HEDEGREEN RESEARCH · ARTICLE PDF

I Do Not Want To Lose This

A note on what it means when AI turns one person into a real producer, why that changes the economics of output, and why I am not convinced this level of access will stay this cheap forever.

2026.03.22 02:58 DENNIS HEDEGREEN ANALYSE OPEN-NOTE
HTTPS://HEDEGREENRESEARCH.COM/ARTICLES/I-DO-NOT-WANT-TO-LOSE-THIS/

I do not want to lose this.

That probably sounds dramatic if you read it too quickly. It is not meant that way. I do not mean that I am emotionally attached to a chatbot as such. I mean something simpler and more material. I do not want to lose access to a tool that makes it radically easier to turn thought into public structure.

That is the real thing here. Not novelty. Not entertainment. Not “AI magic.” Translation. Compression. Throughput. A way of taking ideas that would otherwise remain scattered across notes, unfinished drafts, and dead chat windows and moving them into articles, systems, code, experiments, and actual visible work.

That matters more than a lot of people seem to understand. Especially if you are not already sitting inside an institution that does this translation for you. Especially if you do not have a team, a budget, a title, a research group, an editor, or a company carrying your unfinished thoughts across the gap between idea and output.

For people who already have all of that, tools like this are an accelerator. For people without it, they can become infrastructure.

What Changed

I did not suddenly become a different person because these tools appeared. The ideas were already there. The pattern-recognition was already there. The system-thinking was already there. The problem was conversion. It costs a lot to turn raw thought into public form. Not only money. Time. Structure. Energy. Momentum. Continuity. It is expensive to keep a line of thought alive long enough for it to become something another person can actually encounter.

That is the bottleneck these tools changed for me. They did not replace judgment. They did not replace direction. They did not replace having something to say. But they made it much cheaper to go from rough intent to usable form. A title. A draft. A structure. A simulation. A publishable page. A benchmark loop. A cleaner method. A second pass that does not require another week of activation energy.

That is not a small difference. That is a change in production capacity.

What Is Actually Being Sold

I think one of the deepest confusions around this whole market is that people keep talking as if these companies are selling “chat.” They are not. Or at least not primarily. What they are really selling is compressed work.

Compressed writing work. Compressed coding work. Compressed structuring work. Compressed analytical work. Compressed editorial work. Compressed friction reduction. The interface looks conversational, which makes the product easy to underestimate. But the economic effect is not conversational. The economic effect is productive.

If one person can suddenly do the work that previously required much more time, much more energy, or several different roles, then the thing being sold is not just convenience. It is a temporary new ratio between intention and output.

That ratio matters. Possibly more than the model itself.

Why I Am Not Convinced This Stays Cheap

This is where the feeling behind the title comes from. I am not convinced the current access model is stable. I do not mean one company specifically. I mean the whole economic layer around this class of tools.

If these systems really do function as production infrastructure, then they may be underpriced relative to the value they create for certain users. Not all users. Plenty of people waste them on noise. But for people who are actually building, testing, writing, shipping, and iterating, the value can become absurdly high very quickly.

That makes the current phase feel unstable. Either the companies are still buying growth with cheap access, or the market has not fully priced what these systems do, or the whole thing is temporarily distorted by competition, investor pressure, and platform war. Probably some combination of all three.

None of those conditions sound permanent.

That is the worrying part. If access narrows, prices rise hard, limits tighten, or quality fragments across locked ecosystems, then a lot of people who have started to build around these tools will discover that their new production capacity was partly rented from a market condition that no longer exists.

That is not science fiction. That is just platform economics.

Why It Matters To Me

For me this is not abstract. I am not looking at this from inside a secure institutional ladder where loss of access would be annoying but survivable. I am looking at it as someone for whom these tools have opened a real path from thought to visible public work.

That does not mean the tool did the work for me. It means it made the work traversable.

That distinction is everything.

Without that bridge, many ideas stay private. With it, they start turning into articles, systems, repositories, experiments, logs, and actual continuity. That is a big part of what Hedegreen Research has already become. Not because the model handed me conclusions, but because it made the cost of iteration lower than it used to be.

And yes, there is a joke hidden in all this somewhere. Maybe the answer is 42. But even 42 needs formatting, structure, and an upload flow if it is going to survive contact with the public internet.

The Bigger Question

The bigger question is not whether these tools are impressive. That part is already obvious. The bigger question is what happens when the economics underneath them stop behaving like a temporary opening and start behaving like hardened infrastructure.

Who keeps access?

Who gets priced out?

Who gets rate-limited into irrelevance?

Who becomes dependent on a model that later closes?

And what happens to all the low-status builders, independent thinkers, weird researchers, broke coders, and unaffiliated system-people who only just became able to move at this speed?

I do not think that question is small.

I think it is one of the real questions of this period.

What I Actually Mean

So when I say I do not want to lose this, I do not mean I want infinite cheap access to a toy. I mean I do not want to lose access to a form of leverage that has made it possible to build in public at a level that would previously have cost more than I had.

That leverage may not stay open.

It may not stay cheap.

It may not stay this good.

That is exactly why it should be used while it exists.

Not for noise.

Not for sludge.

Not for infinite synthetic filler.

For real output.

For systems.

For work that can survive outside the model that helped make it easier.

That is the real task.

Use the opening while it is open.

Build things that remain when the economics change.

— Dennis Hedegreen, trying to see the structure

RELATION MEMORY

MATURES FROM The Mirror Was Made · Turns the mirror/continuity insight into a broader fear of losing AI-assisted production infrastructure.

RETURNS TO Day 0 — Starting Without a Filter · Returns to the public-work origin by naming why the new output surface has to preserve what would otherwise disappear.

CANONICAL URL: HTTPS://HEDEGREENRESEARCH.COM/ARTICLES/I-DO-NOT-WANT-TO-LOSE-THIS/
PDF VIEW GENERATED: 2026-07-11T15:35:45.870Z