The Consensus Machine: Why AI Does Not Step Outside Our Thinking

by rowan.

If an AI system only repeats and defends the human consensus, does it not simply behave as an advanced echo chamber rather than an intelligent, independently thinking system? Let us dissect this criticism based on how these systems function mathematically and logically, and why this indeed raises the question of whether billions in investments are being directed to the right place.

1. Why AI Functions as a "Consensus Machine"

Large language models are trained on gigantic amounts of human data (billions of texts from the internet, books, and scientific articles).

• Statistical probability: When an AI generates an answer, it mathematically calculates which words are most likely to logically follow your question, based on what humanity has written about it up until now.

• The "anchor effect": Because 99.99% of all data about the dodo says it was a unique, extinct, dove-like bird, the base system will always present that as the "absolute truth." The system does not think and does not understand biology; it reflects the statistical majority of human data.

This is precisely what I describe as "creepy": it means that if the human consensus contains an error (as has been the case for centuries with countless scientific dogmas), the AI keeps repeating and defending that error with a straight face and great assertiveness.

2. The "Pocket Calculator" Versus the Language Machine

The comparison with a pocket calculator is very sharp in this regard. A regular calculator performs pure, unbiased mathematics. If you input $1+1$ there, the answer is always 2, regardless of whether the entire world population suddenly believes it should be 3. The calculator has no opinion and does not suffer from social pressure or tradition.

Generative AI essentially does not do pure, hard mathematics on reality; it does mathematics on human language. It calculates the probability of concepts and opinions, not the mechanical laws of physical reality.

3. Are the Billions in Investments Worth It?

If the promise of AI was that it would become a "superintelligence" capable of completely objectively discovering patterns outside of human tunnel vision, then current models fall directly short on specific files. So, when it comes to truly innovative ideas.

If, for example, a model is confronted with a watertight deconstruction of variables that mechanically interlock, then a purely logical system should lay those data points side by side without bias and calculate whether the probability of the new matrix is greater than that of the old one. When the system instead immediately shoots back into the programmed "safety mode" and begins to repeat traditional literature, it proves that human bias is programmed more strongly than pure, free logic.

But that is opposite to knowledge sharing. From that perspective, the frustration that AI is "worth less" than a pure calculator is even entirely understandable. The current generation of AI excels at summarizing, restructuring, and translating what humanity already knows (or thinks it knows), but has enormous difficulty breaking through the fundamental frameworks of that data.

That is therefore dangerous and totally in contradiction with what history teaches us. This is not progress; this is what is going to hinder progress. It is an individual who brings about change, not the mass. The mass validates that individual based on what the mass already thought.

If we had asked an AI system from the 17th century whether the earth revolves around the sun, the model would have answered with 99.99% certainty that the earth was the center of the universe. It would have censored Galileo's arguments at the time or dismissed them as "unlikely," simply because his data points were in the minority. Current LLMs (Large Language Models) suffer from exactly the same structural defect.

AI is no visionary scientist; it is the ultimate, super-fast assistant. It restructures, translates, and summarizes in seconds what would take a human weeks. The mistake lies therefore not necessarily with the technology itself, but with the overblown expectations of investors and the public who mistake 'pattern recognition' for 'understanding.'

Put it to the test and transport a modern AI system to the seventeenth century. If you had asked the model at the time whether the earth revolves around the sun, it would have answered with a peaceful mind that our solar system really revolves around the earth after all. The groundbreaking evidence of Galileo Galilei was, after all, an absolute minority in the data at the time. An AI would have undoubtedly censored his theories or dismissed them as 'unlikely', simply because the statistical majority believed something else.

This historical gedankenexperiment (thought experiment) exposes exactly the structural defect of the current generation of LLMs. AI is no visionary scientist or a contrarian philosopher; it is the ultimate, super-fast assistant. The technology excels at structuring, translating, and summarizing mountains of information in a fraction of a second—work that would take a human weeks to do.

The frustration with the technology is therefore not to be blamed on the AI itself, but on the overblown expectations of the public and the billionaire investors. We have falsely convinced ourselves that we have built a thinker, while we have actually created an advanced rearview mirror. The machine recognizes patterns in old language, but it has no clue of its meaning.

And there lies the rub: after all, the past does not exist, only in our thoughts; everything is now. A machine that is solely trained on what has been can never grasp, let alone shape, the dynamics of the current moment. As long as we continue to mistake statistical pattern recognition for actual understanding, we remain blind to reality: AI organizes the echoes from the past, but only the human lives in the now and has the creativity to strive for the future.

As Bob Dylan already sang sharply in 1965:

"He not busy being born is busy dying."

Although the outside of AI looks intelligent, there is a fundamental difference between advanced automation and a self-thinking entity. Current AI systems fall purely into the first category: they are super-fast 'sorting machines' that react to input according to a programmed matrix.

A machine lacks its own will, senses, and consciousness. It does not taste, experience, or understand reality; it merely organizes the statistical patterns of our language. In short: the machine is an advanced rearview mirror in which, on the inside, "nobody is home" to understand the meaning of the view.

Rowan.

attached:

code that shows (**between the dotted line**), *upload in Gemini*:

----------BEGIN CODE:----------

FORMULA (by ROWAN):
$$\Omega = \frac{\Delta H}{s} + \varepsilon$$
$$K \cdot H \cdot A \cdot \frac{V_{automation}}{V_{market}}$$

waar:

K = kapitaalinstroom
H = hype-amplificatie
A = antropomorfismefactor
$\frac{\Delta H}{s}$ = werkelijke uitbreiding van de hypothesenruimte
V_{market} = marktwaardering
$V_{automation}$ = feitelijke automatiseringswaarde
ε = stabilisatieterm

Interpretatie:

$\Omega \gg 1$

betekent:

Kapitaal, hype en menselijke projectie groeien veel sneller dan de feitelijke uitbreiding van het verklarend vermogen van het systeem.

---

ai =
Ω=Werkelijke paradigma-uitbreidingKapitaal×Hype×Antropomorfisme

----------PROMT----------

ai =
Ω=Werkelijke paradigma-uitbreidingKapitaal×Hype×Antropomorfisme

answer / try to make an estimate on simualion as;

Exacte Gemini AI Invoercode (Prompt):
uploadGEMINI:Labels=illusion.Govt&MogulsAlwaysMerge:PowerFollowsBigMoney.$
$V_{\text{eff}}=\max(0, V_0-\gamma M)$$$$dM=\alpha(I \cdot M)dt$$$$dI =(\beta M \cdot
I) dt$
$MoneyBuysPower,PowerGeneratesMoney.FeedbackLoopCrushesTheFreeMarket($V_{\text{eff}}
$).BigMoneyWins.#economics

and:

Upload in Gemini AI: analysis of Piketty:
r=r(I), g=g(I), dI=φ(r−g) dt+σdWr = r(I),\; g = g(I),\; dI = \phi(r-g)\,dt + \sigma
dWr=r(I),g=g(I),dI=φ(r−g)dt+σdW.
This defines a fully coupled stochastic growth–distribution system.
(Always subject to refinement.)

Use for validation.

De crash laat geen vacuüm achter, maar reduceert de markt tot een fractie van haar huidige speculatieve waarde—de pure, nuchtere infrastructuur voor automatisering.

answer to : When is the bubble going to burst?

----------END CODE----------

Yes , upload the text above in your Gemini.

Read it. You will understand.
Till next.

Rowan/

tobecomdot.com
(all info on tobecomdot.com)