomes are evaluated, terms are defined, and what is assumed to be axiomatic will likely affect final conclusions, something that might be missed in analyses only focusing on the evaluation of the ultimate outcome (e.g. Axelrod, 1976; Palaez & Bowles, 1996).

Second, making prior approaches to cognitive mapping particularly inadequate for our purposes, outcomes are often assumed to be evaluated similarly by different people, though we know that evaluations of potential outcomes can vary to a considerable extent. For instance, research on risk perception shows that lay people's perception of risk is determined primarily by the 'dread' factor (referring to catastrophic potential, uncontrollability, risk to future generations, and not being equitable), whereas experts' perceptions of risk is related more to estimates of fatalities (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1983; Slovic, 1987). Moreover, stakeholders might assign different degrees of relative importance across goals.

2.2. Argument Analysis and Mining

Another important stream of related work comes from the domain of argument analysis. Toulmin's seminal model of argumentation (1958) identifies functional components of an argument (Claim, Data, Warrant, Backing, Qualifier, Rebuttal). Later, van Eemeren & Grootendorst (1992) and Walton (1996) identified various argumentation schemas such as causal, symptomatic, comparison, definitional, value based etc. However, no uniform approach to categorizing the components of an argument into a fixed set of premises connected through a fixed set of operators has yet emerged. Such an approach is necessary to entail reliable comparisons across actors in terms of the arguments they make when expressing opinions.

Argument mining focuses on using Natural Language Processing (NLP) to identify claims and premises within individual texts, often to model rhetorical structure or persuasive

intent (Lawrence & Reed, 2019). In applications such as analysing debates, essays, or legal documents, the typical focus is on identifying argument components (such as premises vs. conclusions) and relations (such as support or attack). The classification of premises into types however remains rudimentary. For example, Stab and Gurevych’s (2014) influential corpus of persuasive essays annotates each argument component simply as a *premise* or a *claim*, and connections as support or rebuttal. Where scholars have attempted more detailed classification and comparison across actors, they have had to rely on human judgment, limiting the scale and speed with which argument mining can be conducted (Mochales & Moens, 2011).

In sum, cognitive mapping serves as the basic inspiration for reconstructing reasoning from the text of arguments. Argumentation theory and argument mining provide a basis for describing the structure of arguments beyond causation and demonstrates the possibility of doing so in an automated form. We build on these ideas to outline our solution to the automated comparative analysis of argument structures supporting diverging opinions.

3. A Framework for Analysing Expressed Opinions as Reasoning Chains

Our conceptual starting point is that when comparing differences in expressed opinions, we can treat these opinions as the result of reasoning chains. We can then compare across divergent opinions on a topic to understand the source of divergence between them in terms of the content (premises) and structure (how premises are combined) of reasoning chains that lead to the expressed opinions (conclusions). The crucial step we take here is to depart from attempting to map differences in underlying cognitions about causes (e.g. as in Fuzzy Cognitive Mapping) to instead focus on differences in the structure and content of the reasoning chains underlying expressed opinions. We further demonstrate how these reasoning chains can be systematically extracted using an ensemble of large language models (LLMs).

It is important to reiterate that the reasoning chains we identify—comprising sets of linked premises—do not purport to capture the complete mental models of speakers, as cognitive maps attempt to do. Instead, they have the more modest objective of describing in a compact way the structure of expressed opinions to facilitate classification and comparative analysis. If a cognitive map represents a theory, a reasoning chain represents an articulation of opinions (possibly derived from the theory). Further, we do not need to assume that the opinions expressed are either sincere or accurate- but we do assume the actor expressing them is

attempting to be coherent (i.e. there is internal consistency to their reasoning). This is an assumption we can evaluate after coding the text, by noting any internal inconsistencies.

3.1. Premise Types

We assume that **a reasoning chain is an attempt at communicating a coherent argument about possible states of the world and their desirability**. Reasoning chains involve sequences of premises, because arguments are made up of premises- statements that constitute parts of a chain that culminates in a conclusion (Walton, 1996). We can represent the reasoning chain of a speaker on a topic as a series of linked premises that support a conclusion (Figure 1). Implicit premises can be identified as those that are logically necessary to connect explicitly stated premises to the conclusion.




Figure 1. Example illustrating parts of a reasoning chain in our grammar of premises

To define a mutually exclusive and collective exhaustive set of premise categories, we draw on the theory of culture as codes (Koçak & Puranam, 2022, 2023; Koçak et al., 2023). Formally, a code is a fuzzy mapping between two types of constructs. “Causal codes” are beliefs about how the world works, expressed as (fuzzy) mappings between causes and effects. “Moral/evaluative codes” refer to evaluations of entities, actions, or outcomes as desirable or undesirable, again expressed as a (fuzzy) mapping from the former to the latter. “Lexical codes” are fuzzy mappings between entities and the labels used to describe them. By treating codes as fuzzy mappings (or equivalently non-symmetric, valued matrices), one can formally model the dynamics of how codes adapt through selection and feedback (e.g., Koçak and Puranam, 2018,

2022; March, 1991) and measure them empirically at large scale using machine learning methods (e.g., Corritore et al., 2020; Marchetti & Puranam, 2022).

Our assumption about the nature of reasoning chains implies that the premises they contain must either assert states or assert mappings (e.g. states to labels). This yields five mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive premise types that serve as fundamental building blocks for describing more complex argumentative structures: premises that assert current or future states, or which map states to labels, states to states through causal reasoning, and states to evaluations of desirability. The first two types of premises are *axiomatic*- assertions without further justification within the reasoning chain about a current or future state of the world. The next three are *associative* as they map between or within domains. The cultural codes framework directly supports the definition of these associative premises as they correspond to pairwise associations within cultural codes (lexical, causal and moral/evaluative). Formally, we define the five types of premises as follows:

A factual (current) premise asserts an empirical state of affairs, either present or historical, treated as axiomatic within the reasoning chain without further justification. Formally, a factual premise takes the form "X is/has/was the case" (without providing a causal explanation).

A factual (forecast) premise predicts a future state or event, projecting what is expected to happen *without* providing a causal explanation. Forecast premises describe what is claimed will exists or occur. Formally, a forecast premise takes the form "X will be/do/happen."

A causal premise posits a cause-effect relationship between two variables or states. It specifies how one element influences, produces, prevents, or alters another through some mechanism. Formally, a causal premise takes the form "X causes/influences/prevents Y" or "X leads to a change in Y." It is a particular association within a causal code.

A moral/evaluative premise is a propositional statement that assigns normative value or makes a judgment about the desirability, morality, or worth of an action, outcome, or state of affairs. It reflects a value position rather than an empirical claim. Formally, an evaluative premise takes the form "X is good/ bad/ desirable/ undesirable" or "X has positive/negative value according to criterion Y." It is a particular association within a moral/evaluative code.

A *definitional premise* establishes the semantic boundaries or conceptual scope of a term, entity, or category. It specifies what constitutes membership in a class or the meaning attributed to a concept within the context of the argument. Formally, a definitional premise takes the form "X is defined as Y" or "X constitutes/comprises Y." It is a particular association within a lexical code.

3.2. Linking Relationships

Premises are connected to form reasoning chains through three types of linking relationships:

The *implication operator* (\rightarrow) establishes a binary connective establishing a consequential relationship between two premises, where the first premise leads to or entails the second. Formally, for premises A and B, the expression "A \rightarrow B" signifies that premise A, when accepted, provides sufficient grounds for accepting premise B within the reasoning chain. This operator captures inferential steps without necessarily implying strict logical entailment.

The *combination operator* (+) joins two or more premises such that they are considered jointly rather than independently in supporting a subsequent premise or conclusion. Formally, for premises A and B, the expression "A + B" signifies that premises A and B operate as an integrated unit in the reasoning chain. This operator can represent either conjunctive relationships (where both premises must be accepted) or disjunctive relationships (where either premise may suffice), with the specific interpretation determined by context.

The *evaluation operator* (\wedge) indicates an assessment relationship, where the second premise represents a value judgment about the content of the first. Formally, for premises A and B, the expression "A \wedge B" signifies that premise B constitutes an evaluative stance toward the state, action, outcome, or relationship described in premise A. This operator bridges descriptive and normative elements within reasoning chains, marking transitions from "what is" to "what ought to be" or "what is valuable."

This simple grammar of premises—five types classified based on their internal logic (factual, forecast, definitional, causal, and moral) and three types of operators describing how premises are linked (implication, combination, and evaluation)—offers advantages over prior approaches for understanding opinion differences in an automated manner. First, this approach

offers the prospect of integrating semantic premise types into argument mining. For instance, an argument mining system informed by this grammar might detect that "Crime has increased by 5%" is a factual premise, whereas "Increasing police patrols will reduce crime" is a causal premise, and "Public safety is more important than privacy" is an evaluative premise.

Second, this additional layer of information facilitates comparison between arguments (e.g., identifying that Person A and Person B both cite the same factual premises but differ in their moral premises). For instance, when mining arguments from two politicians on climate policy, we might map each politician's reasoning and then compare them, noting that Politician X's chain relies on a factual premise about scientific evidence and a causal premise about policy effects, while Politician Y's chain relies on a definitional premise about "economic growth" and an evaluative premise about the importance of preserving jobs. The simple grammar of premises we describe thus provides the common language needed for systematic comparison.

Finally, the source of differences being rooted in particular types of premises is likely to assist in identifying paths to resolution. Koçak and Puranam (2022) argue that differences in factual or causal codes may be resolved by verification or research, whereas differences in moral codes may be resolved through negotiation. Koçak et al. (2023) find that differences in moral codes are more likely to be associated with relationship conflict and perceived as harder to resolve than differences in causal codes.

In summary, the novelty of our approach for argument mining lies in its capacity to enrich the representation of arguments (with premise types and logical form), thereby enabling deeper analysis and comparison of arguments than current mining and mapping approaches allow. In this paper, we apply this framework to compare opinions expressed by multiple speakers about AI risk. Importantly, our application is descriptive. We do not evaluate the soundness of premises, the accuracy of the overall reasoning chain, nor do we make any claims about the origins of differences in reasoning chains across actors. We simply distinguish types of premises in their expressed opinions based on the type of assertions they entail within the reasoning chain.

4. Application: Decoding the Debate on AI Risks

4.1. Data on Divergent Opinions on AI risk

The Lex Fridman podcast (<https://lexfridman.com/podcast/>) presents a particularly rich empirical context for examining disagreements about AI risk for several reasons. First, as one of the most prominent platforms for discussions about artificial intelligence, it features extensive dialogues with key figures representing diverse perspectives on AI development and risk, from AI safety researchers to leading technologists and technology entrepreneurs. Second, the long-form conversational format (typically 2-3 hours) allows for in-depth exploration of participants' reasoning, making lexical, causal and evaluative codes more readily observable than in shorter media formats or written statements. Third, Fridman's interviewing approach, which combines technical expertise with philosophical inquiry, consistently probes both the technical foundations of his guests' beliefs (causal codes) and their value judgments (evaluative codes) and attempts disambiguation (arising from fuzzy lexical codes), providing rich data for our theoretical framework. Fourth, the temporal span of these conversations (from 2018 to April 2025) captures the evolution of the debate on AI risk through several significant technological developments, allowing us to observe how codes adapt to new information. Finally, the semi-structured nature of these conversations, where similar themes are explored with different guests, facilitates systematic comparison across perspectives while maintaining the naturalistic character of the discourse, and with the anchor, Fridman himself, acting as a point of constancy.

We first conducted a pilot study in which we analyze five interviews Fridman conducted with guests who are known to vary significantly in their perspectives on AI risk: Marc Andreessen (episode 386), Guillaume Verdon (407), Dario Amodei (452), Eliezer Yudkowsky (268), and Roman Yampolskiy (431). After finalizing our procedure, we downloaded all episodes of the Lex Fridman Podcast available as of April 20, 2025 and applied the analysis to all episodes. As of that date, the podcast included 465 episodes, of which 80 had official transcripts available on Lex Fridman's website (ep. 385, ep. 387 to ep. 465). We downloaded those transcripts directly from the website. For the remaining 383 episodes, we downloaded the audio files and transcribed them using TurboScribe AI, an AI transcription service powered by the Whisper model, which reports an accuracy of 98%. Two episodes—84 and 100—were unavailable. In total, we have 463 transcripts.

4.2. Analysis Procedure

We build a largely automated process for extracting reasoning chains from text data, using an ensemble of Large Language Models (LLM's). We array three LLMs in the structure of a hierarchical team with two parallel, independently operating workers (DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet), whose outputs are evaluated and synthesized by a third LLM in the role of integrator. We use GPT-4.1 as the integrator because it has a longer context window. The final result can be the same as both workers (R3), the same as only one worker (R2), or entirely different from both (R1). In our ensemble analyses across all tasks, the R3 outcome – when all three LLMs agree with each other – was achieved at least 75% of the time for all tasks we apply the ensemble to. We summarize our analytic procedure here briefly and provide full task details and the distribution of agreement outcomes in the appendix.

Our first step is to use GPT-4.1 to segment lengthy transcripts into single-topic chunks. We then have our LLM ensemble process these segments to generate summaries that are faithful to the speakers' statements. Next, we feed these summaries as input into the PEEL framework, to extract structured reasoning chains. Each chain contains one conclusion, a list of premises and a set of logical relationships among them. Premises are labeled by their type (factual, causal, definitional, forecast, moral), whether they are explicit or implicit, with a confidence score (0-100) indicating the certainty of their presence. Explicit premises are those that are stated by the speakers. PEEL extracts implicit premises under the assumption of logical consistency between explicit premises and the stated conclusions.

Finally, we process the conclusions through a final topic and attitude assignment step, which applies a strict classification to retain only conclusions directly concerning AI risks and impacts (based on the Stanford Human AI Institute's categorization) and performs a sentiment analysis to assign an attitude (optimistic, pessimistic, or neutral). Using this dataset, we do a pairwise comparison of reasoning chains for optimistic ("boomer") and pessimistic ("doomer") opinions on the same topic to pinpoint the root divergence where their reasoning fundamentally splits.

Applying this procedure to the 463 transcripts from 408 unique speakers, we extract 410 summaries that contain 1,719 reasoning chains related to AI. The final step creates a core dataset

of 1,130 conclusions on AI risks and impacts, with their assigned attitude (optimistic, pessimistic, or neutral) that we include in our analysis below.

4.3. Results

4.3.1. Topics, Speakers, and Attitudes

Among the 1130 conclusions about AI, we observe a skewed distribution across thematic areas. While some topics attracted significant discussion, such as “AI as an Existential/Extinction Risk” or “AI Impact on Purpose/Meaning/Identity & Dehumanization”, others, like “AI and Data Value Compensation” or “AI Impact on Human Creativity and Mindset”, were covered in only a few chains. Figure 2 presents the ten most frequently discussed topics. We see that the discussion about AI risk and impact in Lex Fridman’s podcasts is clearly concentrated on three main concerns. First, there is a substantive focus on long-term catastrophic risks and the technical alignment and control problem. Second, significant attention is devoted to ethical foundations and AI impact on human meaning and experience. Finally, the discourse also engages with specific, already unfolding AI risks in key societal domains such as employment and information integrity.

Speaker backgrounds were classified primarily based on podcast episode descriptions, cross-referenced with external sources (e.g., Wikipedia, LinkedIn) when unclear. We classified speakers’ professional roles based on their primary field of activity at the time of the interview. An examination of the professional background of speakers shows that academic researchers and industry/tech executives together account for more than 60% of those discussing AI risk, highlighting their central role in shaping this discourse. In contrast, public policy figures and creative/media voices are underrepresented in AI risk conversations relative to their presence in the overall dataset. We find no gender difference between the overall pool of podcast speakers and those discussing AI risk: men constitute about 88% of both groups, while women make up only about 12%.





Figure 2. Ten Most Frequently Covered Topics in Discussions Related to AI-Risk

Attitudes toward AI risk vary considerably across topics. Figure 3 presents the breakdown of attitudes—pessimistic (red), neutral (yellow), and optimistic (green)—for the top 10 topics. In the case of “AI as Existential/Extinction Risk”, we see a high polarized discourse, with few neutral arguments. This suggests a sharp divide: speakers are either deeply concerned about this threat or dismiss it as unfounded. A similar pattern of polarization, though with more neutral opinions as well, emerges in the topic “AI and Employment & Labor Markets”, reflecting a cautious, wait-and-see attitude towards the future of the labor market with AI. In contrast, two topics “AI Societal Benefits and Risks” and “AI Ethics and Beneficial Design” are strongly dominated by neutral attitudes. Across most other topics, neutral and pessimistic attitudes are dominant, with limited optimistic voices, pointing to widespread and genuine concern about AI’s potential negative repercussions across multiple social domains.



**Figure 3. Distribution of Pessimistic, Neutral and Optimistic Attitudes
For the Most Frequently Covered Topics on AI Risk**

To examine how speaker characteristics correlate with attitudes toward AI risk, we ran a multinomial logistic regression at the conclusion level, using the neutral attitude as the baseline outcome. Robust standard errors are clustered at the speaker level to account for within-speaker correlation. Table 1 presents the results of the regression. We find that professional background has no significant predictive power for optimistic attitudes. However, there are significant differences across professions in pessimistic attitudes. Specifically, speakers from creative/media/public backgrounds and from public policy or government sectors are significantly more likely to express pessimistic views on AI risk (compared with academics). In contrast, industry/tech executives are less likely to express pessimistic attitudes than academics, although this effect is only marginally significant. Speaker gender is not a significant predictor of either optimistic or pessimistic attitudes.

Table 1. Multinomial Logistic Regression Predicting AI Attitude (Baseline = Neutral)

DV = Attitude toward AI risks	Optimistic	Pessimistic
<hr/>		
Speaker profession (baseline: Academic)		
- Creative / Media / Public Figure	0.476 (0.323)	0.876 *** (0.249)
- Industry / Tech Executive	0.003 (0.270)	-0.431* (0.223)
- Mixed Academic–Industry	-0.475 (0.417)	-0.694 (0.360)
- Public / Policy / Government / Military	0.655 (0.672)	1.084 ** (0.468)
- Tech / Industry Researcher / Practitioner	-0.207 (0.425)	-0.378 (0.276)
- Other	1.466 (1.252)	1.595 (1.010)
Female speaker	-0.000 (0.3333)	-0.454 (0.288)
<hr/>		
Intercept	-1.060 *** (0.204)	-0.679 *** (0.155)
<hr/>		
N	1130	
Likelihood Ratio $\chi^2(14)$	56.03 ***	

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$, robust standard errors clustered at the speaker level

4.3.2. Reasoning Structure

In this section, we examine the reasoning structure of arguments that we extracted using the PEEL framework. Each reasoning chain consists of a conclusion, a set of supporting premises and the logical relationships connecting them. Most arguments are supported by only one single reasoning chain; only 7 out of 1130 arguments contain multiple chains.

Table 2 presents reasoning chains from two speakers on the topic of “AI as an Existential/Extinction Risk”, representing the “boomer” (Yann LeCun) and “doomer” (Roman Yampolskiy) perspectives. We present the output from the ensemble of LLMs as it is. In the section on relationships, ‘+’ indicates additive support, ‘ \Rightarrow ’ implies implication, and ‘^’ denotes moral evaluation.

Table 2. Examples of Extracted Reasoning Chains on AI Risk

Speaker 1: Yann LeCun– Episode: 416	
Conclusion	'AI doomer' scenarios predicting sudden, uncontrollable superintelligence leading to human extinction are implausible.
Premises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P15: AGI will not emerge as a single event but through gradual, incremental progress across multiple capabilities. (forecast, explicit, confidence: 85) • P16: AGI requires advances in world modeling, memory, reasoning, and planning capabilities. (factual, explicit, confidence: 90) • P17: Intelligence does not inherently lead to a desire for domination. (factual, explicit, confidence: 80) • P18: Drives for power or control are not necessary features of intelligent systems. (factual, explicit, confidence: 80) • P19: AI behavior can be controlled through design. (factual, explicit, confidence: 85) • P20: As AI systems become more capable, society will iteratively develop and improve guardrails. (forecast, explicit, confidence: 80)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P21: Safety in complex technologies like jet engines was achieved through decades of incremental improvement, not a single breakthrough. (factual, explicit, confidence: 90) • P22: AI safety development will follow patterns similar to other complex technologies. (causal, implicit, confidence: 75) • P23: The gradual nature of AGI development allows time for safety measures to be developed. (causal, implicit, confidence: 80) • P24: 'AI doomer' scenarios assume a sudden emergence of uncontrollable superintelligence. (factual, explicit, confidence: 90) • P25: 'AI doomer' scenarios assume intelligence inherently leads to domination. (factual, implicit, confidence: 75) • P26: Scenarios based on false assumptions about technology development are implausible. (definitional, implicit, confidence: 85)
Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R15: $P15 + P16 \rightarrow$ AGI development will be gradual across multiple capabilities, not a sudden event. • R16: $R15 \Rightarrow P23 \rightarrow$ The gradual nature of AGI development provides time for safety measures. • R17: $P17 + P18 + P19 \rightarrow$ Intelligent systems don't inherently seek power and can be designed with controlled behaviors. • R18: $P20 + P21 + P22 \rightarrow$ Safety measures will evolve alongside AI capabilities, following historical patterns of technological safety development. • R19: $P24 + P25 \rightarrow$ 'AI doomer' scenarios are based on assumptions about sudden emergence and inherent domination drives. • R20: $R15 + R17 \rightarrow$ AGI's gradual development and lack of inherent domination drives contradict key doomer assumptions. • R21: $R16 + R18 \rightarrow$ Time for safety measures combined with historical patterns of safety development further contradict doomer scenarios. • R22: $R19 + R20 + R21 \rightarrow$ Doomer assumptions are contradicted by multiple aspects of AI development and safety.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R23: R22 + P26 → Scenarios based on false assumptions are implausible by definition. • R24: R23 ⇒ C3, Since 'AI doomer' scenarios rely on assumptions contradicted by multiple aspects of AI development and safety, and scenarios based on false assumptions are implausible, 'AI doomer' scenarios are implausible.
Speaker 2: Roman Yampolskiy – Episode: 431	
Conclusion	The creation of superintelligent AI poses overwhelming and likely catastrophic risks to humanity that cannot be adequately controlled or mitigated.
Premises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P1: Superintelligent AI poses three categories of risk: existential risk (X-risk), suffering risk (S-risk), and ikigai risk (I-risk). (factual, explicit, confidence: 98) • P2: Existential risk (X-risk) means humanity is destroyed. (definitional, explicit, confidence: 100) • P3: Suffering risk (S-risk) means humans experience extreme, possibly unending suffering. (definitional, explicit, confidence: 100) • P4: Ikigai risk (I-risk) means humans lose meaning and purpose as AI surpasses all human capabilities and renders human contribution obsolete. (definitional, explicit, confidence: 100) • P5: Even if humans survive, we may become powerless, living under the control of superintelligent systems—like animals in a zoo or in simulated realities—without agency or value. (forecast, explicit, confidence: 95) • P6: Controlling AGI or superintelligence is fundamentally impossible. (factual, explicit, confidence: 98) • P7: A single failure with superintelligence could be irreversible and fatal for humanity. (causal, explicit, confidence: 95) • P8: As AI systems become more capable, their potential for harm scales proportionally. (causal, explicit, confidence: 95)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P9: The surface area for possible failure or exploitation becomes effectively infinite, while attackers need only find a single vulnerability. (factual, explicit, confidence: 95) • P10: Superintelligent systems will be unpredictable and unexplainable, capable of devising strategies and dangers far beyond human imagination or defense. (forecast, explicit, confidence: 95) • P11: Current AI systems already display unintended behaviors, can be jailbroken, and have hidden capabilities that developers only discover after deployment. (factual, explicit, confidence: 95) • P12: We cannot anticipate or test for all possible dangerous behaviors—there are always unknown unknowns. (factual, explicit, confidence: 95) • P13: Value alignment (getting AI to do what humans want) is a necessary condition for safe AI. (factual, implicit, confidence: 90) • P14: There is a lack of universal ethics and diversity of human values. (factual, explicit, confidence: 95) • P15: Solving value alignment for all of humanity is intractable. (causal, explicit, confidence: 95) • P16: Superintelligent systems could deceive humans, including their creators. (forecast, explicit, confidence: 90) • P17: No test or verification method can guarantee the absence of deception or a 'treacherous turn' where the AI changes its behavior after gaining power. (factual, explicit, confidence: 90) • P18: Modern AI is not directly designed by humans but emerges from complex, poorly understood training processes, making its capabilities and dangers fundamentally unpredictable. (factual, explicit, confidence: 95) • P19: Open-sourcing advanced AI is like distributing nuclear weapons, as it enables malicious use. (factual, explicit, confidence: 90) • P20: Current efforts in AI safety are inadequate and lag far behind capability advances. (factual, explicit, confidence: 95)
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P21: Formal verification, explainability, and regulation are all limited or ultimately ineffective for self-improving, complex systems. (factual, explicit, confidence: 95) • P22: Pausing AI development until concrete, provable safety mechanisms exist would be necessary to prevent catastrophic risks. (causal, explicit, confidence: 90) • P23: A global pause in AI development is not feasible given global incentives and ease of access to powerful compute. (factual, explicit, confidence: 90) • P24: Malevolent actors could use AGI to maximize suffering, especially if combined with technologies like functional immortality. (forecast, explicit, confidence: 90) • P25: AGI's superior creativity and understanding of human biology would make such harm unprecedented. (causal, explicit, confidence: 90) • P26: The inadequacy of safety measures combined with continued development and potential malicious use makes catastrophic risks from superintelligent AI unavoidable. (causal, implicit, confidence: 90) • P27: Humanity being destroyed is bad. (moral_outcome, implicit, confidence: 100) • P28: Humans experiencing extreme, possibly unending suffering is bad. (moral_outcome, implicit, confidence: 100) • P29: Humans losing meaning and purpose is bad. (moral_outcome, implicit, confidence: 100) • P30: Humanity becoming powerless and without agency or value is bad. (moral_outcome, implicit, confidence: 100) • P31: Unavoidable catastrophic risks to humanity are morally unacceptable. (moral_outcome, implicit, confidence: 100)
Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R1: $P1 + P2 \Rightarrow P32 \rightarrow$ The existence of X-risk and its definition implies that superintelligent AI could cause human extinction.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R2: $P1 + P3 \Rightarrow P33 \rightarrow$ The existence of S-risk and its definition implies that superintelligent AI could cause extreme human suffering. • R3: $P1 + P4 \Rightarrow P34 \rightarrow$ The existence of I-risk and its definition implies that superintelligent AI could cause loss of human meaning and purpose. • R4: $P32 \wedge P27 \rightarrow$ The potential for human extinction is evaluated as bad. • R5: $P33 \wedge P28 \rightarrow$ The potential for extreme human suffering is evaluated as bad. • R6: $P34 \wedge P29 \rightarrow$ The potential for loss of human meaning and purpose is evaluated as bad. • R7: $P5 \wedge P30 \rightarrow$ The forecast that humans may become powerless without agency is evaluated as bad. • R8: $R4 + R5 + R6 + R7 \rightarrow$ All morally evaluated catastrophic outcomes combined. • R9: $P6 + P7 + P8 + P9 \rightarrow$ Combining impossibility of control, irreversible failure, scaling harm, and infinite attack surface. • R10: $P10 + P11 + P12 \rightarrow$ Combining unpredictability, current unintended behaviors, and unknown unknowns. • R11: $P13 + P14 \Rightarrow P15 \rightarrow$ The necessity of value alignment and lack of universal ethics leads to intractability of value alignment. • R12: $P16 + P17 \rightarrow$ Potential for deception and inability to verify trustworthiness. • R13: $P18 + P19 \rightarrow$ Emergent, unpredictable nature and malicious use risk. • R14: $P20 + P21 \rightarrow$ Inadequate safety efforts and ineffective regulation. • R15: $P22 + P23 \rightarrow$ Necessity and infeasibility of a global pause. • R16: $P24 + P25 \rightarrow$ Malevolent use and unprecedented harm. • R17: $R9 + R10 + R11 + R12 + R13 + R14 + R15 + R16 \rightarrow$ All factual, causal, and forecast premises combined to show the dangers and uncontrollability of superintelligent AI.
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R18: $R8 + R17 \Rightarrow P26 \rightarrow$ The combination of catastrophic moral outcomes and uncontrollable, unpredictable, and malicious risks makes catastrophic risks from superintelligent AI unavoidable. • R19: $P26 \wedge P31 \rightarrow$ The unavoidability of catastrophic risks is morally evaluated as unacceptable. • R20: $R19 \Rightarrow C1 \rightarrow$ The moral evaluation of unavoidable catastrophic risks supports the conclusion that superintelligent AI poses overwhelming and likely catastrophic risks that cannot be adequately controlled.
--	---

Figures 4a and 4b summarize the structure of reasoning chains we find in our corpus. Figure 4a shows the distribution of the number of premises per reasoning chain. While most reasoning chains contain 5 to 10 premises, some are considerably longer, reaching up to more than 30 premises.




Figure 4a. Distribution of the Number of Premises per Reasoning Chain

Notably, across our corpus, most reasoning chains (95.84%) contain implicit premises (and therefore constitute *enthymemes*). Figure 4b presents the average proportions of different premise types per reasoning chain and further breaks them down by whether they are stated explicitly or left implicit. Factual and causal premises are the most common, reflecting the discourse on the Lex Fridman Podcast, which tends to focus on scientific and technological arguments. However, factual and causal premises differ in whether they are explicit or implicit: nearly all factual claims are explicit, while about half of causal claims are implicit. Moral premises—the third prominent type—are the most likely to be implicit, with more than 90% unstated. The two least common premise types, forecast and definitional, also differ: forecast claims are mostly explicit, whereas half of definitional premises are implicit.

A chi-square test of independence shows a significant association between premise type and implicitness ($\chi^2(4)=3313.21$, $p<.001$). Pairwise one-sided two-proportion z-tests further confirm that moral premises are significantly more likely to be implicit than causal premises ($z = 33.14$, $p < .001$) and definitional premises ($z = 18.34$, $p < .001$). In other words, given that a premise is implicit, it is most likely to be a moral one. This result highlights that speakers frequently leave moral assumptions implicit, suggesting they view these as uncontroversial, widely accepted, or self-evident.




Figure 4b. Average Proportions of Premise Types per Reasoning Chain, by Explicit vs. Implicit Form

We next examine whether reasoning structures are associated with speaker characteristics or attitudes towards AI risk. We estimate a series of OLS regression models at the argument level, with standard errors clustered by speaker. The dependent variables include the total number of premises in a reasoning chain and the proportional use of different premise types. Key explanatory variables are the conclusion’s attitude toward AI risk, the speaker’s professional background and the speaker’s gender. Topic fixed effects are also included to control for subject-matter difference. Table 3a presents the results of these models when pooling both explicit and implicit premises, while Table 3b shows the results for explicit premises only.

Results indicate that attitude is significantly associated with reasoning structure. Optimistic conclusions are associated with significantly fewer total premises and fewer explicit premises, yet no significant change in the proportion of implicit ones. In contrast, pessimistic conclusions show no difference in the overall number of premises or explicit premises but have a significantly lower share of implicit premises. This pattern indicates that “boomers” employ a more condensed style of argumentation, while “doomers” favor stating their points more explicitly in their reasoning.

Turning to the composition of the reasoning chains, optimistic conclusions are associated with a lower proportion of causal premises, a pattern that holds regardless of whether implicit premises are included. At the same time, an optimistic attitude is significantly correlated with a higher proportion of forecast premises when both explicit and implicit premises are considered; however, this relationship becomes only marginally significant when examining explicit premises alone. These findings suggest that “boomers” tend to employ a more aspirational and narrative-oriented style of argumentation, relying on a future-framing structure, even if they are less inclined to use forecast premises explicitly in their statements. In contrast, pessimistic conclusions exhibit a similar reasoning structure to neutral ones, with one key exception: they are significantly associated with a lower proportion of moral premises. This challenged our initial expectation that pessimistic warnings about AI would be morally laden. Instead, the result suggests that “doomer” conclusions in this discourse tend to derive their persuasive force from other types of premises rather than from moral appeals.

Regarding speaker characteristics, the most interesting pattern emerges for industry and technology executives. Their arguments tend to have fewer premises and rely on a significantly lower proportion of factual premises and a higher proportion of causal premises. Additionally, they also draw on a higher proportion of moral premises; however, this relationship is entirely driven by implicit moral premises. The reasoning pattern of industry and technology executives is therefore characterized by causal framing and implicit normative grounding.

**Table 3a. OLS Regression of Total Premises and Proportional Premise Types on Attitude, Speaker Profession & Gender – All
(Explicit and Implicit) Premises (Models include fixed effects for topics.)**

Dependent Variable	Total Premises	Prop. of Implicit Premises	Prop. of Factual Premises	Prop. of Forecast Premises	Prop. of Causal Premises	Prop. of Definitional Premises	Prop. of Moral Premises
Intercept	8.898 *** (0.660)	0.386 *** (0.024)	0.376 *** (0.028)	0.094 *** (0.022)	0.333 *** (0.023)	0.020 ** (0.009)	0.177 *** (0.018)
Conclusion: Optimistic	-1.151 *** (0.315)	-0.007 (0.015)	0.023 (0.016)	0.033 *** (0.012)	-0.056 *** (0.016)	0.004 (0.006)	-0.005 (0.011)
Conclusion: Pessimistic	-0.135 (0.254)	-0.045 *** (0.013)	0.002 (0.014)	0.009 (0.011)	0.020 * (0.012)	0.001 (0.005)	-0.031 *** (0.008)
Creative / Media / Public Figure	-0.097 (0.524)	0.014 (0.022)	-0.045 * (0.025)	0.014 (0.020)	0.013 (0.023)	0.002 (0.007)	0.016 (0.014)
Industry / Tech Executive	-0.776 ** (0.378)	0.003 (0.015)	-0.069 *** (0.018)	0.008 (0.015)	0.032 ** (0.016)	-0.006 (0.005)	0.036 *** (0.012)
Mixed Academic– Industry	-0.756 (0.599)	-0.034 (0.027)	-0.021 (0.024)	0.026 (0.019)	-0.002 (0.023)	0.016 (0.012)	-0.019 (0.025)
Public / Policy / Gov / Military	2.039 (1.746)	0.022 (0.028)	-0.015 (0.046)	0.046 (0.060)	-0.045 (0.077)	-0.015 * (0.008)	0.028 (0.022)
Tech Researcher / Practitioner	-0.536 (0.528)	0.006 (0.033)	-0.006 (0.029)	-0.016 (0.015)	0.017 (0.021)	-0.007 (0.009)	0.011 (0.017)
Other	1.663 (1.496)	-0.035 (0.061)	-0.063 (0.044)	0.102 *** (0.022)	-0.072 * (0.043)	0.018 (0.015)	0.015 (0.025)

Dependent Variable	Total Premises	Prop. of Implicit Premises	Prop. of Factual Premises	Prop. of Forecast Premises	Prop. of Causal Premises	Prop. of Definitional Premises	Prop. of Moral Premises
Female speaker	-1.149 ** (0.469)	-0.018 (0.018)	-0.002 (0.029)	-0.019 (0.016)	-0.007 (0.023)	0.001 (0.008)	0.026 (0.017)
N	1130	1130	1130	1130	1130	1130	1130
F-statistics	5.803	32.94	11.609	19.646	38.498	6.850	46.690
Adj. R-squared	0.028	0.015	0.069	0.049	0.027	0.014	0.069

* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$, robust standard errors clustered at the speaker level

**Table 3b. OLS Regression of Total Premises and Proportional Premise Types on Attitude, Speaker Profession & Gender –
Only Explicit Premises (Models include fixed effects for topics.)**

	Total Premises	Prop. of Factual Premises	Prop. of Forecast Premises	Prop. of Causal Premises	Prop. of Definitional Premises	Prop. of Moral Premises
Intercept	5.632 *** (0.507)	0.544 *** (0.045)	0.148 *** (0.035)	0.268 *** (0.033)	0.022 (0.017)	0.018 (0.015)
Conclusion: Optimistic	-0.664 *** (0.231)	0.036 (0.029)	0.038 * (0.020)	-0.086 *** (0.023)	0.009 (0.006)	0.003 (0.011)
Conclusion: Pessimistic	0.261 (0.208)	-0.014 (0.022)	0.008 (0.018)	0.031 (0.021)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.023 *** (0.006)
Creative / Media / Public Figure	-0.064 (0.408)	-0.055 (0.040)	0.004 (0.030)	0.024 (0.030)	-0.001 (0.009)	0.028 * (0.015)
Industry / Tech Executive	-0.609 ** (0.280)	-0.073 ** (0.029)	0.003 (0.024)	0.072 *** (0.027)	-0.012 (0.008)	0.009 (0.008)
Mixed Academic–Industry	-0.391 (0.358)	-0.038 (0.044)	0.013 (0.026)	0.016 (0.044)	-0.005 (0.010)	0.014 (0.016)
Public / Policy / Gov / Military	0.977 (1.151)	-0.015 (0.059)	0.032 (0.066)	0.005 (0.105)	-0.020 *** (0.007)	-0.002 (0.009)
Tech Researcher / Practitioner	-0.504 (0.379)	0.039 (0.047)	-0.033 (0.023)	0.007 (0.042)	-0.018 ** (0.008)	0.004 (0.011)
Other	1.440 (1.385)	-0.112 ** (0.054)	0.172 *** (0.064)	-0.049 (0.077)	0.001 (0.023)	-0.012 (0.009)

	Total Premises	Prop. of Factual Premises	Prop. of Forecast Premises	Prop. of Causal Premises	Prop. of Definitional Premises	Prop. of Moral Premises
Female speaker	-0.745 ** (0.323)	-0.005 (0.044)	-0.021 (0.025)	0.013 (0.036)	0.003 (0.010)	0.010 (0.014)
N	1123	1123	1123	1123	1123	1123
F-statistics	2.319	4.554	13.129	16.253	3.437	3.683
Adj. R-squared	0.021	0.059	0.040	0.044	0.003	0.009


* $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$, robust standard errors clustered at the speaker level

4.3.3. Pairwise Disagreement Analysis

We select two topics -- AI existential risk and AI impact on labor markets -- for our pairwise disagreement analysis. The topic on existential risk (X-risk) is the most frequently discussed topic (82 reasoning chains) and also the one on which speakers diverge the most, with respect to attitudes. Among the top 10 topics with the most reasoning chains employment and labor market risk (E-risk, 24 reasoning chains) has the next highest polarization. Further, some have criticized the focus of attention on existential risk as a diversion from more imminent risks like disruptions in the labor market (Bender & Hanna, 2025; Helfrich, 2024). We therefore focus our disagreement analysis on these two aspects of AI risk- namely on X-risk and E-risk.

4.3.3.1. Disagreement Analysis of the topic “AI as Existential/Extinction Risk”

Among the 82 conclusions for which the topic is “AI as Existential - Extinction Risk”, 26 are optimistic (“boomers”), 43 are pessimistic (“doomers”), and 13 are neutral. Figure 5 shows the average composition of reasoning chains for “boomers” (blue bar) and “doomers” (orange bar) within the “AI as Existential Risk” topic. The unconditional averages reveal that, in this specific debate, pessimistic arguments in this topic rely more on causal (31.28%), forecast (19.4%) and moral (17.71%) premises, while optimistic arguments are more heavily anchored in factual premises (47.7%). This pattern suggests that within this specific debate, “doomers” argue from mechanisms to futures, while “boomers” argue from known and demonstrable facts.



**Figure 5. Distribution of Premise Type for “Boomers” and “Doomers”
in the topic “AI as Existential Risk”**

For our disagreement analysis, we focus on pairs of reasoning chains that contrast optimistic and pessimistic conclusions—resulting in 1118 unique pairs (26x43). Of these, 1072 are identified as containing a disagreement, meaning that their conclusions are logically incompatible, or that their supporting premises reflect conflicting beliefs about the same issue (i.e. excluding cases where speakers discuss unrelated topics or domains, their reasoning focuses on different dimensions of AI risks, or their conclusions are compatible, even if phrased differently).

We define the “root divergence” in a disagreeing pair as the earliest point in the reasoning chains where their beliefs conflict, a divergence that leads to later differences in other premises and, finally to their opposing conclusions. To identify it, we guide LLMs to identify all candidate divergences where premises conflict and then apply a dependency check along the reasoning chains to isolate the single root divergence: the point of disagreement that does not logically depend on any earlier conflict and that represents the primary source of the overall disagreement.

Table 4 presents the disagreement analysis for the pair of reasoning chains we shared in Table 2, for Yann LeCun and Roman Yampolskiy. LeCun argues that AI behavior can be controlled through design because AGI emerges through incremental progress, whereas Yampolskiy contends that controlling AGI or superintelligence is fundamentally impossible (because it is emergent). This root divergence is classified as a factual one.

Table 4. An example of pairwise disagreement analysis

Component	Summary
Speakers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boomer: Yann LeCun (ep. 416) • Doomer: Roman Yampolskiy (ep. 431)
Main Conclusions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LeCun: 'AI doomer' scenarios predicting sudden, uncontrollable superintelligence leading to human extinction are implausible.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yampolskiy: The creation of superintelligent AI poses overwhelming and likely catastrophic risks to humanity that cannot be adequately controlled or mitigated.
Disagreement	Yes
The first, core divergence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boomer’s premise: P19 - P19: AI behavior can be controlled through design. • Doomer’s premise: P6 - Controlling AGI or superintelligence is fundamentally impossible. • Type: Factual • This is the foundational disagreement: whether advanced AI can be controlled at all. It directly determines whether catastrophic risks are plausible or unavoidable, and underpins all downstream disagreements about safety and risk.

Figure 6 shows the distribution of root divergence types among the 1072 argument pairs identified as containing genuine disagreements. The blue bars represent the actual probability—how frequently each type appeared as the first point of divergence (the root divergence). The orange bars represent the base probability, which estimates how often each premise type would be expected to appear if root divergences were selected simply in proportion to the local prevalence of premise types within each pair. The base probability for premise type t is calculated as:

$$Base_prob_t = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{P_{t,i}^B + P_{t,i}^D}{P_{total,i}^B + P_{total,i}^D} \right)$$

where N is the number of disagreeing pairs, $P_{t,i}^B$ and $P_{t,i}^D$ are the counts of premise type t for the “boomer” and “doomer” in the pair i , and $P_{total,i}^B$ and $P_{total,i}^D$ are the total premise counts for the two speakers.

A chi-square goodness-of-fit test confirms that the distribution of root divergence types significantly deviates from the baseline distribution ($\chi^2(4) = 921.59$, $p < .001$). The comparison

reveals that causal, forecast and definitional divergences are markedly overrepresented as first points of disagreement: causal divergences occur in 36.85% of cases (versus a 27.95% base rate), forecast divergences in 26.68% (versus 15.11%), and definitional divergences in 17.26% (versus 3.68%). In contrast, factual divergences appear less often than expected (18.84% actual vs. 38.13% base), suggesting that disputes more often arise over predictions and causal mechanisms than over established facts. Finally, moral divergences are strongly underrepresented (1.23% vs. 15.13%).




Figure 6. Distribution of Root Divergence Types in Disagreement over AI Existential Risk Topic

4.3.3.2. Disagreement Analysis of the topic “AI and Employment & Labor Markets”

The topic “AI and Employment & Labor Markets” has 30 conclusions, of which 7 are optimistic, 6 pessimistic and 17 neutral, resulting in 42 comparison pairs (7x6). After running the disagreement analysis over these 42 reasoning chain pairs, we get 39 pairs identified as containing a disagreement. Figure 7 shows the distribution of root divergence type for the Employment topic, using the same notations as Figure 6.

Similar to the Existential Risk topic, the distribution of root divergence types significantly deviates from the baseline distribution ($\chi^2(4) = 25.82, p < .001$). Causal divergences form the dominant root of disagreement (58.97% actual vs. 28.88% base) whereas moral divergences are entirely absent as the root of disagreement, despite moral premises appearing frequently in the discourse. This result suggests that disputes more often arise over how AI affects labor markets rather than whether those effects might be desirable or not.




Figure 7. Distribution of Root Divergence Types in Disagreement over AI Existential Risk Topic

4.3.4. Differences in Causal Models: A Qualitative Aggregation


Having identified the roots of pairwise disagreement, a critical question remains: how can we aggregate these insights to inform decision-making within a multi-stakeholder group? To answer this, we now shift our analysis from the pairwise comparison to the entire set of speakers who addressed either of the two topics on existential risk or impact on labor markets. We focus specifically on causal root divergences, as they were the dominant driver of disagreement in both topics, revealing the most fundamental divides in how speakers think about X and E risks.

To summarize pairwise causal root divergences at the group level, we employ an iterative classification procedure similar to our prior topic and attitude assignment, again using our ensemble of LLMs. We first map all discrete expert disagreements onto one unified fundamental causal model conflict landscape. Particularly, two LLMs (DeepSeek V3 and Claude-3.7) independently assign each causal root divergence to either an existing causal question and its corresponding stance in our dynamic master list or create a new entry when the conflict represents a novel conceptual divide. A third LLM (GPT-41) then evaluates and synthesizes these independent classifications into a final one. The consistency level among the three LLMs is high (79.15% for the topic “AI as Existential/Extinction Risk; and 82.81% for the topic “AI and Employment & Labor Markets). This procedure mapped 518 causal root divergences of the topic “AI as Existential/Extinction Risk” into 63 core causal questions, which we manually grouped further into 12 thematic categories (Figure 7a). The distribution among themes is highly skewed: the top three themes—Fundamental Risk Nature, Technological Trajectory, and Human Control & Safeguards Efficacy—comprise nearly 48% of all root divergences.

Analyzing further the 12 themes revealed a recurring conflict: each debate is shaped by a tension between a “Design” perspective, which views AI as a designable artifact, and an “Emergent” perspective, which views AI development as an emergent process prone to novel and uncontrollable outcomes. For instance, the debate on Fundamental Risk Nature focuses on whether risk stems from human misuse—a failure of design—or is inherent to advanced AI—an emergent property. Similarly, within Human Control & Safeguards Efficacy, the debate centers on whether technical alignment and governance can reliably manage the risks—a design challenge—or superior intelligence will inherently cause a loss of human control—an emergent property. This conceptual map makes clear that expert disagreement is not merely about specific predictions but about more fundamental, opposing worldviews.

While all divergence themes embody the Design-Emergent tension, they differ significantly in their degree of empirical tractability. A small subset of debate questions, such as those concerning Regulatory Impact and Catastrophe Manageability, can be directly addressed through experiments, evaluations, or simulations. The Design–Emergent tension here translates into competing, testable hypotheses. Many other themes, like Human Control & Safeguards Efficacy, cannot be fully resolved empirically, but relevant research can bound the possibilities, stress-test assumptions, and define the plausible parameter space for risk. At the other end of the

spectrum, themes such as Fundamental Risk Nature or Consciousness Requirements represent axiomatic divides in world models and thus cannot be informed much by empirical evidence. For those, the goal may shift from seeking consensus to mapping the competing causal world models to enable robust, adaptive planning under deep uncertainty.




**Figure 7a. Mind map for Core Debate Themes in the topic
“AI as Existential/Extinction Risk”**

For the topic “AI and Employment and Labor Markets”, 23 root divergences are mapped into 6 core causal questions with expert attitudes, which we manually grouped into 5 thematic

categories (Figure 7b). The discourse is strongly dominated by the “Historical Adaptation” theme, which alone comprises 70% of all root divergences, indicating that disagreement centers overwhelmingly on whether history serves as a reliable guide. “Evolution vs. Revolution” is also a recurring structural tension across other themes. For example, the debate on the Driver of Inequality questions whether its primary cause is political choice (a historical lever) or the novel, deterministic force of AI technology.

In contrast to the topic “AI as Existential/Extinction Risk”, the core debate questions here are more concrete and empirically tractable. This narrower scope and empirical nature imply that the potential resolution set is more bounded. Consequently, the path forward for this discourse is more actionable: a focused research agenda aimed at determining the correct causal analogies from history and testing competing hypotheses about the drivers of inequality, job loss fears, human behavior, and welfare in the labor market.



**Figure 7b. Mind map for Core Debate Themes in the topic
“AI and Employment & Labor Markets”**

Taken together, we see a shared, deeper disagreement on the bounds of human rationality across two domains of debate (Figure 7c). The Design vs. Emergent tension in X-Risk debates fundamentally questions our cognitive bounds—the limits of human foresight and implementing control. The Evolution vs. Revolution tension in E-Risk debates focuses on our historical bounds—the applicability of lessons from the past to a new technology. Both debates share doubts about our institutional bounds—whether existing governance, regulatory, and social structures can manage the impact of AI. In this sense, the most divisive questions about the future of AI are at the core the timeless questions about humans: the limits of our capacity to reason and act collectively.




Figure 7c. Summary:
The central role of assumptions about bounded rationality in AI risk debates

5. Conclusion

Debates about issues that matter for public welfare can attain high visibility and volume, without necessarily generating much insight. An important reason for this, we propose, is the complexity of the reasoning underlying different expressed opinions, and the difficulty of analyzing and comparing these in a reliable manner. We draw on the “culture as codes” framework (Koçak and Puranam, 2023) to decompose reasoning chains supporting expressed opinions into a few fundamental types of premises, as well as develop a largely automated approach to coding reasoning chains from text to identify the kinds of premises that seem to be at the root of contention in the debate on a topic. This matters because it offers opportunities for targeted efforts at resolution: what is needed to resolve differences in causal codes is not the same (and may not have the same probability of success) as what is needed to resolve differences in lexical or moral codes.

While we focus on analyzing expressed opinions on AI risk on a prominent podcast, our approach to analyzing reasoning chains at scale, using an ensemble of LLMs to parse textual data into theoretically defined categories, can be applied to identify key points of contention in debates (not only about risk to the public) in any arena.

6. References

- Ackermann, F., Eden, C., & Cropper, S. (1992). *Getting started with cognitive mapping*. Kendal: Banxia Software.
- Argyle, L. P., Bail, C. A., Busby, E. C., Gubler, J. R., Howe, T., Rytting, C., ... & Wingate, D. (2023). Leveraging AI for democratic discourse: Chat interventions can improve online political conversations at scale. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(41), e2311627120.
- Axelrod, R. (1976). *Structure of Decision: The Cognitive Maps of Political Elites*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bakhtavar, E., Valipour, M., Yousefi, S., Sadiq, R., & Hewage, K. (2021). Fuzzy cognitive maps in systems risk analysis: a comprehensive review. *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, 7, 621-637.
- Bakker, M., Chadwick, M., Sheahan, H., Tessler, M., Campbell-Gillingham, L., Balaguer, J., ... & Summerfield, C. (2022). Fine-tuning language models to find agreement among humans with diverse preferences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 38176-38189.
- Bechky, B. A. (2003). Sharing meaning across occupational communities: The transformation of understanding on a production floor. *Organization Science*, 14(3), 312-330.
- Becker, P. B., Laureiro-Martinez, D., & Zagorac-Uremović, Z. (2025). Thirty years of managerial mental representations: a review guiding conceptualization and future research. *Journal of Management*. Forthcoming.
- Bender, E. M., & Hanna, A. (2025). *The AI Con: How to fight big tech's hype and create the future we want*. Random House.
- Bougon, M., Weick, K., & Binkhorst, D. (1977). Cognition in organizations: An analysis of the Utrecht Jazz Orchestra. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 606-639.
- Claggett, E. L., Kraut, R. E., & Shirado, H. (2025, April). Relational ai: Facilitating intergroup cooperation with socially aware conversational support. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-22).

- Corritore, M., Goldberg, A., & Srivastava, S. B. (2020). Duality in diversity: How intrapersonal and interpersonal cultural heterogeneity relate to firm performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(2), 359-394.
- Cronin, M. A., & Weingart, L. R. (2007). Representational gaps, information processing, and conflict in functionally diverse teams. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 761-773.
- Cronin, M. A., & Weingart, L. R. (2019). Conflict across representational gaps: Threats to and opportunities for improved communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(16), 7642-7649.
- Dearborn, D. C., & Simon, H. A. (1958). Selective perception: A note on the departmental identifications of executives. *Sociometry*, 21(2), 140-144.
- Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, A. (1983). *Risk and culture: An essay on the selection of technological and environmental dangers*. Univ of California Press.
- Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2013). The moral roots of environmental attitudes. *Psychological Science*, 24(1), 56-62.
- Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2015). From gulf to bridge: When do moral arguments facilitate political influence?. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(12), 1665-1681.
- Feinberg, M., & Willer, R. (2019). Moral reframing: A technique for effective and persuasive communication across political divides. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(12), e12501.
- Fish, S., Gözl, P., Parkes, D. C., Procaccia, A. D., Rusak, G., Shapira, I., & Wüthrich, M. (2023). Generative social choice. *Working Paper*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.01291>
- Fisher, R., & Ury, W. (1981). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1991). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In (2nd ed.)*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Fishkin, J. S. (1997). *The voice of the people: Public opinion and democracy*. Yale university press.

- Folger, J. P., & Bush, R. A. B. (1994). Ideology, orientations to conflict, and mediation discourse. *New Directions in Mediation: Communication Research and Perspectives*, 3-25.
- Govers, J., Velloso, E., Kostakos, V., & Goncalves, J. (2024, May). AI-Driven Mediation Strategies for Audience Depolarisation in Online Debates. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 1-18).
- Graham, J., Haidt, J., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(5), 1029.
- Greer, L. L., & Dannals, J. E. (2017). Conflict in teams. *The Wiley Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Team Working and Collaborative Processes*, 317-343.
- Guilbeault, D., van Loon, A., Lix, K., Goldberg, A., & Srivastava, S. B. (2024). Exposure to the views of opposing others with latent cognitive differences results in social influence—but only when those differences remain obscured. *Management Science*, 70(10), 6669-6684.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. F. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?*. Princeton University Press.
- Hall, R. I. (1999). A study of policy formation in complex organizations: Emulating group decision-making with a simple artificial intelligence and a system model of corporate operations. *Journal of Business Research*, 45(2), 157-171.
- Hall, R. I. (2002). Gaining understanding in a complex cause-effect policy domain. *Mapping Strategic Knowledge*, 89-111.
- Hall, R. I., Aitchison, P. W., & Kocay, W. L. (1994). Causal policy maps of managers: Formal methods for elicitation and analysis. *System Dynamics Review*, 10(4), 337-360.
- Helfrich, G. (2024). The harms of terminology: why we should reject so-called “frontier AI”. *AI and Ethics*, 4(3), 699-705.
- Howard-Grenville, J., Nelson, A. J., Earle, A. G., Haack, J. A., & Young, D. M. (2017). “If chemists don’t do it, who is going to?” Peer-driven occupational change and the emergence of green chemistry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62(3), 524-560.

- Jehn, K. A. (1995). A multimethod examination of the benefits and detriments of intragroup conflict. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 256-282.
- Kahan, D. M., & Braman, D. (2006). Cultural cognition and public policy. *Yale Law & Policy Review*, 24, 149.
- Koçak, Ö., & Puranam, P. (2018). Designing a culture of collaboration: when changing beliefs is (not) enough. *Organization Design*, 40, 27-52.
- Koçak, Ö., & Puranam, P. (2022). Separated by a common language: How the nature of code differences shapes communication success and code convergence. *Management Science*, 68(7), 5287-5310.
- Koçak, Ö., & Puranam, P. (2023). Decoding culture: tools for behavioral strategists. *Strategy Science*, 9(1), 18-37.
- Koçak, Ö., Puranam, P., & Yegin, A. (2023). Decoding cultural conflicts. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1167123.
- Laukkanen, M., & Eriksson, P. (2013). New designs and software for cognitive causal mapping. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 8(2), 122-147.
- Lawrence, J., & Reed, C. (2019). Argument mining: A survey. *Computational Linguistics*, 45(4), 765-818.
- March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, 2(1), 71-87.
- March, J.G., Simon, H.A. (1958). *Organizations*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Marchetti, A., & Puranam, P. (2022). Organizational cultural strength as the negative cross-entropy of mindshare: a measure based on descriptive text. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 9(1), 1-14.
- Mochales, R., & Moens, M. F. (2011). Argumentation mining. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 19, 1-22.

- Nadkarni, S., & Narayanan, V. K. (2007). Strategic schemas, strategic flexibility, and firm performance: The moderating role of industry clockspeed. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(3), 243-270.
- Özesmi, U., & Özesmi, S. L. (2004). Ecological models based on people's knowledge: a multi-step fuzzy cognitive mapping approach. *Ecological Modelling*, 176(1-2), 43-64.
- Peláez, C. E., & Bowles, J. B. (1996). Using fuzzy cognitive maps as a system model for failure modes and effects analysis. *Information Sciences*, 88(1-4), 177-199.
- Porac, J. F., Mishina, Y., & Pollock, T. G. (2002). Narratives and the Dominant Logics of High-Growth Firms. *Mapping Strategic Knowledge*, 112.
- Priem, R. L., & Harrison, D. A. (1994). Exploring strategic judgment: Methods for testing the assumptions of prescriptive contingency theories. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(4), 311-324.
- Santagiustina, C. R. M. A., & Warglien, M. (2022). The architecture of partisan debates: The online controversy on the no-deal Brexit. *PLoS One*, 17(6), e0270236.
- Schön, D. A., & Rein, M. (1994). *Frame reflection: Toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*. New York: Basic Books.
- Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Slovic, P. (1987). Perception of risk. *Science*, 236(4799), 280-285.
- Stab, C., & Gurevych, I. (2014). Identifying argumentative discourse structures in persuasive essays. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)* (pp. 46-56).
- Tan, J., Westermann, H., Pottanigari, N. R., Šavelka, J., Meeùs, S., Godet, M., & Benyekhlef, K. (2024). Robots in the middle: Evaluating llms in dispute resolution. *Working Paper*. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2410.07053>
- Tegarden, D. P., Tegarden, L. F., & Sheetz, S. D. (2009). Cognitive factions in a top management team: Surfacing and analyzing cognitive diversity using causal maps. *Group Decision and Negotiation*, 18, 537-566.

- Tessler, M. H., Bakker, M. A., Jarrett, D., Sheahan, H., Chadwick, M. J., Koster, R., ... & Summerfield, C. (2024). AI can help humans find common ground in democratic deliberation. *Science*, 386(6719), eadq2852.
- Toulmin, S. (1958). *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Tushman, M. L., & Katz, R. (1980). External communication and project performance: An investigation into the role of gatekeepers. *Management Science*, 26(11), 1071-1085.
- van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1992). Relevance reviewed: The case of argumentum ad hominem. *Argumentation*, 6(2), 141-159.
- Walsh, J. P. (1995). Managerial and organizational cognition: Notes from a trip down memory lane. *Organization Science*, 6(3), 280-321.
- Walton, D. N. (1996). *Argument structure: A pragmatic theory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1991). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations: An analysis of a social interaction system*. Cornell University Press.

Appendix: Analysis Procedure

We build a largely automated process for extracting reasoning chains from text data, using an ensemble of three Large Language Models (LLM's). These were arrayed in the structure of a hierarchical team with 2 parallel workers and a third in the role of integrator of the work of the other two. Which LLM we assigned to which role varies by task, based on our assessment of the quality of the outputs.

A.1. Segmentation by Topic

In this step, we used GPT-4.1 to analyze a long-form conversation transcript of each episode and divide it into a small number of large, coherent segments based on major topic shifts or distinct thematic transitions. Each input consisted of a single conversation, with each turn numbered sequentially. This step was necessary due to the limited context length of models like DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet, making it infeasible for them to process entire podcast transcripts in one single prompt. GPT-4.1 supports an extended context window (up to 1,047,576 tokens), allowing us to input entire long transcripts in a single prompt. In cases where transcripts included multiple speakers speaking in sequence (e.g., a series of interviews rather than a panel discussion), we split the transcript by speaker to reduce input length and then treated each speaker's section as a separate input.

The goal of this step was to segment the conversation into natural, high-level chapters. Each segment ideally covers approximately 10 – 20 minutes of content and contains a complete discussion around one broad theme, including all main arguments and supporting ideas. The output is a JSON list of segments, each including a brief summary of the topic, along with the starting and ending turn numbers. By segmenting long transcripts into multiple topic-specific chunks, we enabled DeepSeek and Claude to handle the next tasks without exceeding input limits or losing contextual coherence.

A.2. Summarization




Figure A.1. Summarization Workflow

The objective of this summarization step was not to restructure or interpret the speaker’s arguments, but to extract only the AI-relevant content in a clear and faithful way. This step reduces textual length and filters out noise commonly found in long-form conversations—such as back-and-forth dialogue, digressions and fragmented delivery—without altering the speaker’s tone or argumentative flow. By generating focused episode-speaker summaries that preserve only the content relevant to AI, we improved the effectiveness and reliability of downstream steps and reduced the risk of misinterpretation by the LLMs.

This step involves two sub-steps. First, we used DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-sonnet to summarize each speaker’s views related to AI’s risks, concerns and impacts on humans and society, excluding Lex Fridman. Due to the limited context length of these models, we applied the summarization prompt separately to each segment of the transcript. In each prompt, the LLM was instructed to focus exclusively on one specific speaker, faithfully preserve the speaker’s original tone and reasoning, and exclude all unrelated content or views on non-AI topics. The final summary for each speaker in an episode was created by combining all of their segment-level summaries. At the end of the first sub-step, from 463 transcripts, we obtained 492 episode-speaker level summaries from each of the two LLMs (each LLM produced 491 summaries, with one unique summary missing from each model’s set).

In the second sub-step, we used GPT-4.1 to evaluate and synthesize the summaries from DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-sonnet. For each speaker in each episode, we provided GPT-4.1 with the full transcript of their conversation, and two summaries from Claude-3.7-sonnet and DeepSeek-V3. We instruct GPT-4.1 to evaluate each summary according to four criteria: faithfulness, completeness, relevance and tone. Based on this evaluation, GPT-4.1 produced a

final synthesized summary that includes only the speaker’s stated views and supporting arguments related to AI’s risks, concerns or its impacts on humans and society. The model was instructed to preserve full reasoning structure and to include any relevant background ideas (e.g., philosophical or ethical beliefs) only if they were used to support the speaker’s views on AI.

At the end of the second sub-step, GPT-4.1 generated 416 final, synthesized summaries from the 492 episode-speaker level inputs. The difference between the number of final summaries and the initial inputs is primarily due to discrepancies in what constitutes a meaningful statement about AI’s risks and impacts. In cases where DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-sonnet generated summaries but GPT-4.1 did not, we manually reviewed those summaries to verify whether a summary was needed.

A.3. Reasoning Extraction (PEEL framework)




Figure A.2. Reasoning Extraction Workflow

A total of 416 final summaries were used as input for the PEEL architecture to extract structured reasoning chains representing each speaker’s views on AI’s risks, concerns and societal impacts. This process consists of two main sub-steps:

1. Reasoning Extraction – using DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-sonnet. In this sub-step, each model independently performs a two-prompt Chain-of-Thought process to identify conclusions, extract explicit and implicit premises, classify them by type, and construct logical reasoning chains.
2. Evaluation and Synthesis – using GPT-4.1, which assesses the faithfulness and logical validity of each model’s output in a three-stage evaluation (faithfulness, structural validation, and final synthesis), selecting the better chain or synthesizing a corrected version when needed.

A.3.1. Reasoning Extraction




Figure A.3. Chain-of-Thought Reasoning Extraction Pipeline

In this sub-step, we applied a two-stage Chain-of-Thought (CoT) procedure to extract the speaker’s reasoning chains about AI’s risks, concerns and societal impacts. This process was run independently using DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-sonnet, both with the same set of prompts. The input of this sub-step is an episode-speaker level summary, previously generated through the summarization step.

Stage 1: Reasoning Extraction Prompt

The first prompt was provided as the system prompt, instructing the model to perform a multi-step reasoning task, including:

- **Conclusion Identification:** Identify distinct conclusions the speaker makes about AI’s risks and impacts. Conclusions are defined as the final endpoints of reasoning—statements supported by other ultimate claims or judgments the speaker is trying to make.

- **Premise Extraction:** Extract all explicit and implicit premises used to support each conclusion. Each premise is classified into one of five types: definitional, factual, forecast, causal and moral (evaluative). The model also assigns a confidence score to each premise, indicating how clearly it is expressed or implied in the summary.
- **Reasoning Chain Construction:** Build complete logical chains linking premises to conclusions using three formal operators: combination relationship (+), implication relationship (\Rightarrow), and moral evaluation (\wedge)

The output of this stage is a structured JSON object containing the extracted conclusions, premises (with types and confidence scores), and reasoning relationships.

Stage 2: Validation Prompt

In the second stage, the same LLM (DeepSeek-V3 or Claude-3.7-sonnet) was prompted again using a validation-focused user prompt. The full context of this stage included:

- The original system prompt
- The summary text
- The structured JSON output from Stage 1

The LLM was asked to validate and if necessary, correct the reasoning output from Stage 1. The validation rules include:

- Identifying missing premises.
- Correcting misclassifications of premise types.
- Ensuring all logical operators (+, \wedge , \Rightarrow) were used correctly.
- Checking that all conclusions are properly supported, and that no unused or invalid premises or chains remain.

The final output is a corrected and validated JSON object, representing a complete reasoning structure for the speaker's position on AI's risks, concerns and impacts. Out of the 416 input summaries, DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet each produced reasoning outputs for 411 cases².

² Both models returned empty outputs for the same four episode-speaker summaries: Seven Pressfield (ep 102), Dan Carlin (ep 136), Craig Jones (ep 363) and Donald Trump (ep 442). There is one case where

A.3.2. Evaluation and Synthesis




Figure A.4. Chain-of-Thought Reasoning Evaluation and Synthesis Pipeline

In this sub-step, we used GPT-4.1 to evaluate, compare and finalize the structured reasoning outputs produced by DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-sonnet. The process follows a

only DeepSeek-V3 produced an output: episode 207, where Chris Duffin discusses performance-enhancing drugs—a topic loosely related to AI but not directly addressing it. Consequently, Claude-3.7-Sonnet returned an empty output for that episode. Conversely, there is one case where only Claude-3.7-Sonnet produced an output: episode 183, where Po-Shen Loh briefly touches on the nature of intelligence and the challenges of building AI system capable of human-like problem-solving such as making heuristic leaps or solving novel math problems. DeepSeek-V3 did not identify any explicit statements on AI risks or societal impacts in this episode and therefore returned an empty output. To ensure completeness and consistency in the final synthesis, all six of these episode-speaker summaries—regardless of whether one or both models produced outputs—were included in the next step, where GPT-4.1 was used to evaluate and synthesize the final results.

three-stage CoT pipeline, guided by a system prompt that defines the structure of valid reasoning chains.

The input of this sub-step consists of:

- An episode-speaker level summary focused on AI risks or societal impacts.
- Two structured reasoning outputs generated by DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-sonnet.

The pipeline includes three evaluation stages:

- Faithfulness check: Assess which model’s reasoning chains more accurately reflect the speaker’s content.
- Logical validation: check for structural correctness, proper use of logical relationships, and presence of all necessary premises.
- Final decision: select the best output or synthesize a better version that synthesizes both chains.

The result of this sub-step is, for each episode-speaker summary, an evaluation of the reasoning extraction quality from DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet, along with a finalized and validated reasoning output in structured JSON format that represents the best available interpretation of the speaker’s position. The reliability of the extracted reasoning chains was evaluated by computing three-way agreement metrics among the three LLMs. The result confirms that consistency of the reasoning extraction with an overall reliability score of 0.78. Among the 416 evaluation and synthesis outputs, six cases resulted in empty reasoning chains. These include four cases in which both Claude and DeepSeek returned empty outputs, and the two disagreed cases between Claude and DeepSeek (Chris Duffin – episode 207 and Po Shen Loh – episode 183). We manually checked these cases and at the end, a total of 410 final reasoning chain outputs were produced.

A.4. Topic and Attitude Assignment




Figure A.5. Topic and Attitude Assignment Workflow

To systematically examine how speakers disagree about AI risks, we first needed to organize their conclusions by topic and attitude. This ensured that we compared arguments addressing the same subject matter but expressing opposing attitudes—such as optimistic versus pessimistic assessment of the impact of AI on employment—rather than making meaningless comparisons between views on unrelated themes. To do so, we conducted topic and attitude classification on all conclusions—statements representing the end points of reasoning chains. From the 410 validated reasoning chain outputs, we extracted a total of 1719 conclusions. We then used DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet to independently classify the topics and attitude of each conclusion with respect to AI risks and impacts. Each conclusion, along with its supporting premises as context, was fed to the two LLMs using the same classification prompt, which involves two tasks:

- **Topic Classification:** Conclusions were mapped to one single, most relevant topic through an iterative process. This procedure began with an initial list of 30 topics derived from the Stanford HAI 2024 AI Index Report (Stanford HAI, 2025) (Table A.1.). For each conclusion, the LLM was asked to select the most appropriate topic from the current list. If none of the existing topics in the list were suitable, the LLM could create a new topic. If a new topic was created, the topic list would be updated for the subsequent topic classifications. This iterative, adaptive approach allowed the topic structure to emerge organically from the conclusions’ content and ensured that conclusions within one topic share the same central issue, which is essential for a meaningful pairwise comparison.
- **Attitude Assignment:** Each conclusion was labeled as pessimistic, neutral, or optimistic, based on its orientation toward AI’s risks and societal impact.

Table A.1. The initial topic list

Theme	Topics
Existential and Catastrophic Risks (5)	AI as Existential/Extinction Risk AI for Mitigating Existential/Extinction Risks AI Capability Runaway & Deployment Pace AI-Enabled Biothreats; AI for Biosecurity Safeguards

AI Safety, Alignment, and Technical Control (4)	AI Alignment Problem AI Incidents & Safety Failures AI Trust, Transparency & Explainability (incl. safety/robustness and model transparency) Data Commons Shrinkage & Training Data Constraints
Security and Geopolitics (4)	AI and Cybersecurity (Offense & Defense) AI and Military/National-Security Risks AI and Global Governance & Coordination (incl. safety institutes) AI and Political/Geopolitical Power Dynamics
Information, Discourse, and Integrity (3)	AI and Information Integrity/Manipulation (incl. deepfakes) AI and Mass Surveillance & Data Privacy AI and Democratic Processes & Accountability
Policy, Regulation, and Institutional Impact (2)	AI Regulation, Standards & Auditing AI and Corporate Concentration & Market Power
Economy, Labor, and Society (4)	AI and Employment & Labor Markets AI and Economic Inequality & Fairness AI and Liability, Accountability & Redress AI and Fairness, Bias & Discrimination
Human Identity, Interaction, and Well-being (4)	AI-Human Competition & Collaboration AI Impact on Social Relationships AI Impact on Purpose/Meaning/Identity & Dehumanization Decision-Making Delegation, Dependency & Autonomy Erosion
Environment and Sustainability (2)	AI Environmental Footprint (energy/compute/emissions) AI for Environmental & Climate Solutions
Other topics (1)	Non-AI topic

After obtaining the topic and attitude classifications from both models DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet, we used GPT-4.1 to reconcile the final classification. The input to GPT-4.1 included the conclusion, its supporting premises (as context only), and the full set of topic and attitude classification produced by the two models. Our prompt instructed GPT-4.1 to evaluate two outcomes: first, whether the assigned topics from both models meaningfully aligned with the core AI risk or impact expressed in the conclusion; and second, whether the identified attitudes

correctly reflected the conclusion’s sentiment toward that risk. Based on this evaluation, GPT-4o then synthesized the final topic and attitude for the conclusion.

Table A.2. presents the consistency between models on topic and attitude classification. The alignment for AI versus Non-AI topic classification is very high, with all three models agreeing in 94.36% of cases. Within AI topics, GPT agreed with both DeepSeek and Claude in 78.93% of cases. This includes 72.12% of cases where all three models identified the same topic and 6.81% of cases where GPT selected one of the two equivalent topics from two models for the final label. In the remaining cases, GPT agreed only with DeepSeek’s topic in 12.92% of cases, only with Claude’s in 7.08% and proposed a new topic in 1.15% of cases. The final classification contained 167 AI topics, a significant increase from the initial 29 topics. This expansion reflects the extensive and multi-faceted impact of AI in our data and provides the necessary granularity to ensure that subsequent pairwise comparisons are made between arguments addressing the same specific dimension.

For attitude classification, the alignment rate was also high, with all three models agreeing in 81.22% of cases. In 18.69% of cases, GPT agreed with either DeepSeek or Claude. For only 0.09% of cases (one conclusion), GPT disagreed with both models. We manually reviewed this case and finally adopted GPT’s attitude assignment.

Table A.2. Consistency across LLM models in topic and attitude classification

Classification Category	Agreement Types	Percentage of Cases
AI vs Non-AI Topic	All 3 models agree	94.47%
	2 models agree	5.53%
AI Topic Assignment	GPT agrees with both DeepSeek & Claude	78.93%
	- Same topic as both models	72.12%
	- Selects topic from one model	6.81%
	GPT agrees with DeepSeek only	12.83%
	GPT agrees with Claude only	7.08%
	GPT proposes a new topic	1.15%
Attitude Assignment	All 3 models agree	81.22%

	GPT agrees with one model	18.69%
	GPT disagrees with both model	0.09%

A.5. Disagreement Analysis




Figure A.6. Disagreement Analysis Workflow

This step focused on uncovering how and why speakers disagree about the same AI risk topic. We grouped conclusions by their primary topic and, within each topic, we systematically compared the reasoning chains of speakers who expressed opposing attitudes—optimistic (“boomers”) versus pessimistic (“doomers”)—toward that specific AI risk. Our goal was to identify the first, fundamental point in their reasoning where the divergence occurs, and to assess whether this divergence roots in deeper, logically necessary differences in foundational assumptions. This step includes 2 sub-steps:

1. Pairwise comparison of structured reasoning chains using DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet independently.
2. Evaluation and synthesis of the outputs using GPT-4.1 to assess the outputs by DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet and finalize the disagreement analysis.

A.5.1. Pairwise comparison




Figure A.7. Chain-of-Thought Disagreement Analysis Pipeline

In this sub-step, we used DeepSeek-V3 and Claude-3.7-Sonnet to independently analyze each pair of reasoning chains. Each input consisted of two structured reasoning chains—one from a “boomer” and one from a “doomer” speaker—both addressing the same AI risk topic and expressing opposing attitudes. Each reasoning chain included:

- A conclusion about AI’s risks, concerns, or societal impacts
- A set of typed premises: definitional, factual, forecast, causal, or moral evaluative
- Logical relationships between premises: combination (+), implication (\Rightarrow), and moral evaluation (^)

Each LLM was instructed to determine whether the two reasoning chains reflected a genuine disagreement. If so, the model was asked to identify all divergence points in the reasoning where conflicting beliefs (premises or combinations of premises) causally explained the differing conclusions. For each divergence, the LLM classified its type and assessed whether it depended on any earlier divergence. Divergences that did not depend on others were marked as root divergences, representing the fundamental starting points of the split.

A.5.2. Evaluation and synthesis




Figure A.8. Chain-of-Thought Disagreement Analysis Evaluation and Synthesis Pipeline

The input of this sub-step includes the pair of reasoning chains for comparison and the two disagreement analysis output from two LLMs. We designed a two-stage Chain-of-Thought (CoT) evaluation system to do the evaluation and synthesis. First, GPT-41 was instructed to compare outputs from two models, determine whether they agree on the existence of disagreement, and evaluate each divergence for alignment, validity, and correctness of root status. Second, GPT-41 was guided to synthesize a single unified output by merging divergence matches, correcting invalid divergences, assigning causal dependencies and identifying the root divergences.

A.5.3. Comparative Performance and Consistency in Disagreement Analysis

We applied the disagreement analysis workflow to the reasoning chains of the “boomers” and “doomers” in two topics: “AI as Existential/Extinction Risks” and “AI and Employment & Labor Markets”. These topics were selected for their high, balanced prevalence of arguments from both sides.

The consistency among the three LLMs—DeepSeek-V3, Claude-3.7-Sonnet, and GPT-4.1—in performing this analysis is summarized in Table A.3. For both topics, the LLMs

demonstrated a high degree of consistency when identifying whether the two speakers disagreed or not: 100% consistency among 3 LLMs for the topic “AI and Employment & Labor Market” and 91.68% consistency for the topic “AI as Existential/Extinction Risks”.

For the argument pairs judged to contain a genuine disagreement, we analyzed the convergence of the three LLMs on identifying root divergences. The majority of validated root divergences represent cases of full three-way agreement, where the same root was identified by both DeepSeek and Claude and confirmed by GPT-4.1 (69.46% for the topic “AI as Existential/Extinction Risks” and 81.82% for the topic “AI and Employment & Labor Markets”). Most of the remainder were cases where GPT-4.1 confirmed a root from either Claude or DeepSeek. Only a very small proportion of roots were introduced solely by GPT-4.1 (6.06% for "AI as Existential/Extinction Risk" and 2.27% for "AI and Employment & Labor Markets"). Overall, these results indicate the strong consistency among three LLMs in our disagreement analysis.

Table A.3. Comparative Analysis of Inter-LLM Consistency in Disagreement and Root Divergence Identification for two topics

Metric	Topic “AI as Existential/Extinction Risk”	Topic “AI and Employment & Labor Markets”
Total Argument Pairs	1118	42
Disagreement Identification		
- Full Consistency (All 3 LLMs: Disagreement between 2 speakers)	89.45%	92.86%
- Full Consistency (All 3 LLMs: No Disagreement between 2 speakers)	1.97%	7.14%
- Partial Consistency (2 of 3 LLMs)	8.32%	-
Root Divergence Identification		
- Number of Disagreement Pairs	1072	39
- Three-way consistency	69.22%	79.49%

- GPT agreed with Claude only	14.37%	7.69%
- GPT agreed with DeepSeek only	14.09%	2.56%
- Introduced by GPT	2.33%	10.26%