



EPIC-PP-2026-005 · ESSAY · AI GOVERNANCE

Borrowed Certainty: The AI Risk That Feels Like Relief

EPIC – Emirati Perspectives and Insight Centre

Seeing what others miss...

20 October 2026

CC BY 4.0 · Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International · creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0

Borrowed Certainty: The AI Risk That Feels Like Relief

EPIC – EMIRATI PERSPECTIVES AND INSIGHT CENTRE

EPIC-PP-2026-005 · AI Governance · Published 20 October 2026

© 2026 EPIC – Emirati Perspectives and Insight Centre. Released under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0): <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

EPIC is an independent research initiative in formation. It is not yet a registered or licensed entity. EPIC does not accept donations, payments or contracts.

When a confident answer arrives in seconds, the mind relaxes. That relief can feel like knowledge. Often it is only certainty we have borrowed — and the vigilance we owe our own judgements is what we risk losing.

What follows is an argument about that quieter risk: not the machine that errs, but the human who stops checking.

We usually picture the danger of artificial intelligence as error: the machine that lies, hallucinates, or misleads. We want to point to a quieter danger, one that arrives even when the machine is right. It is the feeling of relief. When a fluent, confident answer appears in seconds, the mind relaxes. The question that was pressing on us is closed. That relief feels like knowledge, but it is something else: certainty that has been borrowed.

Certainty and knowledge are not the same thing. Certainty is a psychological state, the absence of doubt. Knowledge is an achievement: a belief that is true because the believer reached it competently, by tracking the reasons. Epistemologists in the virtue tradition, Ernest Sosa among them, describe knowledge as apt belief, accurate because it is skilful. Borrowed certainty gives us the state without the achievement. We end up holding a correct belief the way one holds a parcel delivered to the wrong address: it is in our hands, but it is not ours.

Erich Fromm described a human tendency he called the escape from freedom. Faced with the burden of judging for ourselves, we hand our judgement to an authority that offers ready-made certainty in return. In the twentieth century that authority was the leader, the party, or the closed group. Today it can be an interface. The structure is the same: anxiety is relieved by surrender, and the surrender feels like rest. What is new is that this authority demands nothing of us. It does not ask for loyalty or an oath. It only asks us to stop checking, and it asks so politely that we barely notice.

Kant defined enlightenment as humanity's emergence from its self-imposed immaturity, the inability to use one's own understanding without another's guidance. He added that this immaturity is comfortable: "If I have a book which understands for me, a pastor who has a conscience for me, a physician who decides my diet, and so forth, I need not trou-

ble myself." Kant was describing, two centuries early, the user experience of a confident machine. The risk is not that AI makes us ignorant. It is that it makes immaturity convenient again, at a scale Kant never imagined.

None of this argues against trusting machines. All knowledge depends on trust: we trust doctors, encyclopaedias, and maps we never drew. But healthy epistemic trust stays responsive. The one who trusts keeps the ability to notice when the source fails, and keeps the responsibility for what is done with the answer. The real line falls between trust that stays awake and trust that falls asleep. Relief is the moment trust falls asleep.

We propose therefore that the ethics of AI should measure not only how accurate a system is, but what it does to the vigilance of the person using it. A system that is right ninety-nine times and teaches us to stop checking may be more dangerous than one that is right ninety times and keeps us alert, because the hundredth error lands on a mind that has forgotten how to doubt. Accuracy is a property of the machine; vigilance is a property of the human, and it is the human who must answer for the decision.

The practical conclusion is simple. Design should return a small, deliberate friction to the moment of relief: showing uncertainty honestly, giving the reasons rather than only the verdict, and inviting the user to confirm what matters. And the moral conclusion is simpler still: we may lend our questions to machines, but we must never lend them our judgement. Certainty can be borrowed. Responsibility cannot.

Further reading / Sources

Sosa, E. (2007). *A Virtue Epistemology: Apt Belief and Reflective Knowledge, Volume I*. Oxford University Press. Knowledge as apt belief — accurate because skilful. Overview: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology-virtue/>

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from Freedom*. Farrar & Rinehart. On the psychological escape from the burden of freedom. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Escape_from_Freedom

Kant, I. (1784). *An Answer to the Question: "What is Enlightenment?"*. Trans. Lewis White Beck. Wikisource (public-domain translation; quote verified against this text): https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/What_is_Enlightenment%3F

AI-use disclosure