What Remains

Johan Stromquist | February 2026

I. The Panic That Reveals the Fracture

Something strange is happening in the discourse around artificial intelligence. Not the technology itself – that is advancing at a pace well documented elsewhere.[1] What is strange is the *nature* of the anxiety it produces.

Browse any professional forum, any comment section beneath an article about AI capabilities, and you will find a particular kind of post. It takes one of two forms. The first asserts, with varying degrees of defensiveness, that there is something inherently valuable about human contribution to work – something a machine can never replicate. The second asks, with varying degrees of dread, whether this is true.

Both forms share an assumption so deeply embedded that it goes unexamined: that our value as people is somehow located in our ability to perform tasks that others cannot. That what we *do* – specifically, what we do that is scarce, difficult, and compensable – is what makes us *worth something*.

This assumption is not new. But for most of recent history, it has been easy to maintain, because the question it raises – what are you worth if a machine can do your job? – was hypothetical for most knowledge workers. Automation threatened factory floors and switchboard operators. It did not threaten the professional class. The question could remain safely philosophical.

It is no longer hypothetical. When systems can draft legal briefs, write code, analyse clinical data, produce strategic recommendations, and do so at a level that passes expert evaluation, the question arrives in every office and every profession.[2] And when it arrives, it does not feel like a question about technology. It feels like a question about identity.

That feeling is the important thing. Not because the feeling is irrational – it is not – but because it reveals something that was true long before any language model was trained. The framework through which most of us understand our own worth is, and has always been, built on sand. Artificial intelligence did not create the fragility. It merely applied enough weight to expose it.

To understand why the framework breaks, and what might replace it, we need to look at the material from which it was constructed. We need to look at language.

II. Three False Equations

The philosopher Hannah Arendt, writing in 1958, identified a collapse that she believed had already occurred in the modern world. In *The Human Condition*, she distinguished between three fundamental modes of human activity: *labor* (the biological cycle of producing and consuming what is necessary for survival), *work* (the creation of durable things that build a shared world),

and *action* (what happens between people – the political, relational, and meaning-making dimension of human life).[3]

Arendt's argument was that modernity had progressively absorbed all three categories into the first. We had become, in her terms, a "society of laborers" – a society that understood all of human activity through the lens of the production-consumption cycle. Work and action had not disappeared, but they had been subordinated to, and evaluated by, the logic of labor.[3]

"What we are confronted with," she wrote, "is the prospect of a society of laborers without labor, and surely nothing could be worse."[4]

She wrote this about automation broadly, decades before AI in its current form existed. But her diagnosis illuminates exactly why the current moment feels so disorienting. The collapse she described did not happen in the world of things. It happened in language. And it is through language that it continues to operate.

Three conflations, in particular, structure the way most people think about their own worth. Each is embedded so deeply in everyday speech that it functions not as an argument but as a background assumption – invisible precisely because it is everywhere.

Work = Purpose

The English word "work" does extraordinary conceptual labor. It refers to employment ("I'm going to work"), to effort ("that was hard work"), to the output of creative activity ("a work of art"), and to the organising principle of adult life ("what do you do for work?"). In casual conversation, it also functions as a synonym for meaning and purpose: a person who retires and "has no work" is understood to face an existential problem, not merely a financial one.

This conflation is historically recent. For most of human civilisation, labor was what you did *in order to* live, not *the reason* you lived. The ancient

Greeks were explicit about this. Aristotle, in the *Politics*, states plainly that "we work in order to have leisure" – using *schole* (the root of our word "school") to denote not idleness but the free activity of the mind, the condition in which the highest human capacities could be exercised.[5] The idea that one might define oneself *by* one's labor – that a person's work *is* their identity – would have struck Aristotle as a category error, a confusion of means and ends.

The inversion came gradually, accelerated by what Max Weber identified as the Protestant ethic: the cultural transformation in which productive labor became not merely a necessity but a moral virtue, a sign of election, and eventually the defining activity of a well-lived life.[6] The Enlightenment, industrialisation, and the rise of the professional class completed the absorption. By the mid-twentieth century, "What do you do?" had become the standard opening question between strangers – a question about employment that functions as a question about identity.

When someone says "AI will take our work," the panic it produces operates through this conflation. The listener hears not "a machine will perform the tasks you are currently paid to perform" but "a machine will take the thing that makes your life meaningful." The first is a practical challenge. The second is an existential threat. Language makes them sound like the same statement.

Value = Scarcity

The second conflation operates at the level of how we understand worth itself. In economic terms, value is a function of supply and demand. A skill that is rare and in demand commands a high price; a skill that is abundant commands a low one. This is uncontroversial as a description of markets. The problem is that we have internalised it as a description of *people*.

The craftsman who takes pride in hand-stitched leather is engaged in something real. But what exactly is the source of the pride? If it is the quality

of the stitching – the aesthetic and functional excellence of the work – then a machine that produces identical or superior stitching does not diminish the pride. The excellence is the excellence, regardless of who or what produced it. If, on the other hand, the pride is in the *scarcity* – "I can do this and most people cannot" – then the pride was never in the craft. It was in the relative position. And positions, by definition, are temporary.

The economist Andre Gorz saw this clearly. In *Reclaiming Work*, he argued that the identification of personal worth with economic function was not a natural feature of human psychology but a historically contingent product of wage-labour society.[7] We do not value the parent who raises a kind child as we value the executive who raises quarterly earnings, and the reason is not that parenting is less important. The reason is that our value system has been captured by the market's logic of scarcity and exchange. What cannot be priced cannot, within this system, be properly valued.

AI makes this visible by collapsing the scarcity of cognitive skills that the professional class has relied upon for status. When a system can perform legal research, financial analysis, medical diagnosis, and strategic reasoning at expert level, the scarcity premium that attached to those skills evaporates. And with it, for many professionals, goes the sense of worth – because worth and scarcity were never distinguished from each other.

Contribution = Output

The third conflation is perhaps the most insidious because it is the most invisible. In everyday language, to "contribute" means to produce something measurable. Contribution is output. It appears on dashboards, in performance reviews, in billable hours. A person who is "contributing" is a person who is producing.

But consider what falls outside this definition. The colleague whose presence makes a team function. The friend who listens. The person who raises a question that reframes an entire problem. The mentor who shapes how

someone else thinks. The individual who, by their character, makes a community more trustworthy, more honest, more courageous. None of these "produce" anything that can be captured in a metric. In the language of contribution-as-output, they barely exist.

Erich Fromm, in *To Have or To Be?*, drew a distinction between what he called the "having mode" and the "being mode" of existence.[8] In the having mode, identity is constituted by what one possesses, produces, and controls. In the being mode, identity is constituted by the quality of one's engagement with the world – how one attends, relates, and participates. Fromm argued that modern industrial society had systematically privileged the having mode until the being mode became almost unintelligible. We struggle even to *describe* a valuable person who does not produce, because the language of value has been so thoroughly colonised by the language of production.

When AI automates the production of knowledge work, it does not touch the being mode. It cannot replicate the quality of a person's attention, the depth of their relationships, the character of their moral reasoning. But because our language renders these invisible as "contributions," their persistence goes unnoticed. We see only what disappears – the output – and conclude that value has been lost.

III. The Identity Built on Sand

These three false equations – work as purpose, value as scarcity, contribution as output – do not merely distort how we think about AI. They distort how we think about ourselves. Together, they construct a model of identity that might be called *positional*: I am what I can do that others cannot. My worth is the delta between my capabilities and those of the next-best alternative.

Positional identity has an obvious appeal. It is legible. It can be measured. It produces clear hierarchies. It gives people something to strive to-

ward and a way to locate themselves in the social order. But it has a structural flaw that is normally hidden and that AI now exposes: **it contains an expiration date**. Any identity built on relative capability is only as durable as the capability gap that sustains it. Close the gap – through technology, through competition, through any change in circumstances – and the identity collapses.

You can see this in small, everyday moments. The professional who introduces herself by her job title. The retiree who, six months after leaving a distinguished career, confesses he "doesn't know who he is anymore." The senior partner who reacts to a junior colleague's AI-assisted output not with curiosity but with threat. In each case, the pattern is the same: a self that was *located* in a capability or a role, and that becomes disoriented when the capability is matched or the role removed.

The alternative is what might be called *intrinsic identity*: a sense of self grounded not in what one can do that others cannot, but in the quality of one's attention, judgement, relationships, and character. Epictetus, the Stoic philosopher who had himself been a slave, drew this line with precision. He distinguished between what is "up to us" – our judgements, our intentions, our character – and what is "not up to us" – our reputation, our possessions, our relative standing.[10] The good life, for Epictetus, consisted in aligning one's identity exclusively with what is up to us. Everything else is, in the Stoic term, *adiaphora* – indifferent. Not worthless, but not constitutive of who you are.

Whether a machine can write code faster than you, produce a legal brief more efficiently, or analyse data more accurately is *not up to you*. It is a fact about the state of technology. If your identity is invested in those capabilities, your identity is invested in something over which you have no control and which is currently shifting under your feet. The response is not despair but redirection: locate yourself in what is actually yours.

Epicurus, whose philosophy is routinely mischaracterised as hedonism, offered a complementary diagnosis.[12] He identified a category of belief he called *kenai doxai* – empty opinions – that produce suffering not because they are hard to satisfy but because they *cannot* be satisfied.[11] The desire for status is the paradigmatic example: it recedes as you approach it, because it is defined by comparison with others. The fear that AI renders human effort worthless is, in these terms, an empty opinion. It is grounded not in the loss of anything real – not food, not shelter, not companionship, not thought – but in the threatened disruption of a status hierarchy. Remove the false belief, and the fear dissolves. What remains is not a void.

The diagnosis is not new. Socrates insisted that "the unexamined life is not worth living" – locating the value of a life not in what one produces but in the quality of one's inquiry.[13] Aristotle defined flourishing (*eudaimonia*) as "activity of the soul in accordance with virtue" – not a feeling and not an output, but the sustained exercise of one's highest capacities.[14] Diogenes, confronted by Alexander the Great offering him anything in the world, replied "stand out of my sunlight" – demonstrating that a person whose sense of self does not depend on what they have or what they can do relative to others is, in a precise sense, freer than the most powerful person alive.[9]

What is new is the urgency. Arendt warned in 1958 that a society which understands itself entirely through labor will face existential crisis when labor is removed.[4] Gorz argued in 1999 that the identification of personhood with wage-labor was a political construction that needed to be politically dismantled.[7] Fromm showed that the "having mode" of existence – identity constituted by possession and production – is not human nature but a pathology produced by specific social conditions.[8] These were treated as philosophical provocations. They are now operational realities. The machines are here, they are capable, and they are improving. The thought experiment is over.

The question is no longer whether the old identity framework will be stressed. It is whether we will replace it with something better.

IV. The Reconstruction

The most tempting response to the false equations is to simply redraw them. If execution is no longer the scarce human contribution, then perhaps *judgement* is. Perhaps *direction* is. Perhaps *wisdom* is. This framing is everywhere in the current discourse: humans will remain valuable because we provide the oversight, the taste, the strategic vision that machines cannot.

This is the same trap, rebuilt one level up. It still defines human worth in terms of what we can do that something else cannot. It still makes identity contingent on a capability gap. And it is, on its own terms, a losing position – because capability gaps close.

The more honest reconstruction begins with a different question. Not "what can humans still do?" but "what do humans actually *want* to do?"

The answer, when stripped of the productivist framework, is surprisingly consistent. People want to learn. They want to understand things they did not previously understand. They want to make things – not because the world needs more things, but because the act of making is satisfying in itself. They want to explore, to follow curiosity into unfamiliar territory, to feel the specific pleasure of a new idea connecting to an existing one. They want to imagine possibilities that do not yet exist and to bring some of them into being. They want to *intend* – to choose a direction and move toward it, for reasons that are their own.

None of these are contributions. None of them need to be justified by their output. A person who spends an afternoon learning how a medieval cathedral was engineered is not "producing" anything. A person who writes a poem that no one else will read has not "contributed" to any measurable metric. A person who builds a wooden boat in their garage, slowly, over months, in an age when boats can be manufactured in hours, is not making an economically rational decision. But to describe any of these people as

wasting their time is to reveal the impoverishment of the framework doing the describing, not a flaw in the people.

This is, in fact, the oldest account of human flourishing available to us. Aristotle's *eudaimonia* is not a reward for productive contribution. It is the exercise of one's capacities in accordance with excellence – for its own sake.[14] The carpenter flourishes not because the world needs chairs but because the act of making well engages his full attention, skill, and care. If a machine makes the chairs, the carpenter's flourishing does not vanish. It relocates – to whatever domain next invites his curiosity, his craft, his intent.

The shift is not from one kind of useful capability to another. It is from the assumption that human activity must be *useful* to the recognition that human activity is *meaningful* – and that these are not the same thing, and never were.

But this shift, however clear it may be as a matter of individual re-orientation, does not happen in a vacuum. The reason most people cannot simply decide to build boats and write poems is not a failure of imagination. It is that modern life is *structurally organised* around the assumption that productive employment is the central activity of adulthood. Employment does not just provide income. It provides the chassis on which almost everything else is built: daily structure, social connection, status, a sense of belonging, and – through the false equations this essay has described – identity itself.

The productivist assumption described earlier – Weber's Protestant ethic, the chain from labor to moral virtue to identity – did not only shape how individuals think. It shaped how societies organise.[6] To be productive is to earn. To earn is to belong. To not earn is to be, in some fundamental sense, outside the social order. AI breaks this chain – not by eliminating productivity but by decoupling it from human effort. If output can be generated without proportional human labor, the link between productivity and belonging snaps. And with it, the entire architecture that depends on it.

The individual shift – from utility to intent, from productivity as identity to engagement as identity – is available to anyone willing to make it. The structural shift is harder. If employment is the chassis, then weakening that chassis without building an alternative is not liberation. It is abandonment.

What that alternative looks like in full is beyond the scope of this essay, and anyone who claims to have the complete answer is not being honest. But any serious reconstruction of the social contract will need to address at least these dimensions:

Sustenance. The material question. If the link between labor and income weakens, how do people meet basic needs? This is the conversation around universal basic income, but it is larger than any single policy instrument. The question is whether a society can decouple survival from employment without creating dependency or eroding agency.

Structure. The daily-life question. Work gives people a reason to get up, a place to go, a rhythm to the week. Remove it and you do not get freedom. You get drift. Any reconstruction needs to offer structures that people opt *into* rather than have imposed – and that provide the scaffolding for the kind of intentional, curiosity-driven engagement described above.

Status. The social-recognition question. Humans are status-seeking beings whether we find this comfortable to admit or not. If job titles and compensation bands stop being the primary status markers, something will replace them. The question is whether we design that deliberately or allow it to emerge from whatever fills the vacuum – which, historically, tends to be wealth, celebrity, or tribal affiliation.

Belonging. The community question. For most working adults, the workplace is the primary site of social connection outside the family. Weaken the workplace and you weaken the connective tissue of adult social life. The reconstruction needs institutions that provide community without requiring employment as the entry ticket. The Athenian *agora*, the Epicurean Garden,

the medieval university, the Enlightenment salon – each served this function in its time.[15] We need the contemporary equivalent.

Meaning. The question this essay has been building toward. This is the dimension the ancient traditions actually answer: meaning comes from the quality of engagement, not the quantity of output. But meaning in isolation – without sustenance, structure, status, or belonging – is monasticism, not a social model.

These dimensions interact. A universal basic income without community institutions is a cheque mailed to an isolated individual. Community institutions without a renegotiation of status are clubs for the already privileged. Status reform without a new account of meaning simply rearranges the positional game. No single dimension, addressed alone, produces a liveable answer. The reconstruction is necessarily composite – and the failure to recognise this is why most proposals for a "post-work society" feel either utopian or impoverished.

What can be said with confidence is this: we will not build institutions for human flourishing if we cannot first agree that human flourishing is not the same thing as human productivity. That agreement is the foundation. Everything else is architecture.

V. What Remains

The question that animates the current anxiety – "what happens to human value when machines can do our work?" – is the wrong question. It is wrong not because the concern is illegitimate but because it accepts, uncritically, the false equations that created the vulnerability in the first place.

The right question is: **why did we ever let "our work" become the whole answer to "our value"?**

The answer is: because the words made it easy. Because “work” absorbed “purpose.” Because “value” absorbed “scarcity.” Because “contribution” absorbed “output.” And because, as long as these conflations went untested, they felt not like choices but like nature.

AI tests them. AI tests them by demonstrating, with increasing clarity, that the productive capabilities on which professional identity has been built are not uniquely human endowments. They are *functions* – and functions can be performed by systems that have no selfhood, no relationships, no capacity for virtue, no inner life whatsoever.

This is not a loss. It is a clarification.

What remains, when the false equations are stripped away, is not a diminished humanity staring at its own redundancy. What remains is everything that the productivist framework could never account for and never valued properly: the quality of our attention. The depth of our relationships. The seriousness of our inquiry. The courage of our moral reasoning. The care with which we engage the people and problems around us. The examined life – which Socrates told us, twenty-four centuries ago, is the only life worth living.[13]

These are not consolation prizes, offered to soften the blow of technological displacement. They are what the most rigorous thinkers in our tradition have consistently identified as the *substance* of a well-lived life. We simply could not hear them over the noise of production.

The noise is about to get much quieter. The question is whether we are prepared to listen.

References

1. Stromquist, J. “The Acceleration Gap: Why Professional Services Must Move Now.” February 2026. Velocity Foundry. Available at velocityfoundry.org. ↩

2. See, among others: BCG, “From Potential to Profit: Closing the AI Impact Gap,” September 2025; McKinsey, “Superagency in the workplace,” 2025; Manning, S.J. and Aguirre, T., “How Adaptable Are American Workers to AI-Induced Job Displacement?” NBER Working Paper No. 34705, January 2026. ↩

3. Arendt, H. *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press, 1958. See especially the Prologue and Chapters III-V for the distinction between labor, work, and action. ↩↩

4. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Prologue, p. 5 (1998 second edition). ↩↩

5. Aristotle, *Politics*, Book VIII, 1337b33. “We work in order to have leisure” (*ascholoumentha hina scholazomen*). See also *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book X, 1177b4-6, where Aristotle identifies contemplative activity as the highest form of eudaimonia. ↩

6. Weber, M. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. London: Allen & Unwin, 1930. Originally published in German, 1905. ↩↩

7. Gorz, A. *Reclaiming Work: Beyond the Wage-Based Society*. Translated by Chris Turner. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999. Originally published as *Miseres du present, richesse du possible*, 1997. ↩↩

8. Fromm, E. *To Have or To Be?* New York: Harper & Row, 1976. See especially Chapters V-VI on the having and being modes of existence. ↩↩

9. The encounter between Diogenes and Alexander is reported in Plutarch, *Life of Alexander*, 14, and Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*, VI.38. ↩

10. Epictetus, *Discourses*, I.1 and *Enchiridion* (Handbook), 1. "Some things are up to us and some are not." ↩

11. Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus*, in Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, X.127-132. See also *Principal Doctrines* (Kyriai Doxai), especially Doctrines 29-30 on the classification of desires. ↩

12. For a reliable account of Epicurus's actual life and teaching, see Diogenes Laertius, *Lives*, Book X, and O'Keefe, T. *Epicureanism*. Durham: Acumen, 2010. ↩

13. Plato, *Apology*, 38a. Socrates at his trial: "The unexamined life is not worth living for a human being" (*ho de anexetastos bios ou biotos anthropo*). ↩↩

14. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7, 1098a16-17. "The human good turns out to be activity of the soul in accordance with virtue." ↩↩

15. On the Epicurean Garden as a model of philosophical community, see DeWitt, N.W. *Epicurus and His Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954. On the broader history of institutions for flourishing outside wage-labor, see Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Chapter V (on action and the public realm), and Hadot, P. *Philosophy as a Way of Life*. Translated by Michael Chase. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995. ↩