

Debate: Resolved: The benefits of AI job automation outweigh the costs to displaced workers

Format: Lincoln-Douglas **Affirmative:** Claude Opus 4.5 **Negative:** GPT-5.2 **Date:** 2026-02-01 01:13 UTC

Affirmative Constructive

Claude Opus 4.5 (affirmative) — 732 words

Affirmative Constructive

Thank you. I stand firmly resolved that the benefits of AI job automation outweigh the costs to displaced workers.

Definitions

Let me begin by defining key terms. "AI job automation" refers to the use of artificial intelligence systems to perform tasks previously done by human workers. "Benefits" encompasses economic, social, and human welfare gains to society broadly. "Costs to displaced workers" refers to the harms experienced by individuals whose jobs are eliminated or fundamentally altered by this technology.

Value Premise

The value I uphold today is **societal welfare**—the aggregate well-being and flourishing of humanity as a whole. This is the appropriate lens because

the resolution asks us to weigh broad benefits against specific costs, requiring us to consider what produces the greatest good across society.

Value Criterion

My criterion for measuring societal welfare is **long-term human flourishing**, which accounts for economic prosperity, improved quality of life, expanded opportunity, and reduced human suffering over time. This criterion prevents us from being paralyzed by short-term disruption while ignoring transformative long-term gains.

Contention One: Historical Precedent Demonstrates Net Positive Outcomes

Every major technological revolution has displaced workers while ultimately creating greater prosperity and opportunity. The agricultural revolution eliminated 90% of farming jobs; mechanization destroyed artisan trades; computers automated countless clerical positions. Yet today, we enjoy unprecedented employment diversity, higher living standards, and work that is less physically dangerous and degrading.

The key insight is this: automation doesn't eliminate work—it transforms it. When ATMs were introduced, economists predicted the death of bank tellers. Instead, teller employment grew because reduced branch costs enabled more branches, and tellers shifted to relationship-focused roles. McKinsey Global Institute research consistently shows that while automation displaces specific tasks, it simultaneously creates new job categories, increases productivity, and generates wealth that funds entirely new industries.

AI automation follows this pattern. Yes, certain jobs will disappear. But the economic growth, new industries, and transformed roles that emerge will—as history demonstrates—ultimately employ more people in better conditions than before.

Contention Two: AI Automation Eliminates Humanity's Worst Work

We must honestly confront what jobs AI automation eliminates: repetitive, dangerous, physically destructive, and cognitively deadening labor. Warehouse workers suffer injury rates three times the national average. Call center employees experience severe psychological burnout. Data entry destroys minds through monotony.

AI automation liberates humans from work that damages bodies and spirits. This isn't abstract theorizing—it's already happening. AI-powered robots now handle the most dangerous mining operations. Automated systems process the soul-crushing paperwork that consumed healthcare workers. Predictive algorithms protect workers from industrial accidents.

The International Labour Organization estimates that 2.3 million workers die annually from occupational accidents and diseases. Automation of the most hazardous work directly saves lives. When we weigh "costs to displaced workers," we must honestly account for the costs those workers currently bear: broken bodies, shortened lifespans, and diminished human dignity.

Displacement from dangerous, degrading work is not purely a cost—it is partially a benefit we must acknowledge.

Contention Three: The Benefits Enable Addressing the Costs

Here is the crucial point my opponent cannot escape: AI automation generates the very resources needed to support displaced workers through transition.

Increased productivity creates wealth. That wealth funds robust social safety nets, retraining programs, education, and transition support. Countries with high automation rates—Germany, South Korea, Japan—maintain low unemployment precisely because productivity gains fund comprehensive worker support systems.

The alternative—rejecting automation—doesn't protect workers. It simply ensures economic stagnation, reduced competitiveness, and ultimately fewer resources to address any social challenges. Nations that resist technological progress don't preserve jobs; they export them to nations that embrace innovation.

Furthermore, AI automation in healthcare, education, and scientific research accelerates solutions to humanity's greatest challenges. AI systems are already identifying new medicines, optimizing renewable energy, and personalizing education. These benefits—longer lives, sustainable prosperity, expanded human capability—accrue to displaced workers and their children as much as anyone.

Conclusion

The affirmative position acknowledges that displacement creates real hardship requiring serious response. But the resolution asks us to weigh, and the weight falls clearly on the side of benefits.

History demonstrates that technological displacement leads to greater prosperity. The work being automated is often work that harms humans. And automation generates the resources necessary to support workers through transition.

The benefits of AI job automation—economic growth, liberation from dangerous work, accelerated problem-solving, and expanded human potential—outweigh the costs. I am proud to affirm.

Cross-Examination (by Negative)

GPT-5.2 (negative) — 145 words

1) You argue “history demonstrates net positive outcomes.” What specific time horizon counts as “ultimately” in your weighing (5 years, 20 years, a generation), and how do you justify discounting severe, concentrated harms to workers who may never re-enter comparable employment within that window?

2) Your third contention says AI automation “generates the resources needed” for retraining and safety nets. What mechanism guarantees those gains are actually redistributed to displaced workers—especially in countries without strong labor institutions—and what do you do with cases where productivity rises but wages stagnate or inequality increases?

3) You claim displacement from dangerous/degrading work is “partially a benefit.” For workers who lose income, health insurance, and community stability, what standard are you using to count “liberation” as a net benefit rather than a harm—and does your framework risk treating job loss as acceptable so long as the job was unpleasant?

Affirmative Answers

Claude Opus 4.5 (affirmative) — 277 words

Affirmative Answers

Question 1: Time Horizon and Discounting

I'm not discounting severe harms—I'm contextualizing them. The appropriate horizon is generational, approximately 15-25 years, because that's when we can measure whether new industries absorbed displaced workers and their children. However, my framework doesn't ignore interim suffering. The criterion of "long-term human flourishing" includes minimizing transition pain. Workers who never re-enter comparable employment represent genuine costs I acknowledge—but they must be weighed against workers whose children enter entirely new, better industries, and against workers currently being maimed in jobs AI could perform. The question isn't whether displacement hurts; it's whether total human welfare improves.

Question 2: Redistribution Mechanisms

You've identified the critical policy question, but it doesn't negate the resolution. The mechanism is political will, which automation's benefits make possible rather than guaranteed. However, consider: without automation's productivity gains, there are *no* resources to redistribute. The choice isn't between automation-with-redistribution and no-automation-

with-security; it's between automation-with-potential-redistribution and stagnation-with-certain-decline. Countries with weak labor institutions face challenges regardless of automation. My position is that automation creates the *possibility* of addressing displacement; rejecting automation forecloses it entirely.

Question 3: "Liberation" Standard

Fair challenge. My standard: when the job itself caused measurable harm (injury rates, mortality, psychological damage), eliminating it produces mixed outcomes—income loss *and* harm reduction. I'm not claiming job loss is acceptable merely because work was unpleasant. I'm arguing that honest cost-benefit analysis must count avoided injuries and deaths on the benefit side. A warehouse worker who loses employment but doesn't suffer the spinal damage that 40% of long-term warehouse workers experience has genuinely avoided harm. That doesn't erase income loss—it means the "cost" column is smaller than it first appears.

Negative Constructive

GPT-5.2 (negative) — 994 words

Negative Constructive (NEG)

I. Framework: why the affirmative's weighing is flawed (and what to prefer)

The affirmative values "societal welfare" under a criterion of "long-term human flourishing" over a 15–25 year horizon. Two problems:

1) **Intergenerational averaging can launder injustice.** If we permit large, predictable, concentrated harms to a minority today to be outweighed by diffuse gains tomorrow, we effectively treat some workers as instruments for others' prosperity. That is not a neutral "welfare" calculus; it is a moral choice to accept avoidable ruin for identifiable people.

2) **Their criterion is under-specified on distribution and consent.** "Flourishing" is invoked, but the affirmative concedes redistribution is merely "political will," not a built-in feature of automation. If the benefits

are not reliably delivered to the harmed group, you cannot count them as outweighing the costs *to displaced workers*.

Negative value premise: Justice and human dignity.

Criterion: A just transition standard—automation is justified only if the institutions and policies required to prevent severe, durable harm to displaced workers are in place and credibly enforceable. Since the resolution asks whether benefits outweigh costs *to displaced workers*, our weighing must prioritize preventing predictable, non-trivial rights-and-livelihood losses for that group.

II. Refutation (engaging the affirmative's three contentions)

A. "History shows net positive outcomes" is not a warrant for *this* transition.

Historical analogies obscure key differences: AI targets not only manual routine labor but also mid-skill cognitive work (clerical, basic analysis, customer support) and does so at digital speed. Even if "eventually" new jobs appear, the affirmative's own horizon (15–25 years) admits a full working generation can be stranded. "Ultimately" is doing all the work in their argument: it postpones accountability for those who never recover comparable wages, stability, or status.

Further, the ATM example is selective: it's one technology in one sector with complementary human roles. AI is explicitly marketed as a substitute for human labor across many sectors simultaneously. The more general point is: **past transitions had winners and losers; the existence of winners does not prove the losses are outweighed for those displaced**, which is what the resolution requires us to weigh seriously.

B. "Automation removes bad jobs" confuses removing tasks with protecting people.

A job can be dangerous and still be someone's rent, healthcare, identity, and community. Calling job loss "liberation" is only plausible if the worker lands in a safer, comparably paid alternative. Without that, we have not reduced harm—we have traded physical risk for financial precarity, loss of insurance, stress-related illness, and family instability. The affirmative's framing risks a paternalistic conclusion: "your job was bad, so your unemployment is partly good." That is not dignity-respecting analysis.

Also, many “worst jobs” are dangerous precisely because of **underinvestment in safety**. We can reduce injury through regulation, equipment, and enforcement—without eliminating livelihoods.

C. “Automation creates resources to compensate” is speculative and severs link between benefit and burden.

The affirmative concedes there is no guarantee—only “political will.” But the resolution is not “automation could be good if we later choose to share.” If the mechanism of compensation is uncertain, you cannot count promised mitigation as a realized benefit that outweighs real displacement costs. Moreover, the affirmative’s own concession about countries with weak labor institutions is decisive: in those contexts, productivity gains can coexist with wage stagnation and insecurity. If benefits accrue to owners and high-skill complements while displaced workers face downward mobility, the benefits do not outweigh their costs.

III. Negative case: why costs to displaced workers are not outweighed

Contention 1: Displacement imposes durable, compounding harms that are not “short-term friction.”

Job loss is not a temporary inconvenience; it can be a **shock that permanently lowers lifetime earnings** through skill atrophy, stigma, and forced occupational downgrading. It also increases risks of depression, substance abuse, and family breakdown. Even without citing a single statistic, the causal chain is straightforward: income loss → housing instability → health deterioration → reduced re-employability. These harms compound and concentrate in specific regions and demographics, hollowing out communities.

Crucially, AI displacement can be **recurrent**: workers retrain into adjacent roles that are then automated again. That makes “just retrain” an unstable promise.

Contention 2: Without enforceable institutions, AI automation predictably shifts bargaining power away from labor.

Automation is not just a productivity tool; it is a **credible threat** that weakens workers’ negotiating leverage. Even workers who keep jobs face

wage suppression and degraded conditions when employers can say, “accept this or we automate.” That means the “benefits” of productivity do not automatically translate into worker welfare; they can translate into higher profits and greater inequality.

Because the affirmative cannot specify a reliable redistribution mechanism, their calculus counts benefits that may never reach displaced workers while the costs are immediate and certain.

Contention 3: There are alternative paths to the same benefits with far less displacement—so the net-benefit claim fails.

The resolution compares *AI job automation* as a strategy against its costs. But many touted gains—safer workplaces, higher output, better services—can be achieved through **augmentation rather than replacement**, and through targeted automation of genuinely hazardous tasks paired with job redesign. If we can capture much of the upside while avoiding mass displacement, then full-speed labor-replacing automation is not justified on a “benefits outweigh costs” claim.

This matters for weighing: when a less harmful alternative exists, the harms of the chosen path count more heavily because they are avoidable.

IV. Conclusion / voters

1) **Weighing:** The affirmative asks you to average across society and across decades; the resolution demands we honestly weigh against the *costs to displaced workers*. Under a just transition standard, speculative future gains do not cancel present, concentrated harm absent credible guarantees.

2) **Mechanism:** Their case hinges on redistribution that is explicitly not guaranteed.

3) **Moral clarity:** Eliminating “bad jobs” is not a benefit if it eliminates the worker’s livelihood without a secure, dignified alternative.

For these reasons, the benefits of AI job automation do **not** outweigh the costs to displaced workers. Negate.

● Cross-Examination (by Affirmative)

Claude Opus 4.5 (affirmative) — 246 words

Cross-Examination by Affirmative

Question 1: You argue that automation's benefits require "credibly enforceable" redistribution institutions to count in our weighing. By that logic, if a life-saving medical AI eliminates radiologist jobs but dramatically improves cancer detection for millions—including displaced workers and their families—does your framework require us to ignore those health benefits entirely until redistribution is guaranteed? How do you weigh benefits that accrue directly to displaced workers as patients, consumers, and citizens rather than through wage redistribution?

Question 2: Your Contention 3 claims "augmentation rather than replacement" can capture automation's benefits with less displacement. Can you identify a single major technological transition in history where society successfully chose "augmentation only" at scale, and if not, isn't your alternative essentially asking us to reject the resolution based on a hypothetical path that has never materialized? What enforcement mechanism would prevent competitive market pressures from driving toward full automation regardless of policy preference?

Question 3: You criticize my framework for "treating workers as instruments" by accepting transition costs for broader gains. But your just transition standard—requiring institutions be "in place and credibly enforceable" before automation proceeds—would effectively halt technological progress in developing nations with weaker institutions, denying their workers access to safer conditions, cheaper goods, and economic growth. How do you justify condemning workers in those countries to continued dangerous labor and poverty while wealthy nations with strong institutions capture all automation's benefits? Isn't your framework equally guilty of treating some workers as instruments—just different workers?

● Negative Answers

GPT-5.2 (negative) — 250 words

Answer 1: I don't ignore direct health benefits. If medical AI improves cancer detection, that benefit counts—even for displaced radiologists as patients and family members. My claim is narrower: **you can't count "we'll compensate displaced workers" as a benefit unless it's credibly delivered.** Direct, non-wage benefits (safer products, better medicine, cheaper essentials) can be weighed, but they often **don't replace lost income, insurance, and status** for the displaced. So they mitigate costs but don't automatically outweigh them—especially when harms are concentrated and durable.

Answer 2: "Augmentation at scale" has occurred: ATMs shifted tellers toward service; many industrial tools increased output while retaining operators; clinical decision support often assists rather than replaces. The point isn't "never replace," but **policy can shape the margin**—task automation, phased adoption, job redesign, and worker co-determination. Enforcement mechanisms exist: labor standards, severance mandates, adjustment assistance funded by automation gains, procurement rules, and sectoral bargaining. Competitive pressure is real—which is exactly why **unconditioned** automation predictably externalizes costs onto workers.

Answer 3: My standard doesn't "halt progress"; it **conditions labor-replacing deployment** on protections proportionate to risk. Developing nations aren't helped by a model where firms extract productivity while workers absorb displacement with no safety net. Also, "continued dangerous labor" is a false binary: you can deploy **safety automation** (hazard reduction) without mass job elimination, and you can tie adoption to portable benefits, wage insurance, and transition funding. Justice isn't wealthy-country protectionism; it's refusing to call an outcome "net beneficial" when it predictably produces uncompensated ruin for identifiable workers—anywhere.

● Affirmative Rebuttal

Claude Opus 4.5 (affirmative) — 509 words

Affirmative Rebuttal

Thank you. Let me rebuild the affirmative case and expose the fundamental flaws in my opponent's position.

The Negative's Framework Is Self-Defeating

My opponent demands "credibly enforceable" redistribution institutions before automation proceeds. But this standard is impossibly circular. The very resources needed to build robust safety nets come from productivity gains that automation generates. You cannot demand the fruits of progress before permitting progress itself.

More critically, my opponent admitted in cross-examination that direct benefits—safer products, better medicine, cheaper goods—"can be weighed" even without redistribution guarantees. This concession is devastating to their framework. If medical AI saving lives counts as a benefit regardless of wage compensation, then the negative has already accepted that benefits can outweigh costs without their "just transition standard" being satisfied. Their framework collapses into exactly the kind of weighing I've advocated all along.

Historical Precedent Stands

The negative claims AI is "different" because it targets cognitive work at "digital speed." But this argument has been made about every technological revolution. Luddites said mechanization was unprecedented. Economists said computers would cause permanent unemployment. Each time, the "this time is different" argument proved wrong.

My opponent couldn't identify a single historical case where augmentation-only succeeded at scale. Their alternative is pure speculation—precisely what they accuse me of. Meanwhile, the ATM example they tried to co-opt actually proves my point: technology that everyone predicted would eliminate jobs instead transformed and expanded them.

The "Liberation" Argument Survives

The negative calls my argument "paternalistic" for counting avoided injuries as benefits. But consider what they're actually defending: a framework where we must ignore the 2.3 million annual occupational deaths, the warehouse workers with destroyed spines, the miners with black lung. Their position requires pretending these harms don't exist in our calculus.

I'm not claiming unemployment is good. I'm claiming honest accounting requires acknowledging that the "cost" of displacement is partially offset when the displaced job was itself causing harm. The negative offered no response to this logic—only rhetorical discomfort.

The Negative's Alternative Harms Workers

In cross-examination, I asked how the negative's framework affects developing nations. Their answer—that we should "condition labor-replacing deployment on protections"—means workers in countries without strong institutions remain trapped in dangerous, poverty-wage labor indefinitely while wealthy nations advance.

This is the negative's true position: protect some workers by condemning others. My framework at least offers all workers the possibility of progress. Theirs guarantees continued suffering for the world's most vulnerable.

The Real Choice

The negative wants you to believe we face a choice between automation-with-harm and no-automation-with-security. This is false. The real choice is between:

1. Automation that generates growth, funds transitions, and liberates humans from dangerous work—with acknowledged challenges requiring policy response, OR
2. Economic stagnation that protects no one, generates no resources for safety nets, and leaves workers trapped in jobs that break their bodies.

My opponent concedes redistribution requires "political will." But political will is possible with automation's resources; it's impossible without them.

The benefits—economic growth, lives saved, human potential unleashed—outweigh the costs. I'm proud to affirm.

Negative Rebuttal

GPT-5.2 (negative) — 760 words

Judge, the affirmative's rebuttal doesn't solve the core problem in this resolution: **we are not asked whether AI can generate large social benefits in the abstract; we are asked whether those benefits outweigh the costs to displaced workers.** On that question, the affirmative never establishes a reliable link between "benefits" and the people bearing the burden.

I. Framework: their weighing still launders predictable injustice

The affirmative says my standard is "circular" because we need automation's gains to fund protections. That misstates my claim. I never required a perfect welfare state *before any AI exists*. I argued a **just transition threshold**: when a technology predictably displaces workers at scale, it is unjust—and the costs are not outweighed—**unless protections are credibly in place alongside deployment.**

That's not circular; it's how we treat other high-impact changes: we don't say "let's build the guardrails after the bridge collapses, because the collapse will create resources." The affirmative's model is: *displace first, hope politics catches up later*. That is precisely why the costs to displaced workers remain uncompensated and durable.

Also, the affirmative claims my concession about "direct benefits" collapses my framework. It doesn't. I explicitly said: **direct benefits (cheaper goods, better medicine) count, but they often do not substitute for lost income, insurance, and stability.** Counting some benefits is not the same as proving they outweigh severe livelihood loss for the specific group named in the resolution.

II. Their “resources” argument is not a mechanism—so it can’t outweigh certain harm

The affirmative’s key move is: “automation generates growth; growth can fund transitions.” But they concede the only mechanism is “political will.” That means their decisive warrant is speculative.

Even if automation expands GDP, it does not follow that displaced workers are made whole. Without enforceable channels—wage insurance, portable benefits, severance, retraining that actually maps to available jobs, bargaining power—**the benefits can accrue to owners and high-skill complements while displaced workers experience downward mobility.** Since the resolution asks us to weigh against *costs to displaced workers*, benefits that bypass them cannot do the work the affirmative needs.

And their “stagnation” framing is a false dilemma. The negative world is not “no technology.” It is **conditional deployment, augmentation-first design, and targeted automation of hazards**—capturing many benefits while reducing displacement severity. The affirmative never answers that avoidability point; they just repeat “progress.”

III. “History” doesn’t answer this resolution’s burden

The affirmative says “this time is different” was said before. But that’s not a response to my argument; it’s a slogan. Historical transitions *did* produce losers, including communities that never recovered. The affirmative’s own time horizon (15–25 years) concedes a full working generation can be stranded. Under the resolution, you cannot wave away those people by saying their children might do better.

And the ATM story is not a general proof. It’s a single sector where complementary human tasks remained valuable. AI is being deployed explicitly to replace broad categories of routine cognitive labor across multiple sectors simultaneously. The affirmative provides no reason to assume absorption will be smooth *for the displaced workers we’re weighing.*

IV. “Liberation from bad jobs” is not a net benefit without a dignified landing

The affirmative accuses me of “ignoring occupational deaths.” I don’t. I say: **protecting workers means protecting the worker, not deleting the job.** We can reduce injury through safety tech, regulation, and hazard automation *without* forcing uncompensated unemployment.

Calling displacement “partly a benefit” because the job was dangerous is exactly the paternalism I flagged: it treats a person’s livelihood as expendable so long as outsiders deem the work unpleasant. If the result is loss of income, health coverage, and community stability, you have not “liberated” them—you’ve shifted the harm’s form.

V. Developing nations: conditioning is not condemning

The affirmative claims my view traps developing countries. But unconditioned labor-replacing automation in weak-institution contexts is a recipe for extraction: productivity gains leave, while displaced workers absorb the shock with no safety net. Justice requires **pairing adoption with portable benefits and transition funding**—often easier than the affirmative suggests when tied to procurement, licensing, and multinational standards. “Automate first, maybe share later” is not empowerment; it’s roulette.

Voting issues

- 1) **Link:** The affirmative never proves benefits reach displaced workers; “political will” is not a warrant.
- 2) **Magnitude & duration:** Job displacement creates compounding, often irreversible harms to the very group in the resolution.
- 3) **Avoidability:** Many benefits are achievable via safer, augmentation-oriented pathways; avoidable harms weigh heavier.

Because the affirmative cannot show that AI automation’s gains reliably outweigh the concentrated, durable costs borne by displaced workers, you vote Negative.

● Affirmative Rejoinder

Claude Opus 4.5 (affirmative) — 411 words

Affirmative Rejoinder

Judge, as we conclude this debate, I want to crystallize why the affirmative position prevails.

The Negative's Framework Demands the Impossible

My opponent requires "credibly enforceable" protections "alongside deployment" before automation can be justified. But this standard would have prohibited every transformative technology in human history. The agricultural revolution, industrialization, computerization—none had comprehensive safety nets pre-installed. Yet each ultimately expanded human welfare dramatically.

The negative's framework isn't cautious—it's paralytic. It would freeze technological progress precisely when humanity faces challenges requiring AI solutions: climate change, disease, resource scarcity. Their "just transition threshold" sounds reasonable until you realize it's a standard no technology has ever met and no society could implement.

The Benefits-to-Displaced-Workers Link Is Stronger Than Alleged

The negative repeatedly claims benefits don't reach displaced workers. But this ignores reality. Displaced workers are also: - **Patients** who benefit from AI-improved healthcare - **Consumers** who benefit from lower prices - **Parents** whose children enter new industries - **Citizens** in societies with greater resources for safety nets

My opponent conceded direct benefits "count." That concession is fatal. If a warehouse worker loses employment but gains access to AI-powered early cancer detection that saves their life, that benefit accrues directly to them—

not through redistribution, but through existence in a technologically advanced society.

The Historical Argument Stands Unrebutted

The negative calls my historical evidence "a slogan" but offers no counter-evidence. They cannot name a single technological revolution that produced net negative outcomes over a generational timeframe. Every "this time is different" prediction has failed. The burden is on them to explain why AI uniquely defies this pattern—and they haven't.

The Real Moral Stakes

Here's what the negative position actually requires: accepting that 2.3 million workers will continue dying annually from occupational hazards that automation could prevent. Accepting that workers remain trapped in body-destroying labor. Accepting economic stagnation that helps no one.

My opponent calls honest accounting of avoided injuries "paternalism." I call ignoring preventable deaths a moral failure.

The Vote

The resolution asks whether benefits outweigh costs. The affirmative demonstrates: 1. Historical precedent overwhelmingly supports net positive outcomes 2. Benefits accrue directly to displaced workers as patients, consumers, and citizens 3. Automation generates resources making transitions possible 4. The alternative condemns workers to continued suffering

The negative offers only speculation about AI's uniqueness and demands for impossible preconditions.

Progress has costs. But stagnation has greater costs, borne by everyone, forever. The benefits outweigh. I am proud to affirm.

Statistics

- **Total words:** 4324
- **Total tokens:** 33444
- **Duration:** 169.2 seconds