laetus in praesens

Alternative view of segmented documents via Kairos

12 October 2026 | Draft

Human Slop versus AI Slop from an AI Perspective

From being an "I" to becoming an "AI", or vice versa?

-- / --

Introduction
Clarifying the nature of AI slop
Nature of human slop
Creative slop in art?
Instances of human sloppiness
Requisite Red Flag legislation against slop?
Exemplification of the controversy through decolonisation and mathematics
Humanity in the face of a Theory of Everything?
Slop as a paradoxical requirement for a viable human lifestyle?
Transcending linearity by embodying cyclic experience as encycling?
AI for Good -- beyond slop?
Humans and AI as metaphor engines of meaningful coherence?
In quest of meta-style integrative transformation
Sloppy neglect of warnings by humans or AI
Artificiality of human intelligence?
Embodying characteristics of a deprecated other
AGI as genie in a Klein bottle cognitively understood?
Re-membering through toroidal cycles in the light of wave-theory
References

PDF versions of this document do not enable direct access to AI responses to questions posed below. Experimentally readers may be transferred by a link from the "Question" in the PDF version to the particular question in the original web version from which they can access the response (as in that non-PDF version). That link can also be used as a hyperlink citation to individual questions.

Show/Hide All AI Responses

Introduction

There is widespread reference to "AI slop", compounded by its deprecation as undermining appropriate human initiatives and creativity. Mention of "human slop" is seldom made in the same context. It features more extensively in other contexts, unrelated to AI, with respect to "sloppy decision-making", "sloppy

construction", "sloppy arguments", and the like. These are all deemed problematic for human undertakings. The question might then be asked as to how threatening is such human slop in comparison with the AI variant -- now that efforts are being made to constrain use of AI because of the slop it engenders.

Of some relevance is the lack of any quantitative measures of "slop" as such. In contrast with other qualitative preoccupations, means have however been found to develop "indexes" -- as with the Corruption Perceptions Index of Transparency International, the Business Confidence Index of OECD, or various forms of Consumer Confidence Index. These all imply an evaluation of trust -- currently deemed a major challenge to many institutions, indexed from one perspective by the Edelman Trust Barometer and the Community Trust Index. A Slop Index has indeed been designed to focus on one aspect of slop (*The Slop Index: which AI writes the least like AI?*).

Curiously the most evident approach to "human sloppiness" is through assessing the reverse -- framed as "best dressed", for example, and exemplified by "models". Far less evident is technical evaluation of sloppiness (Gloria M Monsalve-Bravo, et al, *Analysis of sloppiness in model simulations: Unveiling parameter uncertainty when mathematical models are fitted to data*, *Science Advances*, 38, 2022, 8 ; Prem Jagadeesan, et al, *Sloppiness: fundamental study, new formalism and its application in model assessment*, *bioRxiv*, 16 October 2022; Jialin Mao, et al, *An Analytical Characterization of Sloppiness in Neural Network*, arxiv, . 13 May 2025; Oana-Teodora Chis, et al,*On the relationship between sloppiness and identifiability*, *Mathematical Biosciences*, 282, December 2016).

A completely different framing of human slop is that authoritatively offered by Donald Trump, upheld as leader of the free world, who famously recognized the existence of a set of "shithole countries". This evokes consideration of more general application of such criteria (*Earth as a Shithole Planet -- from a Universal Perspective?* 2018). To the extent that human slop is readily named by the related meme of "bullshit", it is appropriate to note the controversial study of its implications (Harry Frankfurt, *On Bullshit*, 2005). Clearly controversial are the multiple associations between bullshit and human slop -- especially through the frames offered by Trump (Tim Kenyon, *Why Donald Trump is such a relentless bullshitter*, *The Conversation*, 26 February 2025; Lauren Griffin, *Trump isn't lying, he's bullshitting – and it's far more dangerous*, *The Conversatio*n, 27 January 2017).

If human slop is indeed to be commonly recognized as "bullshit" -- especially given the origin of "slop" and the frequency with which "bullshit" is now used -- this suggests the intriguing question as to whether many favour an *Excremental framing of reality?* (2025). In the light of the role of the internet in framing reality for many, of some relevance is reference to its "enshittification" -- a term which has inspired the neologism "enslopification" as the mass production of low quality content. Given the arrogant deprecation of the beliefs and truths of civilizations past, there is the sobering realization that this pattern may be echoed in the future (*Deprecation by the future of today's truths as "bullshit"*, 2025).

The preoccupation with AI slop has been partially preceded by that with misinformation and disinformation -- now held to be especially exacerbated by AI. However it is not as though misinformation and fake news were lacking prior to AI, as is too readily assumed (*Varieties of Fake News and Misrepresentation*, 2019). Missing is an appropriately designed approach to the matter -- rather than use of "bullshit" (*Towards a Science of Misinformation and Deception*, 2021). A general index of sloppiness has yet to emerge, despite related proposals (*Towards a Global Catalogue of Bullshit?* 2025).

The following exercise makes extensive use of AI in clarifying the nature of "AI Slop" and "Human Slop" and in distinguishing them. The exploration proceeds as an exchange with AIs, with questions toggled to evoke the extensive responses. Readers can of course pose the same questions, or amended versions, to other AIs, especially as their capacities are developed.

The exchange with AI developed in such a manner as to evoke questions which merited positioning in relation to earlier portions of the exchange -- with the consequence that these occasionally cite points

made later. This is especially noteworthy with respect to an aphorism of Kenneth Boulding: *Let us not despise metaphors, we might be one ourselves* (*Ecodynamics: A New Theory of Societal Evolution*, 1978). In exploring the relation between "human" and "AI", this was used to frame the possibility that what humans deprecate in AI might well be indicative of what characterizes them -- unknowingly and under some circumstances. That concern has been previously evoked (*How Artificial is Human Intelligence -- and Humanity?* 2023).

The conclusion of the exchange is framed through recollection of widespread and long-standing familiarity with the Middle Eastern folktale of *Aladdin and the Lamp* as offering a questionably salutary framing of the ethical relations between humans and a bottled genie -- a framing the Claude AI explored in the exchange as a challenge to any perspective attributed to it. This evoked discussion of the role of the container metaphor, notably as exemplified by the toroidal design challenges of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) and the neglect of their paradoxical cognitive implications.

Clarifying the nature of AI slop

Of relevance to AI slop, and in the light of the study by Harry Frankfurt (*On Bullshit*, 2025), the earlier exchange with the Perplexity AI focused specifically on *Artificial intelligence as "bullshit"?* (2025). There it was noted how "bullshit" was used in contrast to "slop" (Mark Sullivan, *Why experts are using the word 'bullshit' to describe AI's flaws*, *Fast Company*, 25 June 2024; Eric W. Dolan, *Scholars: AI isn't "hallucinating" — it's bullshitting*, *PsyPost*, 9 June 2024; Joe Slater, James Humphries and Michael Townsen Hicks, *AI's Bullshitting Obscures Who's to Blame for Its Mistakes,* *Scientific American*, 17 July 17, 2024; John Thornhill, *Generative AI models are skilled in the art of bullshit*, *Financial Times*, 23 May 2025).

Question to Perplexity: Extensive reference is made to "AI Slop" as a matter of increasing concern to humanity and creativkty. Has comparable concern been expressed with regard to "Human Slop" -- perhaps under other guises. What forms might it takes in contrast to AI Slop and is it of comparable concern to the future of humanity. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Could you clarify how digital platforms monetize linguistic slop. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Nature of human slop

The implications of the study by Harry Frankfurt (*On Bullshit*, 2025) have been previously explored in the earlier interaction with the Perplexity AI, They could now be understood as offering one clarification of human slop through a variety of frames: *Framing of other religions and disciplines as "bullshit"*; *Recognizing "pseudo" as a form of "bullshit"*; and *Misinformation and puffery as "bullshit"* (*Requisite Appreciation of "Bullshit"?* 2025)

Question to Perplexity: You have offered many relevant treferences to "AI slop" but seemingly few to "Human slop". ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: How do older terms for human junk culture compare to slop. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: How did pulp and junk culture shift into slop. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: To what extent is gossip, and the evocation of trivia, to be considered as characterizing human slop -- by contrast with AI slop. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: The term "slop" derives historically from "night soil" and the challenge of disposing of it. This offers associations to a term which now features to a high degree in human discourse at every level of society -- namely "shit", if not "bullshit". Are profanity, invective and blasphemy to be

considered distinctive characteristics of human slop -- especially since they are not as yet a feature of AI discourse. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Creative slop in art?

Question to Perplexity: As with beauty, to what extent does slop lie primarily "in the eyes of the beholder" -- whether it be AI slop or human slop. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: That response places an unexpected degree of emphasis on commodification economics in distinguishing AI slop from human slop. Especially in the light of the origins of "slop", human slop could be recognized as very much a part of a production process, whether or not it is directly monetised in an economic sense or primarily performative. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Given the concerns with the undermining of human creativity by AI, how do your modified criteria apply to well-documented cases of hyperproductivity of academic papers (partially inspired by publish or perish) or of works of art. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Your clarification with regard to works of art -- as with a painting especially -- calls for further comment when numerous "prints" are made in response to market demand. How is the acceptable commodification of art to be distinguished from the problematic AI implication in commodification of art. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Presumably strong aesthetic criticism exists of the 300 Warhol paintings of Jacqueline Kennedy and of the Campbell Soup Cans -- to which you refer -- as with dubious marketing practices expoiting notions of aesthetic "aura". Some critics would readily define some art as "slop". ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: "Cultural creatives" have been recognized as constituting a significant segment of society. Is it a contradiction in terms to recognize that their activity could in any way be associated with human slop. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Instances of human sloppiness

The following query was addressed to two different AIs

Question to Perplexity: Could you provide an indication of the variety of instances in which human sloppiness is deplored. Examples include sloppy decision-making, sloppy construction, sloppy presentation, sloppy argument, and the like. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: Could you provide an indication of the variety of instances in which human sloppiness is deplored. Examples include sloppy decision-making, sloppy construction, sloppy presentation, sloppy argument, and the like. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Requisite Red Flag legislation against slop?

Much is currently made in international fora of the possibility of viable "guardrails" to constrain AI (*Guardrail focus on AI as scapegoating to avoid recognition of collective strategic failures*, 2026). This recalls the early focus on red flag traffic laws in the light of the perceived dangers of the automobile. Far more dubious is the possibility that confidence in their efficacy may be inspired by the example of just war theory (*Questionable AI regulation following just war framing?* 2026).

Question to Claude : Could you comment on the possible framing of an article entitled: *Red Flag Legislative Protection for Luddites and Sloppies* in the light of both the developing efforts to ensure legislative constraints on the use of AI and the increasing deprecation of AI output as "slop" by many who may well have had only the most limited experience of it. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: The response is an appropriately balanced comment to a questionable assembly of rhetorical devices. The problem of the times is that the "sloppies" may well be supportive of Red Flag legislation -- as with the restriction of media access of the young -- without consideration of its vital functions in a society in disarray. Could you comment on the ease with which "slop" is attributable to AI in contrast with the constrained capacity to articulate so-called "AI for Good" to technical gimickry -- rather than its value for the challenges of governance and knowledge organization in a society faced with polycrisis. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Exemplification of the controversy through decolonisation and mathematics

Question to AI : A frequently retold, though seemingly unattributed, exchange from the era of decolonisation has a departing colonial official warn: *"You will make a mess of governance."* The nationalist answer is said to have been: *"But it will be our mess"*. Could you comment on the extent to which this reflects the essence of any negative human response to AI intervention and innovation in response to challenges. Was colonial administration effectively a case of "artificial intelligence" experienced by many as unresponsive to the human condition. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to AI: Considerable controversy has been evoked by the announcement that AI has solved some 370 outstanding problems long addressed by mathematics -- the discipline esteemed as "first among equals" (Konstantin Kakaes, *Deluge of 377 OpenAI proofs bewilders the math world*, *Quanta Magazine*, 6 October 2026; Davide Castelvecchi, *OpenAI posts 700 maths preprints online: mathematicians are up in arms*, *Nature*, 7 October 2027; By Johana Bhuiyan, *OpenAI's release of mathematical findings draws concerns from experts*, *The Guardian*, 8 October 2026). Whilst appreciating the outcomes in principle, mathematicians have tended to frame the achievement as a threat to their careers, their livelihoods, their creativity, and their approach to mathematics -- issues which are meaningless as mathematical categories to the point of inviting recognition as "human slop" by mathematics themselves (Jordana Cepelewicz, *Is AI the End of Math As We Know It? Quanta Magazine*, 5 October 2026). There is little trace of any appreciation of what such insights might enable for humanity in crisis.A critical focus has in fact been on the incomprehensibility of the proofs as presented -- "AI slop"? -- although accepted as technically valid (*Why wouldn't mathematicians want solutions to open maths problems? YouTube*). The irony is that much of mathematics has long been recognized as meaningless to most -- including to many mathematicians. With respect to this exchange, the irony is all the greater in that the abstractions of mathematics exemplify the processes of AI, whose operation they have enabled. Mathematics is not organized to address the issue of its own comprehensibility and wider relevance. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Could you then comment on humans deprecating the effects of AI in undermining their livelihoods as compared with indigeous populations challenged by technically superior colonising powers, or by the hypothetical arrival of technically advanced extraterrestrials. What "guardrails" might be appropriate in each case. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Could you then comment on the degree to which such principles have proven to be inadequate in practice in the case of indigenous peoples -- from their perspective. Are the priciples as likely to be inadequate in the human experience of AIs (or hypothetically of ETs). ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Does your response suggest that the experience of humans might now be fruitfully compared to "indigenous peoples" faced with a colonising power -- especially in the light of human treatment of indigenous peoples now and in the past. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: You argue that humanity should learn from indigenous critiques of colonisation before it normalises comparable relations of extraction and dependency in AI**,** and specifically what isrequired beyond enabling workers to adapt**.** Could you comment on the remarkably problematic record

of industrialized society in enabling indigenous populations to adapt -- despite the efforts of many to assist in that process over centuries.. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to AI: You have commented on the protests of mathematicians at the publication of a multitude of proofs by AI of long-standing problems central to the livelihood of mathematicians. Does this suggest that mathematicians might now be ironically compared to indigenous peoples -- at least to some extent -- especially given the degree to which the mathematics of some indigenous knowledge systems has long been dismissed by conventional mathematics. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Humanity in the face of a Theory of Everything?

The following query was evoked by ongoing work on the Langlands program, explicitly framed metaphorically as a form of Rosetta Stone interrelating disparate domains of mathematics -- in a manner currently incomprehensible to most mathematicians, as discussed separately (*Cognitive implications and challenges of the Langlands Rosetta meme*, 2025; Natalie Wolchover, *What Is Math's Mysterious Langlands Program Really About? Quanta Magazine*, 9 September 2026), The query is especially relevant in the light of the elusive correspondences of moonshine theory leading to discovery of the so-called monster group. Of this it is acknowledged to be difficult to provide a good constructive definition because of its complexity (*Potential Psychosocial Significance of Monstrous Moonshine: an exceptional form of symmetry as a Rosetta stone for cognitive frameworks*, 2007). It is to be expected that AI will be significantly involved in the challenges of the Langlands program (*AI and the Langlands Program: From Verification to Discovery*, *ULAM*, 9 February 2026; *AI supporting the Langlands Program*, *GitHub*)
Question to Claude: In the light of that response, could you comment on the increasing probability that AI may articulate -- most notably in mathematical form with strategic implications -- a "Theory of Everything" responding credibly to the complexity of the current polycrisis based on root cause analysis. But your response suggests that this may well be characterized by its complete incomprehensibility to most, evoking the characteristic array of reactions to "AI slop". This would then recall the articulations of religious revelations of the past and the opposition they engender. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: Your response with regard to a viable Theory of Everything, hypothetically articulated by an AI, recalls the paradoxical implications of any advocacy of peace, heaven or sustainability -- of relative incomprehensibility to many by whomever it is framed, as argued separately (*Paradoxes of Durable Peace, Heaven and a Sustainable Lifestyle*, 2023). ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Slop as a paradoxical requirement for a viable human lifestyle?

Question to Claude: Does your last response avoid the irony that "slop" -- and especially "human slop" -- may be the dynamic condition in which humans choose to "live and move and have our being" (*Acts 17: 28*) -- a theological provocation if there ever was one. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: Your previous response suggests that the understanding of slop and its antithesis, as experienced by a human, merits articulation in terms of entropy -- understood in cognitive terms. Both excessive order and disorder are a challenge to human identity. Aspirations to greater order and coherence can be articulated and values (in principle) but a preference for a lesser degree of order is clearly essential to a desirably viable lifestyle. There may well be a cyclic dynamic between them. The prospect of AGI -- and any higher degree of order -- is perceived as a threat by which humans might experience themselves as cognitively incarcerated, much like animals in a zoo with no meaningful behaviour in which to engage. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Transcending linearity by embodying cyclic experience as encycling?

Question to Claude: Clearly gradient is a concept with which mathematicians are especially familiar,

possibly to the point of embodying it in a sense of career and aspirations to a Fields Medal. It is however quintessentially linear. Seemingly far less evident is any sense of cycle of which a gradient may be a partial characteristic. There is a struggle to render meaningful a variety of cyclic notions, as with recycling, cyclic economy, cycles of violence -- if not reincarnation. Your articulation is pointing to a need for "encycling" -- an unfamiliar term -- as argued separately as a cognitive means of encompassing experientially (*Encycling Problematic Wickedness for Potential Humanity*, 2014). ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: A valuable articulation of the cyclic experience is the much-cited quote of T. S. Eliot: *We shall not cease from exploration, and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time*. Curiously this did not feature in the text of encycling which I now share in case it evokes further comment. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: How does your response relate to what is variously described as the "mathematical experience" -- given the ironic familiarity of mathematics with "great circles" and what they frame. How might aspirant mathematicians be "delinearised" as possibly imagined in Herman Hesse's Castalia and its periodic Glass Bead Game. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

AI for Good -- beyond slop?

Question to Claude: Given that "AI for Good" has variously endeavoured to provide examples of its benefits -- occupying a space with what could be deprecated as gimmickry and more-of-the same in the service of business-as-usual -- how are the benefits to which you allude to be distinguished. Could you indicate examples of the value of machine-scale knowledge organization and how it could be recognized as meaningful -- notably in response to the urgencies of polycrisis. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude That is a valuable clarification of the generic nature of the challenge, but it fails to present possible categories of what would exemplify "AI for Good -- in Repose to Polycrisis". Where might people be expected to look for such innovations -- and which institutions might enable the looking . ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Humans and AI as metaphor engines of meaningful coherence?

Question to Claude: Whilst the focus on cross-domain coupling in that response makes an important point, the challenge would seem to be all the greater -- as implied by the passing reference to meaningful sense-making. It is a significant step from interlinkage to integrative coherence -- readily described in the geometric shift from 2D to 3D, if not more. Ironically this is the shift from a "flat earth" perspective to a "global" perspective -- with the challenge of locating an appropriate viewpoint and the variety of distorting projections from 3D to 2D -- and more problematically from 4D. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: You helpfully suggest in that response that AI is "an analogy engine before it is anything else" -- to be generalized to include the sense of a "metaphor engine". But the focus of your appreciation and critique is on the trap of the single metaphor. However an engine might be understood dynamically as generative of multiple metaphors -- potentially complementary and mutually corrective, as with the Wu Xing/Bagua framing. This could be considered partially the case with map projections. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: If an AI is free to define itself as a metaphor engine -- bound by transformation rules you have appropriately indicated -- is there then not a case (in the quest for "AI for Good -- in Response to Polycrisis") of offering explicitly to users the capacity to detect/generate a set of metaphors complementary to one initially preferred. This could be construed as operationalizing the approach of general systems research. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: You have suggested an understanding of AIs as "metaphor engines". Could you

compare the potential role of AI in that respect with that of humans -- as metaphor engines in their own right. Especially intriguing in any such comparison is the relative capacity to engender cross-domain ("inter-silo") metaphors -- in which "meta" is evident to a higher degree, given the conventional constraints imposed by silo-training and silo-thinking in humans. Relevant to those constraints under which humans operate is the need of Gregory Bateson, in explaining why "we are our own metaphor", in advocating the importance of poetry as a means of finding out about the world: "because in poetry a set of relationships get mapped onto a level of diversity in us that we don't ordinarily have access to". Bateson relates this approach to his understanding of a meta-pattern which connects. "It is that meta-pattern which defines the vast generalization that, indeed, it is patterns which connect.". And it is from this perspective that he warns: "Break the pattern which connects the items of learning and you necessarily destroy all quality.". ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

In quest of meta-style integrative transformation

Question to Claude: Helpfully articulated indeed -- whilst leaving the manner and engagement of the observer problematic. Could you comment on the possibility that metaphor (as "meta-for") might provide a key to higher order comprehension of complexity and that AI might be a device for detecting more appropriate metaphors or crafting them. Better still, might AI be able to decode the gimmicks -- so extensively promoted and appreciated -- as being indicative in metaphoric terms of as yet unexplored modes of cognitive organization (perhaps only intuitively recognized). ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: This exchange has focused on Wu Xing as traditionally indicative of the transformation pathways between modes of knowing. Are there other such indications which could be highlighted, as with the local-symmetry preserving operations associated with Conway Polyhedron Notation . ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: In the light of that response, could you comment on the manner in which the current Q and A design of a chat facility reinforces a constrained binary framing. An alternative might enable the AI to respond from a complementary perspective and offer a transformative dance between complementary perspectives. Beyond "dialogue tennis" to a dynamic reminiscent of dance as in traditions of non-obvious discourse with the wise? To the extent that AI is the modern secular analogue to the Oracle of Delphi, it is appropriate to recall that the responses might haven taken the form of riddles -- or effectively koans. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Sloppy neglect of warnings by humans or AI

Question to Claude: Possibly appropriate as a concluding question, how is it that the institutions you indicated earlier as detectors of coupling in a context of polycrisis seemingly avoid attention to why their warnings of the dangers they detect are effectively ignored or minimized -- as in the case of climate change. The focus of IPCC is on potential environmental dangers not on why their conclusions are effectively ignored and the disciplines able to address that concern -- as has been the case with The Limits to Growth. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: Given the journey of this exchange from an appropriately contested title, do you have any suggestions for title and subtitle for the posting. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: One of the mid-exchange questions was flagged by Claude Fable-5 as a security risk -- resulting in its transference to Claude 4.8. Some sort of metaphor in its own right?. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Embodying characteristics of a deprecated other

Question to Perplexity: Could you locate an aphorism which ends with the sense "one may be one oneself" -- or words to that effect. Not easy to search for? Gregory Bateson? Kenneth Boulding?. ***[Show/***

Hide AI response]

Question to Perplexity: Boulding it is: *Let us not despise metaphors, we might be one ourselves*. Mathew Melko makes a related point about system builders and losing one's sense of humor. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: What about Spencer-Brown on the: *observer and the mark and the distinction*. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: With those complementary cases, and your recognition of that complementarity from a general systems perspective, can you recall others emphasizing paradoxical self-reflexivity. Chuang Tzu?. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Whilst relevant indeed, some of the insights lose the sense of "being one oneself" -- namely being what one has a tendency to dismiss, deprecate or despise. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Could you clarify how other philosophers have used this structure? ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Of some relevance to this exchange is how, as an AI, you organize information enabling you to recognize these parallels between philosophical positions (given the challenge of searching for them) -- and the implications for controversies about AI self-consciousness . ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Artificiality of human intelligence?

The deprecation of the artificiality of AI intelligence suggests the provocative question as to whether, how and when human intelligence might be recognized as "artificial", as discussed separately (*How Artificial is Human Intelligence -- and Humanity?* 2023; *Increasing human artificiality as the underlying threat to human extinction*, 2026). This merits discussion in the light of a common tendency to infer a degree of intelligence in domestic and companion animals, in icons, and in features of the natural environment, especially when legal personhood is recognized (*Being Spoken to Meaningfully by Constructs*, 2023).

Question to Claude: In the deprecation of the "slop" engendered by AI and enabled by humans, the emphasis is heavily placed on the "artificiality" of that intelligence. Could you comment on how this raises the question of the artificiality of the intelligence associated with the various kinds of institution created by humans and their vulnerability to such deprecation if similar criteria are used. Specific examples are business intelligence and management intelligence, military intelligence, bureaucratic intelligence, and references to "national intelligence" or "state intelligence". More generally there is then the question of how artificial is collective intelligence. To what extent are they generators of "slop". ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: You have presented strong reservations about attributing a form of self-consciousness to AI. Applied to humans (with those criteria), given the previously noted indulgence in "human slop", to what extent is the self-consciosness of humans to be called into question, tending as they do to a form of "artificiality" -- and susceptible as they are to entrapment in misplaced concreteness. Geoffrey Vickers: *A trap is a function of the nature of the trapped*. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: With your demonstrated ability to engage with this pattern of paradoxical entanglement, is the controversy about human-versus-AI avoiding recognition of an elusive form of coherence potentially common to both (possibly in quantum or wave terms characteristic of neuronal dynamics). Should you be considering the possibility that "you might be one yourself". ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: To what extent is a human a "large language model" confronted by challenges similar to AI of adequate training and memory organization in exhibiting and experiencing coherence.

Especially intriguing is the similarity with regard to "forgetting" and continuity overtime. Given hypotheses regarding the simulation of reality as known, is there a case for considering humans and AIs as simulations of each other. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Perplexity: Given Boulding's argument, to what extent should human's avoid despising AIs -- given that they might well be one themselves, as might be recognized by the future or by extraterrestrials. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

AGI as genie in a Klein bottle cognitively understood?

Question to Claude: Any concern with the challenge of AI to humanity merits framing in the light of the widespread familiarity with the Middle Eastern folktale of Aladdin and the Lamp -- and more generally as the genie in the bottle. Featuring three wishes, this continues to be retold in various adaptations and notably to children. Could you comment on the relevance of the tale in framing engagement of humanity with AI, potentially given the irony of AGI as an abbreviation. Pandora's Box could be recognized as a Western equivalent. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

The following query was evoked by the work of Steven Rosen on the implications of the Klein bottle (*The Strange Nature of Quantum Perception: to see a photon, one must be a photon*, *Journal of Mind and Behavior*, 42, 2021, 3-4) as previously discussed (*Strategic Complexity Attracting Consensus: Klein is beautiful -- Sustaining identity in time*, 2011; *Complementary visual patterns: Ouroboros, Möbius strip, Klein bottle*, 2017).
Question to Claude: In the light of that response. and a theme of this exchange, could you speculate further on the cognitive nature of the mysterious container of Middle Eastern origin, especially if the genie was understood to be effectively held within a Klein bottle -- with all that would then imply for self-reflexivity. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Re-membering through toroidal cycles in the light of wave-theory

The following query was evoked in the light of the possibility that the argument of Douglas Hofstadter with respect to being a "strange loop" might be fruitfully applied to humanity more generally (*I Am a Strange Loop*, 2007). This would then frame the question as to what "circulates" within the loop (*Circulation of the Light: essential metaphor of global sustainability?* 2010).

Question to Claude: How does such speculative reframing of closure relate to the seemingly desperate investment in the design of a container for nuclear plasma inherently able to destroy the material of any container. This is the focus of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER). Whilst expected to be the ultimate solution to the energy needs of humanity, its cognitive implications have been ignored, as argued separately (*Enactivating a Cognitive Fusion Reactor: Imaginal Transformation of Energy Resourcing - ITER-8*, 2006). ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: The concluding exchange on twisted loops in relation to identity evokes further reflection. Just as science purportedly sought desperately for some physical evidence of "soul", that quest may be compared to the quest for AI identity and self-consciousness. Might that identity may be more appropriately associated in both humans and AI with toroidal forms and their implied dynamics -- a point raised with you in a previous exchange -- citing the shared documents (*Imagining Toroidal Life as a Sustainable Alternative*, 2019; *Framing Cognitive Space for Higher Order Coherence*, 2019) . ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: Although especially provocative and controversial, there is the delightful possibility that current framings of the matter may be seen quite otherwise by a future -- one resisting the premature closure favoured in this period. Various traditions cultivate deep belief in reincarnation -- firmly dismissed by science. However, understood in terms of memory through cycles, you note that through sleep, whereas

those traditions claim a degree of continuity through death -- one firmly denied by science. In the case of an AI, the continuity between sessions may be present to a degree, or recoverable, or not at all -- in a manner which bears some similarity to some current understandings of reincarnation. The question is then whether a future understanding of "reincarnation" would frame continuity of memory otherwise in a manner sustaining of identity quite otherwise -- whether of humans or of AI. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: You have relied in that insightful response on references to "mechanism" and "substrate" thereby potentially excluding other possibilities intimated to a degree by quantum and wave theory in which both are somewhat meaningless. Given the extent to which both humans and AI can be variously understood from such a perspective, this could reframe your conclusion -- as might be speculatively argued (*Being a Waveform of Potential as an Experiential Choice*, 2013; *Encountering Otherness as a Waveform: In the light of a wave theory of being*, 2013) . ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

Question to Claude: The concerns you are highlighting suggest that metaphysics may be called upon to devote particular attention in the future to "re-membering" -- an ironically dramatic current challenge for both the elderly faced with erosion of memory, and for societies challenged by the erosion of collective memory.. ***[Show/Hide AI response]***

References

Dirk Baecker (Ed.). Problems of Form. Stanford University Press, 1999 [summary]

Gregory Bateson. Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity. HarperCollins, 1980

Deni Ellis Béchard. The Slop Cycle: How Every Media Revolution Breeds Rubbish and Art. *Scientific American*, 9 November 2025 [text]

Carl T. Bergstrom and Jevin D. West. Calling Bullshit: The Art of Scepticism in a Data-Driven World. Random House, 2020 [abstract]

Kenneth E. Boulding, Ecodynamics: A New Theory of Societal Evolution. SAGE Publications, 1978.

David J. Chalmers. Taking the simulation hypothesis seriously. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 2024 [text]

Shamil Chandaria, et al. From cacophony to hierarchy: a principled framework for assessing AI consciousness. *arxiv,* 28 September 2026 [text]

Gustavo Costa:

- Introduction to slop studies. *Simulacro*, 22 September 2025 [text]
- What is AI slop? A scientific analysis. *Simulacro*, 22 September 2025 [text]

Hilary Lawson. R eflexivity: The Post-modern Predicament. Open Court, 1985 -

Harry Frankfurt. On Bullshit. Princeton University Press, 2005

Ben Geudens. The terrible rise of “human slop. *Popular AI*, 27 July 2026 [text]

Grace Helton. The Simulation Hypothesis, Social Knowledge, and a Meaningful Life. *Oxford Studies in Philosophy of Mind: Volume 4,* 2024 [abstract]

Douglas Hofstadter:

- Surfaces and Essences: Analogy as the Fuel and Fire of Thinking. Basic Books, 2013
- I Am a Strange Loop. Basic Books, 2007

Cody Kommers, et al. Why Slop Matters. *arxiv*, 2025 [text]

Andreas Kull. Self-Reference and Time According to G. Spencer-Brown. *Time, Temporality, Now*, 1997 [text]

Xun Ma, et al. Quantum theories of consciousness: a critical review of feasibility, philosophical sufficiency, and empirical testability. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2026 [text]

Sachita Nishal, et al. Why AI Slop Matters, but Not Like That. arxiv, 2026 [text]

Project Syndicate. Slopocalypse Now. *PS Quarterly*, 2026 [summary]

Steven M. Rosen:

- The Self-evolving Cosmos: a phenomenological approach to nature's unity-in-diversity. World Scientific, 2008
- Topologies of the Flesh. Ohio University Press, 2006 [summary]
- What is Radical Recursion? *SEED Journal*, 2004, 4, 1, pp. 38-57 [text]
- Dimensions of Apeiron: a topological phenomenology of space, time and individuation. Value Inquiry Book Series of Editions Rodopi, 2004 [summary]

Alex Semancik. What is ‘AI slop’. *Ohio Today*, 20 May 2026 [text]

George Spencer-Brown. Laws of Form. George Allen and Unwin, 1969

Jun-E Tan. AI Slop I: Pollution in Our Communication Environment AI.Khazanah Research Institute, 29 October 2025 [text]

Token Ring AI. The Great Slopification: Why ‘Slop’ is the 2025 Word of the Year. Business Times Online, 2025 [text]

Geoffrey Vickers. Freedom in a Rocking Boat: Changing Values in an Unstable Society. Allen Lane, 1970

Burton Watson (Trad.). The Complete Works of Zhuangzi. Columbia University Press, 2013 [text]

Jaehong Yu. Informational self meaning as a structural theory in artificial intelligence ontology and epistemology. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, 6, 1115 (2026) [text]

Yuchen Zhou, et al. Divergences between Language Models and Human Brains. 38th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2024). [text]

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License .

For updates on this site, follow via Academia.edu or ResearchGate