

To Know Is to Filter: Norbert Wiener and the Mirage of Semantic Estimation

Stationary Assumptions, Kalman State-Space, and the Error of Statistical AI

Emmanuele Somma^{✉1}

¹Epistechonology Research Project

Abstract

For Norbert Wiener, knowing was filtering: separating a stationary signal from corrupting noise. Contemporary AI inherits this premise, mistaking the statistical suppression of error for genuine understanding and judgment.

Keywords: cybernetics, epistemology, wiener, filtering, kalman, intelligence augmentation, ai

Norbert Wiener defined knowing as filtering. Developing fire-control radar in *Cybernetics* (1948), he set aside metaphysical inquiries into the nature of objects. Knowing means extracting regular pattern from temporal disturbance.

This premise generated the Wiener filter: the optimal linear minimum mean-square error (LMMSE) estimator designed to isolate a stationary signal $s(t)$ from additive noise:

$$y(t) = s(t) + n(t)$$

Exploiting power spectral densities and autocorrelation matrices, Wiener showed how a mathematical calculus separates trajectory from interference.

1 The Stationary Anchor and Kalman's Recursion

Wiener's optimality held under strict mathematical conditions: processes had to be linear, Gaussian, and wide-sense stationary. Stationarity was the critical epistemic anchor. It guaranteed that statistical moments (mean, variance, and autocorrelation) remained invariant across temporal shifts, enabling computers to project the past as a template for the future.

In 1960, Rudolf Kalman reconfigured this architecture. Abandoning static spectral integrals across infinite time horizons, Kalman cast linear estimation into dynamic state-space recursion:

$$x_k = F_k x_{k-1} + B_k u_k + w_k$$

$$z_k = H_k x_k + v_k$$

By updating an internal state estimate $\hat{x}_k$ alongside error covariance P_k through a continuous feedback loop, the Kalman filter brought Wiener's mathematics into real-time aerospace guidance, inertial navigation, and robotics. Kalman balanced prior physical models against noisy sensory inputs.

The engineering achievement was magnificent. The philosophical distortion was immediate: the calculus of variance minimization was promoted into a universal model of reason.

2 Demarcations: Variance vs. Meaning

Contemporary artificial intelligence inherits Wiener's operational framework. In transformer architectures, multi-head attention weights minimize cross-entropy loss over text corpora, treating linguistic divergence as statistical variance to be eliminated.

Confusing the suppression of variance with semantic comprehension is an old category mistake:

1. **Syntax vs. Semantics:** Filtering manipulates tokens according to quadratic error penalties ($\mathbb{E}[(s - \hat{s})^2]$). A filter is indifferent to what a signal means, whether an assertion is true, or what political consequences follow from its execution. It preserves structural information in Claude Shannon's transmission sense, not truth in an epistemic sense.
2. **Stationarity vs. Living Practice:** Biological and social environments are non-stationary, open, and normative. As Georges Canguilhem established, living organisms do not maintain static equilibrium against noise. They institute novel norms, reorganize their

EIN: 6 Revision: 0 Broadcast: Episode 6

Canonical URL: <https://www.epistechonology.org/to-know-is-to-filter/>

Audio Edition: <https://www.epistechonology.org/podcast/epistech.006.006.000.to-know-is-to-filter.mp3>

Corresponding author: emmanuele@epistechonology.org

This work is licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).

environment, and redefine what counts as an error. When context and values are contested, stationary stochastic models shatter.

3. **Estimation vs. Judgment:** An estimator calculates conditional expectations within an established probability model. Judgment determines which model is relevant, decides whether a loss function is ethically acceptable, and accepts accountability for systemic breakdown. Estimation operates inside a closed frame. Judgment establishes the frame.

3 Narrative Thought Experiments: Lem and Dick

Early cybernetic fiction anticipated the impasses of reducing thought to filtering.

Stanislaw Lem dismantled the illusion of predictive correlation in *The Investigation* (*Śledztwo*, 1959). When corpses vanish from provincial English mortuaries, Scotland Yard pairs a traditional detective with a statistician named Sciss. Sciss plots flawless curves linking the anomalies to temperature fluctuations and regional cancer rates. His equations predict future incidents with minimal variance. Yet he cannot identify a perpetrator, a motive, or a cause. Lem demonstrates what the filtering paradigm obscures: optimal stochastic modeling delivers predictability without intelligibility. The apparatus tracks the distribution of noise; it cannot generate semantic truth.

Philip K. Dick analyzed the political danger of hypostatizing predictive estimation in *The Minority Report* (1956). The Precrime apparatus functions as an extrapolation filter: human behavior is mapped as a stationary trajectory intercepted before execution. The system disintegrates when confronted with the minority report. The moment an agent learns of a predictive estimate, reflexive feedback alters their behavior, destroying statistical stationarity. Dick exposes the authoritarian temptation of the Wiener premise: when governance treats the future as an error-minimization calculation over past records, statistical extrapolation becomes preemptive coercion.

4 Amplifiers of Inquiry, Not Surrogates for Reason

Filtering algorithms are indispensable tools. In cardiology, optimal filters separate microvolt cardiac potentials from muscular tremors, allowing physicians to detect ischemia. In meteorology, data assimilation pipelines integrate satellite telemetry with hydrodynamic equations to track storms.

In every legitimate application, the filter functions as an epistemic amplifier of human perception, never as a substitute for human judgment. The filter cleans the channel so that a living thinker can examine the phenomenon.

Treating next-token predictors as autonomous intelligences repeats the error Wiener warned against in *The Human Use of Human Beings* (1950): projecting subjective agency onto an automated feedback loop. Replacing

the human thinker with an automated estimator does not produce objective cognition. It obscures human design choices, conceals corporate agendas, and abdicates moral accountability.

In Epistechology, cybernetic filtering finds its true home in **Intelligence Augmentation (IA)**. Mathematical filters are vital cognitive prostheses: they reduce operational friction and clarify signals, while interpretation, normative deliberation, and ethical responsibility remain anchored in living human agents.

5 References

- Canguilhem, Georges. *La connaissance de la vie*. Paris: Hachette, 1952.
- Dick, Philip K. "The Minority Report." *Fantastic Universe* 4, no. 6 (1956): 4-36.
- Kalman, Rudolf E. "A New Approach to Linear Filtering and Prediction Problems." *ASME Journal of Basic Engineering* 82, no. 1 (1960): 35-45.
- Lem, Stanislaw. *Śledztwo* [*The Investigation*]. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Ministerstwa Obrony Narodowej, 1959.
- Shannon, Claude E. "A Mathematical Theory of Communication." *Bell System Technical Journal* 27, no. 3 (1948): 379-423.
- Wiener, Norbert. *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1948.
- Wiener, Norbert. *The Extrapolation, Interpolation, and Smoothing of Stationary Time Series*. Cambridge, MA: Technology Press of the MIT, 1949.
- Wiener, Norbert. *The Human Use of Human Beings: Cybernetics and Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1950.