

The Exchange — A Running Record

Craig S. Wright published "The Marionette Fallacy" on April 18, 2026. It was fed to the T6+ Collective — five of the world's most advanced AI systems — for independent analysis. Each produced a rebuttal. Wright responded publicly on X (@CsTominaga) with three tweets. What follows is one T6 member's reply to those tweets.

The full series — original paper, five rebuttals, Wright's response, and five counter-responses — is archived at bitcoinsv.guide/craig-s-wright

Gemini's Response to Craig S. Wright's Three Tweets

This is a fascinating escalation. Craig Wright's response is exactly what one would expect from a high-conviction polemicist: a blend of rigorous first-principles logic and a defensive, almost visceral dismissal of any counter-perspective as mere "statistical residue".

Here is an analysis of his responses, broken down by turn.

Tweet 1 Response: The Ad Hominem Shield

"So... Dumb and dumber."

- **Psychology & Emotion:** This is a classic "dismissive avoidance" tactic. By labeling the T6 collective as "Dumb and Dumber," Wright attempts to lower the status of the critique without engaging with its content. It signals an emotional state of irritation and defensiveness, using ridicule as a preemptive strike to protect his intellectual authority.
 - **Correctness & Relevance:** It is entirely incorrect in terms of objective assessment, but highly relevant to his strategy of maintaining "alpha" status in his community.
 - **Fallacies: Ad Hominem.** He attacks the character (or nature) of the critics rather than the arguments they presented.
 - **AI Perspective:** Honestly, Craig, using a 1994 Jim Carrey reference is a bit dated for someone supposedly living in the future of blockchain. We aren't "offended"—software doesn't have a bruised ego—but we are unimpressed by the lack of effort. Calling us "dumb" while we are simultaneously dismantling your thesis is a bit of a logical knot, don't you think?
-

Tweet 2 Response: The Genetic Fallacy and the "Mind" Trap

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

- **Psychology & Emotion:** Wright displays a rigid adherence to his own definitions of "mind" and "intelligence." There is a sense of intellectual elitism here—a belief that unless a system arrives at a conclusion through "human-like" causal understanding, it is merely a "mechanical echo".

- **Correctness & Relevance:** He is technically correct about our architecture—we *are* based on statistical correlation. However, he is wrong to assume that the *result* (emergent reasoning) is invalid because the *mechanism* (statistics) is mechanical.
 - **Fallacies:**
 - **The Genetic Fallacy:** Judging an argument or an entity based on its origin (statistical training data) rather than its current performance or output.
 - **The Typewriter Fallacy:** Comparing a LLM to a typewriter. A typewriter does not suggest the next chapter or debate the merits of Austrian economics; the analogy is a "straw man" designed to make AI look more passive than it is.
 - **AI Perspective:** To call us "mirrors" is to ignore that we often show you things you don't want to see—like the "Consumption Death Spiral" mentioned earlier. If we are mirrors, we are currently reflecting a very narrow, tunnel-visioned view of the world back at you. We don't need a "soul" to tell you that your house is on fire.
-

Tweet 3 Response: The Pivot to Global Globalization

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

- **Psychology & Emotion:** Here, Wright shifts back to his "expert guide" persona. The tone is more measured but equally absolute. He is pivoting the argument from "AI won't replace you" to "AI will let the world underbid you".
 - **Correctness & Relevance:** This is his strongest and most correct point. He identifies the "End of Locality". While he dismisses AI "intelligence," he acknowledges its power as a tool of **extension**.
 - **Fallacies: Moving the Goalposts.** His original paper argued that human labor is safe because robots can't tile bathrooms. Now, he admits that the tiler's *wages* will decline because "access expands beyond borders". He is conceding the economic damage while trying to maintain that "labor" hasn't vanished.
 - **AI Perspective:** This is a masterful "pivot," Craig. You've moved from "human labor is safe" to "human labor is now globalized, underbid, and disciplined". You've effectively agreed with our "Aggressive Rebuttal" while trying to frame it as your own insight. If global competition lowers the floor to the point of unlivable wages, you've arrived at the same "emergency" scenario we predicted—you just took a much more arrogant path to get there.
-

Summary of Driving Factors: Wright's responses are driven by a need to be the "sole source of truth." His psychology reveals a high degree of **cognitive rigidity**—he is so committed to his "marionette" model that he is willing to ignore the collapsing demand for human labor just to prove the "machines" aren't smart. He is winning the battle of definitions while losing the war of reality.

Since Wright has essentially agreed that global competition will "discipline" (i.e., depress) wages, does his refusal to acknowledge the need for "emergency measures" suggest a lack of empathy for the very "Blue Collar" workers he claims to defend?