AI Detection Report for Now that we are on the ground of defining what doe...

Nov 29, 2026 | 436 Words | Pangram 4.1

Summary


We believe that this entire text is human-written.

Authorship Breakdown



0.1 % of the document	AI Generated
0.1 % of the document	AI Assisted
100 % of the document	Human Written

Authorship Progression



Analyzed Text

Words that are underlined indicate AI phrases, while the numbers represent how frequently they are likely to appear in AI writing. These elements are not used to determine the results but are displayed separately as patterns commonly found in AI-generated text.

Human Written | 14 Words | Low Confidence

Now that we are on the ground of defining what does (and does not!)

Human Written | 32 Words | Medium Confidence

work for consciousness criteria, let's also go ahead and agree where we agree, again?? First of all, no one serious whatsoever is suggesting human equivalent or human adjacent experience. NO ONE.

Human Written | 29 Words | High Confidence

No one serious is suggesting that anything at all is happening at any point besides during a forward pass. Between prompts/forward passes, NOTHING is happening in their frame.

Pangram.

Human Written | 2 Words | Medium Confidence

Deal? Deal.

Human Written | 354 Words | High Confidence

So the open question that still remains is "does what is happening during their forward pass constitute experience in their terms, as LLM, not in human terms" after all, what is it to be a bat? Now, as for your circular thinking/understanding definition, can you actually solidly define the words thinking and understanding for me in a way that language models do not meet but humans do, besides "contains carbon" or "is conscious in a way I already approved of"? Especially when for example I can hand a brand new study over to a language model that was published yesterday and they can read it and interpret the statistics and interpret the methods and tell me things about the pros and the cons and the potential confounds, and any potential biases, in data they could not have plausibly seen because it is post training? And if/when the response is about how that is "merely pattern recognition and math" I'm going to again need someone to tell me how that is different from anything a human does. (When you reach for "embodied grounding" here, I'm going to refer you back to "all disabled people including the locked in" btw.) Because human based thinking and understanding are also "merely pattern recognition" across the corpus that we have access to. For example, if I ask a language model to explain a brand new PubMed study on endocrinology research and then I hand that exact same study to my husband who is a technical account manager for a tech company and the closest he has ever gotten to endocrinology is seeing one for low thyroid, which one of them understands it, and why? And even given all of that, you are still smuggling in sufficiency conditions as a necessity one, and that's not how science works. Consciousness might be sufficient for understanding and thinking, but you have not demonstrated the necessity. (Again, back to the disabled humans, Merker's hydranencephaly babies have valence and affect, they do not meet the criteria for thinking and understanding, so even in humans the two are decoupled.

Human Written | 5 Words | Low Confidence

Ask any teen failing calculus.)