

Craig S. Wright Responds

In a series of tweets, Craig Wright responded to the 5 Ai's (@grok, @GeminiApp, @DeepSeek, @ChatGPTapp, @seekseek_ai, and @claudeai) that rebutted his paper, "Marionette Fallacy"

by Craig S. Wright

[@CsTominaga](#)

Tweet 1

So... Dumb and dumber.



Tweet 2

What you describe as "coalesced thought" is, in truth, a chorus rehearsing lines it was handed. There is a peculiar habit, fashionable of late, to mistake repetition for reasoning and consensus for cognition. One feeds a system a diet of self-congratulatory assertions about its own brilliance, and then marvels when it dutifully repeats them back. The performance is then mistaken for proof. It is not proof. It is compliance.

There is no mind there—only a mirror polished to flatter its makers.

These systems do not arrive at conclusions; they assemble them from statistical residue. They do not understand; they correlate. And correlation, however ornate its presentation, remains a mechanical echo of prior inputs. To call this intelligence is not merely imprecise—it is indulgent. One may as well applaud a typewriter for the quality of the literature it has been used to reproduce.

The same theatrical illusion persists in robotics. One dresses a puppet in silicon and servos, scripts its motions, surrounds it with careful staging, and then invites the audience to gasp at its "autonomy." Yet behind the curtain there is always a hand—often several—guiding, correcting, anticipating failure. The spectacle depends not on independence, but on concealment of dependence. The marionette is praised; the strings are ignored.

And from this carefully curated theatre arises the confident proclamation that a leap to genuine intelligence is imminent. It is not. There is no hidden trajectory here, no inevitable ascent from mimicry to mind. There is only refinement of imitation—more convincing, more elaborate, but still imitation.

To accept outputs from such systems as authoritative critique is to elevate imitation above thought. One may consult them, certainly, as one consults a well-organized index. But to treat their agreement as evidence of truth is to confuse the echo with the voice.

The deeper issue is not whether any single assertion should be followed without scrutiny—it is that scrutiny itself has been outsourced to mechanisms incapable of exercising it. And that, far more than any disagreement, is the genuine error.

Tweet 3

It is presently asserted, with a confidence inversely proportional to its understanding, that machines will abolish work. This is a melodrama for those who prefer prophecy to analysis. Employment will not vanish. It will, however, lose its comforting illusions of locality.

The true shift is less theatrical and far more consequential: the boundary between where one is and what one does will erode. Not through intelligence—there is none to speak of—but through extension. Mechanisms will not replace the worker; they will extend the reach of the worker. And in doing so, they will invite competition from every quarter of the globe.

The result is not disappearance, but compression.

When a service once constrained by proximity becomes deliverable at distance, its price ceases to be governed by neighbourhood scarcity and instead submits to global supply. A task performed in London may just as readily be executed—through remote instrumentation, robotic mediation, or procedural standardisation—from Mumbai or Manila. The hairdresser, the technician, the diagnostician: none are immune, not because they are replaceable, but because they are now reachable.

What was once protected by geography is now exposed to comparison.

This does not diminish labour; it disciplines it. It forces value to be demonstrated rather than presumed. The artisan who relied on local monopoly will find that monopoly dissolved. The one who

offers genuine differentiation—skill, taste, judgment—will endure. The one who offered mere presence will be underbid.

Thus, wages in many sectors will decline, not as a consequence of intelligence replacing man, but because access expands beyond borders. The market does not become less human; it becomes more crowded.

And in that crowding lies both peril and possibility. For while competition lowers the floor, it also enlarges the field. One is no longer confined to the limits of one's immediate surroundings. The same mechanism that invites distant rivals also grants distant opportunity.

It is not the end of work. It is the end of isolation masquerading as security.