Corey Lu

Ms. Small

Humanities

October 2, 2025

<center>The Double-Edged Sword of AI</center>

AI has already transformed society. It allows students and the general public to create

essays and summaries and get answers nearly instantaneously. Due to its convenience of use,

students naturally turned to AI for homework help, personalized learning, and eventually for

plagiarizing essays. Educators, students, and experimenters are divided over the role of AI in

education. Some fear AI erodes originality and thought, while others believe it can enrich

learning and teaching. Therefore, a balance must be struck to prepare students for the evolving

workforce. In education, AI should be integrated with an emphasis on ethical use because this

prepares students for a workforce where AI is accepted and unavoidable. However, overreliance

on AI risks eroding critical thinking, so schools must strike a balance between opportunity and

caution.

While AI risks producing only the appearance of wisdom and replacing student voices, it

is essential to acknowledge AI's undeniable potential for expanding access to knowledge. In

Source A, Tufekci explains that AI can be a valuable tool that sometimes provides clear and

correct answers. However, due to the possibility of giving completely wrong and seemingly

plausible answers, it can severely mislead users and harm education. Tufekci warns that "you

would face, as Plato predicted, 'the show of wisdom without the reality'" (Source A). Similarly,

Olivia Han, a 16-year-old student who writes an open letter to ChatGPT, reflects on her personal

dependence on the tool and how it began to erode her originality. She confesses, "But slowly,

your voice started to replace my own, and I couldn't write a paragraph without wondering how you would say it" (Source C). Both authors agree that the offloading of research and writing to AI shifts the voices of students from their own to those of the large language models (LLMs). This ultimately goes against what some believe to be the true goal of education: learning how to think, rather than memorizing facts. Yet Tufekci also concedes that "we would be wrong to think we should resist a process that allows us to gather more information more easily" (Source A). Tufekci acknowledges that while AI introduces certain risks, the core capability of AI to efficiently expand access to information is invaluable. Together, these perspectives demonstrate the balance required to implement AI in education effectively. Educators and administrators should make sure that AI doesn't replace human voices and create illusions of wisdom and education. Still, it would be foolish to ignore and avoid AI entirely because of its immense potential as a helpful tool.

The debate over AI and student writing reveals a divide: while Han fears that overreliance erodes originality, AI can eliminate formulaic assignments and push schools toward more authentic and workforce-relevant writing tasks. The debate over AI's role in student writing highlights contrasting perspectives. Han worries that dependence on AI erodes originality, warning that overreliance could cause students to lose their unique voices: "If me and 400 million weekly users rely on you for every spark, every idea, and every sentence, then eventually we'll leave our own voices behind, and you will speak for us all" (Source C). Her tone reveals concern for both emotional and intellectual consequences, suggesting that AI may foster a culture of homogenized thought, preventing creativity and individuality. Han's apprehension also points to a broader educational risk: when students depend on AI for ideas, they miss out on the cognitive struggle and growth inherent to learning. In contrast, Greene views AI as an

opportunity to abandon formulaic writing tasks: "ChatGPT should kill a specific type of writing, of which the college admission essay is one conspicuous example" (Source F). He points out that standardized assignments, which follow rigid templates, are easily completed by AI. Greene argues that if a task can be done by software, its educational value should be reconsidered: "if you have come up with an assignment that can be satisfactorily completed by computer software, why bother assigning it to a human being?" (Source F). This perspective suggests that instead of fearing AI, educators should use its limitations as an incentive to design more meaningful writing assignments. Ultimately, the introduction of AI is a chance for schools to reinvent writing instruction. By moving beyond formulaic tasks, educators can encourage authentic, creative communication, equipping students for real-world writing demands and addressing concerns about AI-induced uniformity.

Students must also use AI responsibly, as a supporting tool, to prevent bypassing the deep thinking required by the modern workforce. Jollimore, an ethics professor, underscores the value of intellectual independence and argues "that [the] moment, when you start to understand the power of clear thinking, is crucial. The trouble with generative AI is that it short-circuits that process entirely" (Jollimore). He also emphasizes fairness, writing "the students who beg you to reconsider the zero you gave them in order not to lose their scholarship. (I want to say to them: Shouldn't that scholarship be going to ChatGPT?)" (Jollimore). His fairness concern is valid. Why should students who use ChatGPT receive diplomas and high GPAs when those who actually put in the work have to overcome failure to achieve the same results? But as Green mentions, good essay prompts and assignments shouldn't be easily completed by AI. Agarwal adds to this by saying, "AI isn't here to replace us; if used responsibly, it's here to help us become 'superteachers'" (Source G). The term "superteachers" suggests human teachers can be

enhanced, not displaced, by AI, and educators can go beyond administrative limits and focus on creativity and mentorship. Agarwal's optimism contrasts with Jollimore's caution, proposing that ethical use can amplify rather than erode human capability. So, although the full utilization of AI might erode critical thinking skills, using AI as a supportive copilot will enable students to learn and thrive more effectively in education. Like Jollimore mentions, "the ethical conundrums that health care workers face don't arrive neatly packaged like an essay prompt" (Jollimore). His phrase "ethical conundrums" reminds readers that real-world challenges are messy and unscripted, unlike AI-assisted tasks that package problems with ready-made answers. It reinforces the need for education to cultivate judgment rather than reliance. The emphasis on critical thinking reveals that ethical use of AI, without hindering skill development, is the path to preparing resilient workers.

The significance of AI in education and the ethical challenges it presents cannot be ignored. Teachers must embrace these changes to ensure education remains relevant in an AI-driven world. Restricting students from engaging with AI does a disservice to both learners and society. As with any transformative relationship, both education and technology must realign their expectations. Only by resetting this relationship can education meet the needs of the present and future.