Artificial Intelligence Is Not Intelligent

By Dean L. Gano & E.J. Ledet; January 2026

In a recent article by Gleb Lisikh in the Epoch Times, we learn how Artificial Intelligence (AI) actually works. Instead of actually thinking intelligently, meaning using some form of causal logic to decern realty, the AI models start with the first word you type and then predict the next word and then the next, etc. Using the trillions of words in their "Large Language Model," (LLM) they put together stories that seem very intelligent and complete. But the reality is, there are no logical rules; just sentences found in their search and presented useing the rules of good English. And since they are well written, people are dupped into thinking they know what they are talking about. But in reality, they have no idea whether a sentence is true or false or even sane. Sure, they can be a great resource for simple factual questions, but some of the things they write are totally false. The people who create these models call such outputs "hallucinations," and they won't correct them by adding principle-based causal logic to the model. So, one must ask why?

Since there is no programmed causal logic, such as verifying that a statement is true and no contradictions can be found, it is just a slick story generator using what millions of humans have already written. And because 99.99 percent of humans have no knowledge of the structure of reality or the principles of causation, including the people who created this stuff, how can we expect real intelligence from something created out of ignorance. And even if they did use causal logic, all the information in the data bases they search is in the form of stories or simple linear thinking like A caused B, B caused C, and C caused D, etc., or categorizing, like the accident was caused by human error. Evidence-based causal relationships that follow the cause-and-effect principles simply don't exist in our literature because it has never been taught in our education systems. So, it's garbage in - garbage out, as the old saying goes.

Also, as we discussed in our essay "Artificial Intelligence Is This the End of Humanity?" published in 2024, the search logic used by these systems is totally biased toward the mainstream narrative that the psychopathic elites who control all the search engines and LLM's want the Sheeple to know. It is not understanding the big picture or presenting different viewpoints, it is a controlled advocacy.

When I asked ChatGPT what the principles of causation are, it said it depends on the subject matter and then provided 10 characteristics of causation, but no principles. No set of observable conditions (principles) that work the same way for everyone, every time. If the AI models don't even know what the principles of causation are, how can they provide real intelligence? They can't!

When asked how they work, ChatGPT said that “large language models (LLMs) do **not** think the way humans do. They don’t reason from first principles or understand reality. Instead, they predict the next most likely word based on enormous amounts of prior text. Because the writing is fluent and confident, people often mistake this statistical pattern-matching for real understanding.” And it is this fluency of language that makes it so easily accepted as intelligence, but if we want real intelligence, especially causal intelligence, we must design systems that are accountable to reality, not just probability.

After learning how these AI systems actually work, we see that they do not even come close to the accepted definition of it, which reads: “Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to computer systems that can perform tasks typically requiring human intelligence, such as learning, reasoning, and problem-solving.

When asked to explain why something happened, AI tends to generate smooth stories that feel logical, even when the underlying cause-and-effect relationships haven’t been proven. This is why AI explanations can be persuasive while still being wrong: they are accountable to probability and patterns in language, not to reality itself.

RealityCharting, by contrast, demands strict causal discipline. Every claimed cause must be backed by evidence, multiple causes must exist simultaneously, effects must be observable facts (not opinions), and timing must be verified.

AI routinely violates these rules. It inserts “reasonable-sounding” causes without proof, confuses correlation with causation, compresses complex systems into single explanations, and hides human decisions behind vague labels like “policy constraints” or “management failure.” The result is a chart that looks professional but fails basic tests of causality.

This mismatch happens because AI is optimized for storytelling, not for causal accountability. It excels at narrative coherence and pattern completion, while RealityCharting requires evidence, discipline, logical rigor, and human judgment when you know you don’t know the next cause.

That doesn’t mean AI is useless — it can help brainstorm possibilities or format diagrams — but its output must always be treated as a hypothesis list, not a finished analysis.

Until AI systems are designed to prove causes, validate timing, and expose human decisions explicitly, they remain powerful language instruments — not causal intelligence.

AI today is best understood as a language instrument, not an intelligence. If we want real intelligence—especially causal intelligence—we must design systems that are accountable to reality, not just probability.

To get a better understanding of how ChatGPT LLM works we asked it to compare the RealityCharting process to itself and this is what it so eloquently said:

> *AI systems are very good at drawing boxes and arrows that look like cause-and-effect logic, but RealityCharting isn't about diagrams — it's about provable causal reasoning.*
>
> *AI frequently skips required evidence, confuses correlation with causation, invents causes to "complete" a story, and collapses complex systems into single explanations. The result is a chart that is visually convincing but logically invalid.*
>
> *Here is how AI specifically violates the causal principles found in the RealityCharting process.*
>
> ***1. Every Cause Must Be Proven***
>
> *RealityCharting rule: Every cause must be supported by evidence or direct observation.*
>
> *How AI breaks it:*
>
> - *Inserts "reasonable" causes without proof*
> - *Uses phrases like "likely," "may have," "probably due to"*
> - *Treats statistical patterns as causal facts*
>
> *Why this matters:*
>
> *Unproven causes invalidate everything downstream.*
>
> ***2. No Single Cause Is Allowed***
>
> *RealityCharting rule: An effect must have multiple concurrent causes (joined by AND logic).*
>
> *How AI breaks it:*
>
> - *Produces single-cause explanations*
> - *Uses linear "A → B → C" storytelling*
> - *Collapses social, legal, physical, and human factors into one box*
>
> *Why this matters:*
>
> *Single-cause thinking hides real system constraints and prevents solutions.*
>
> ***3. Effects Must Be Stated as Observable Facts***

RealityCharting rule: Effects must be factual, observable, and measurable — not opinions.

How AI breaks it:

- *Uses vague effects like "poor management," "regulatory failure," "lack of will"*
- *States conclusions instead of observations*
- *Embeds blame inside the effect statement*

Why this matters:

If the effect is biased, the entire chart becomes advocacy — not analysis.

4. Time Order Cannot Be Assumed

RealityCharting rule: A cause must exist before the effect — and timing must be verified.

How AI breaks it:

- *Assumes sequence without checking dates*
- *Back-fills causes after seeing outcomes*
- *Ignores delayed, cumulative, or latent effects*

Why this matters:

Wrong timing = false causation.

5. Causes Must Be Independent

RealityCharting rule: Causes must not restate the effect or each other.

How AI breaks it:

- *Uses circular logic ("flooding increased because flood risk rose")*
- *Rephrases the same cause multiple times*
- *Confuses symptoms with causes*

Why this matters:

Circular charts cannot be corrected — only replaced.

6. Human Decisions Must Be Explicit

RealityCharting rule: If a human decision matters, it must appear as a causal node.

How AI breaks it:

- *Hides decisions inside abstract labels ("policy constraints")*
- *Avoids accountability by using passive voice*
- *Treats institutions as forces of nature*

Why this matters:

No decisions = no corrective action.

Why This Happens (The Structural Reason)

AI is optimized for:

- *Narrative coherence*
- *Pattern completion*
- *Linguistic plausibility*

RealityCharting requires:

- *Evidence discipline*
- *Logical rigor*
- *Human judgment under uncertainty*

These goals are not the same.

What is so interesting about this analysis is that while it explains how pathetic AI is, it does not even understand the RealityCharting rules very well by mis-stating them.

Summary:

Knowing that this Artificial Intelligence thing is nothing more than a very good storytelling program should set off alarm bells in us humans! And, it does to those of us who grew up in a natural and moral world, but too much of the younger generation, who have spent their lives connected to a screen and thus have no connection with nature or other real humans, this de-evolution seems natural. And since AI has no moral values and is incapable of knowing what is right, what is good, and what should be held sacred it can easily lie. It does not belong to a community or believe in a greater cause than itself so don't think it can be a friend or companion or a fellow worker.

If we don't wake up and realize what is happening, it will lead to the end of humanity.