

The Human Element

Why AI Will Enhance, Not Replace

Sami Karam and Richard Sprague

2025-03-25

Table of contents

Preface	1
Introduction	3
1 The False Binary: Why AI Won't Replace Human Work	9
2 Inside the Black Box: Understanding What AI Actually Does	17
2.1 The Emperor's New Statistics	17
2.2 One-Way Streets: The Critical Limitation of LLMs	19
2.3 Inside the Training Process	20
2.4 What Does the Training Data Include?	21
2.5 Models Learning from Models: The Recursive Training Problem	23
2.6 Beyond Text Completion: Fine-Tuning for Specific Tasks	24
2.7 What AI Can't Do: The Limitations That Matter .	25
2.8 The Human Element: What We Bring That AI Can't Replace	26
2.9 The Balance: Where Humans and AI Excel . . .	27
2.10 The Implications: Why This Matters	28
2.11 Where We Go From Here	29
3 The What-How Divide	31
3.1 The Traditional "How" Advantage	31

Table of contents

3.2	AI's Disruption of "How"	32
3.3	The Rise of "What" Skills	33
3.4	Real-World Examples	34
3.4.1	ChatGPT and Chess: The What vs. How Divide	34
3.4.2	Book-Writing: When Bulldozers Move Words	36
3.5	More examples	38
3.5.1	Software Development: Beyond Code Generation	38
3.5.2	Investment Analysis: Beyond the Numbers	42
3.5.3	AI and Healthcare: Beyond Pattern Recognition	45
3.6	Investment Implications	49
3.7	The Future of Work	49
3.8	Preparing for the Transition	50
3.8.1	The Human Element Remains Central . .	51
3.9	Looking Ahead	51
3.10	Beyond the False Binary	52
3.11	Philosophical Dimensions of the Divide	55
3.12	Case Studies: The Divide in Practice	57
3.12.1	Software Development	57
3.12.2	Content Creation	58
3.12.3	Healthcare	58
3.13	The Competitive Dynamics of the Divide	59
3.14	Organizational Implications	61
3.15	Investment Implications	62
3.16	The Evolution of Knowledge Work	63
3.17	Integration with Enhancement Thesis	64
3.18	Conclusion: Navigating the Transformation . . .	65
4	Beyond Computation: The Philosophy of Human Intelligence	67

Table of contents

5	The Human Edge	77
5.1	The Uniqueness of Human Judgment	77
5.2	The Architecture of Judgment	79
5.3	The “What-How” Divide in Professional Contexts	81
5.4	Decision-Making Under Uncertainty	83
5.5	The Enhancement Framework Revisited	84
5.6	The Philosophical Stakes	86
5.7	Investment Implications	87
5.8	Judgment as Competitive Advantage	89
6	Finding the Sweet Spot	91
6.1	The Enhancement Zone	92
6.2	The Enhancement Framework	93
6.3	Real-World Enhancement Sweet Spots	97
6.4	Implementation Principles for Finding Your Sweet Spot	100
6.5	Finding Your Organization’s Sweet Spot	104
6.6	Beyond Optimization: The Strategic Implica- tions of Enhancement	106
7	The Implementation Challenge	111
7.1	The Enhancement Framework in Practice	112
7.2	Building Trust Through Transparency	113
7.3	The Training Challenge: Beyond Technical Skills	114
7.4	Measuring Success Beyond Efficiency	115
7.5	Common Implementation Pitfalls	116
7.6	The Path to Successful Implementation	117
7.7	Cultural Change Management	119
7.8	Looking Ahead: The Future of Implementation .	120
7.9	Investment Implications	121
7.10	Conclusion	121
8	The Human Element in Creative Work	123
8.1	The Beethoven Challenge	123

Table of contents

8.2	The Results: Technical Success, Artistic Failure	124
8.3	The Role of Human Struggle	125
8.4	Beyond Music: The Broader Implications	126
8.4.1	Sports and Entertainment	126
8.4.2	Business Leadership	126
8.4.3	Professional Services	126
8.5	The Enhancement Opportunity	127
8.6	Looking Forward	127
9	Following the Money	129
9.1	The What-How Investment Landscape	130
9.2	Value Creation Through the What-How Lens	133
9.3	The What-How Integration Matrix	135
9.4	Industry-Specific Applications	138
9.5	Investment Strategy Implications	141
9.6	Conclusion: Value Creation and Capture in the AI Era	143
10	Building the Future: A Human-Centric Vision for AI	145
10.1	The “What-How” Imperative	145
10.2	The Managerial Mindset	146
10.3	Rethinking AI Implementation	147
10.4	Educational Transformation	148
10.5	Policy Imperatives	149
10.6	Individual Adaptation Strategies	150
10.7	Investment Implications	151
10.8	Looking Forward: The Human Element	152
	Summary	155
	Building the Future: A Human-Centric Vision for AI	155
	Author Dialog	158
11	About the Authors	163

References	165
-------------------	------------

Preface

Current word count:

17040

Introduction

In 2021, a fascinating experiment took place in the world of classical music. A team of music historians, musicologists, composers, and computer scientists gathered to undertake an unprecedented task: completing Beethoven's unfinished Tenth Symphony with the help of artificial intelligence. Beethoven had begun composing this symphony but died in 1827 before making significant progress, leaving behind only a few musical sketches rather than a substantive draft.

The team approached this challenge using the two-step process typical of AI applications. First came the training phase, where they fed Beethoven's entire body of work—his completed symphonies, chamber music, and piano compositions—into their AI system, along with the sketches he had started for the Tenth Symphony. Then came the inference phase, where they asked the AI to generate the rest of the symphony based on what it had learned.

This project neatly encapsulates a common aspiration: the idea that AI might eventually replace human creative work. Here was a team of professionals training a machine to replicate the work of a human genius. The stakes were high, with considerable publicity surrounding the announcement that the AI-generated Tenth Symphony would premiere in Bonn, Germany—Beethoven's birthplace—on October 9, 2021.

Introduction

When the performance finally took place, the initial response was impressive. The music did sound Beethoven-esque in many parts. Yet in the days and months that followed, a consensus emerged: while technically competent, the AI-generated symphony lacked the essential qualities that made Beethoven's actual works masterpieces. It missed the passion, spirit, and tangible human touch that defines great art. Instead, it sounded somewhat mechanical and betrayed its artificial genesis through repetitive patterns. It was precise and competent, but ultimately deficient in its ability to convey emotion, to elevate, and to inspire listeners.

Among the many expert opinions we reviewed, one comment from music critic and Beethoven scholar Jan Swafford particularly resonated. He described the AI composition as “aimless and uninspired” and observed that what audiences fundamentally want is “to see the human doing it.” This insight—that humans want to see other humans create—forms the central thesis of our book.

We believe AI can serve as an extraordinarily effective assistant to humans across numerous domains, but it will never satisfactorily replace the human element. Leadership, teamwork, and creative work require the inspiration and judgment that only humans can provide. An AI program, no matter how sophisticated, cannot replicate these quintessentially human qualities.

This is a particularly appropriate moment to explore this perspective, as the AI revolution has generated two competing narratives, both fundamentally flawed. The doomsayers warn of widespread job displacement as artificial intelligence becomes increasingly capable of performing human tasks. The techno-utopians promise a future where AI solves humanity's greatest challenges, freeing us from mundane work. But the reality emerging from actual AI implementations tells a different

story—one where artificial intelligence enhances rather than replaces human capabilities.

In our view, AI functions best as a force multiplier. Throughout history, humanity has developed many such force multipliers—from the wheel to the printing press to the computer—all of which have enhanced human productivity and contributed to societal wealth. AI represents perhaps the most powerful force multiplier yet developed, with the potential to dramatically boost productivity and raise living standards.

This is not to say the transition will be painless. Many jobs will disappear or transform dramatically, and significant numbers of people will need to retrain for new roles. But this pattern of creative destruction has been a constant feature of technological progress. The industrial revolution replaced manual labor with machines; the digital revolution automated clerical tasks; now the AI revolution will reshape knowledge work. Each wave of change brings disruption but ultimately creates new opportunities and greater prosperity.

Drawing on our combined experience in finance and technology, we've observed a consistent pattern across industries: the most successful AI applications are those that augment human judgment rather than attempt to replace it. From financial trading desks to hospital diagnostic centers, from military command posts to creative studios, the winning formula consistently involves keeping humans “in the loop” while leveraging AI's computational capabilities.

Previous technological revolutions follow similar trajectories. Consider the introduction of ATMs in banking. Many predicted the extinction of human bank tellers. Yet something unexpected happened: while fewer tellers were needed per branch, banks opened more branches, and the total number

Introduction

of tellers actually increased. The nature of their work evolved from routine transactions to more complex customer service and relationship management.

The same pattern emerged with computer-aided design tools in architecture. Rather than replacing architects, these tools enhanced their creative capabilities and ultimately enabled firms to hire more architects to pursue more ambitious projects.

What makes AI unique is its ability to process vast amounts of data and recognize patterns that humans might miss. But this capability, impressive as it is, remains fundamentally different from human intelligence. AI can analyze millions of medical images to flag potential anomalies, but it takes a doctor's judgment to interpret these findings in the context of a patient's overall health. AI can process thousands of financial data points per second, but it takes a human analyst to understand how changing geopolitical dynamics might affect market sentiment.

Throughout this book, we challenge both the fear-mongering and the hype surrounding AI, presenting instead a framework for understanding how AI can enhance human capabilities across industries. Drawing on real-world case studies and our own experience implementing AI solutions, we demonstrate why keeping humans central to decision-making leads to better outcomes than pursuing full automation.

For business leaders, we offer practical guidance on implementing AI in ways that augment rather than replace human workers. For investors, we provide frameworks for evaluating AI companies based on their approach to human-AI collaboration. For policymakers, we outline principles for governing AI development while preserving human agency and judgment.

The coming decades will see artificial intelligence transform every industry. But this transformation will not follow the simple

pattern of automation and replacement that many predict. Instead, we are entering an era of enhancement, where human capabilities are amplified by AI rather than superseded by it. Understanding this distinction—and its implications for business strategy, investment decisions, and policy choices—will be crucial for navigating the AI revolution.

The future belongs not to those who try to replicate human intelligence, but to those who find ways to enhance it. This is the human element in the AI revolution.

1 The False Binary: Why AI Won't Replace Human Work

How both AI doomsayers and utopians miss the fundamental nature of human-AI interaction

When ATMs rolled out across bank lobbies in the 1970s, the forecast was grim for tellers. Machines that could spit out cash and swallow deposits seemed poised to erase a whole category of jobs. Why pay humans to handle transactions when steel boxes could do it faster and cheaper? Yet, the numbers told a different story. By the 1990s, the U.S. had *more* bank tellers than before ATMs arrived—not fewer. The machines slashed the cost of running a branch, so banks opened more of them. Tellers didn't vanish; their work morphed into something less mechanical—advising customers, solving problems, building trust. Technology didn't replace them. It redefined them.

This story isn't an outlier. It's a blueprint. From looms to assembly lines, every leap in automation has sparked the same debate: will machines liberate us or leave us jobless? Today, artificial intelligence has reignited that question with a vengeance. Techno-optimists paint a future where AI cures diseases and halts climate disasters, while doomsayers see a world of shuttered offices and idle hands. Both sides, though, are stuck in a

1 The False Binary: Why AI Won't Replace Human Work

false binary—replacement or utopia—that misses what's really unfolding. AI isn't here to take over human work. It's here to amplify it. The evidence, from history to the latest deployments, shows that the most powerful outcomes come when humans and machines collaborate, not when one tries to oust the other.

This chapter sets the stage for that argument. We'll unpack why the replacement narrative keeps falling short, explore where AI shines and where it stumbles, and show how this shift toward enhancement is already reshaping industries. The goal isn't to dismiss AI's potential or its disruptions—it's to reframe the conversation around what it can realistically do alongside us.

Beyond Replacement: The Historical Lens

The ATM tale is a good starting point because it's concrete. Between 1970 and 2010, teller jobs grew from about 500,000 to 600,000 in the U.S., even as ATMs ballooned from a handful to over 400,000. Banks didn't ditch humans; they leaned on machines to handle the rote stuff—counting bills, processing checks—freeing tellers to tackle thornier tasks like mortgage advice or fraud disputes. The tech didn't erase the human touch; it made it more valuable by stripping away the mundane.

This pattern echoes across decades. When computer-aided design (CAD) software hit architecture firms in the 1980s, skeptics predicted drafting tables would gather dust and architects would fade into obsolescence. Instead, CAD turbocharged creativity. Architects could test wilder ideas, tweak designs in real time, and pitch clients with vivid 3D models. Firms didn't shrink—they expanded, hiring more talent to dream bigger. The software didn't supplant human vision; it gave it wings.

Fast-forward to the 21st century, and the script holds. Amazon's warehouses buzz with robots zipping packages along conveyor

belts, yet human workers haven't vanished. In 2023, the company employed over 1.5 million people—up from 800,000 in 2019—despite pouring billions into automation. Robots excel at fetching boxes, but humans handle the exceptions: a torn label, an odd-shaped item, a last-minute order tweak. The machines crank through the predictable; people wrestle with the messy. Together, they've turned Amazon into a logistics juggernaut—not by replacing workers, but by retooling their roles.

These examples cut through the hype. Technology doesn't follow a straight line from human to machine. It zigzags, finding new ways to mesh with what we're good at. AI, for all its dazzle, fits this mold—not breaks it.

The Hype and the Hope: AI's Modern Moment

Enter ChatGPT in late 2022. Overnight, AI went from a buzzword to a living room guest. It could write poems, debug code, even fake a job interview. CEOs scribbled AI-first strategies, stocks like NVIDIA spiked, and headlines swung between marvel and panic. Some saw a golden age dawning—AI as the ultimate problem-solver. Others braced for collapse—white-collar jobs vaporized by algorithms. The truth, as usual, is less dramatic but more interesting.

Take Microsoft's CoPilot, an AI baked into Office tools. A Fortune 500 consumer goods company rolled it out in 2023, hoping to slash grunt work. It churned out email drafts, meeting summaries, and slide decks at lightning speed. But the shine faded fast. Employees spent hours tweaking outputs—fixing tone, adding context, catching errors the AI couldn't see. A manager drafting a client pitch found CoPilot's version polished but flat, missing the rapport that seals deals. The tool saved time on mechanics, sure, but the human layer—judgment, intent, finesse—still ruled the outcome.

1 The False Binary: Why AI Won't Replace Human Work

This isn't a knock on CoPilot. It's a clue. AI's strength lies in crunching what's known—data, patterns, templates. It's a wizard at “how” once you've nailed the “what.” But deciding *what* matters—strategy, purpose, nuance—that's where humans hold court. In software development, GitHub Copilot spits out code snippets with eerie precision, but it's useless without a programmer framing the problem: What's the user need? How should this system scale? The AI executes; humans steer.

Even in creative turf, the story tracks. Recall the 2021 bid to finish Beethoven's 10th symphony with AI. A team fed it every note Beethoven ever wrote, plus his early sketches, and let it compose. The result debuted in Bonn to fanfare—and fell flat. Critics like Jan Swafford pegged it right: it mimicked Beethoven's style but lacked his fire. The notes aligned, but the soul didn't stir. Listeners craved the human behind the music—not just the sound, but the struggle and spark that made it real. AI could assemble; it couldn't inspire.

Where AI Shines, Where It Stalls

To get why this keeps happening, we need to peek under AI's hood—just enough to see its edges. Today's systems, like the large language models powering ChatGPT, are pattern machines. They're trained on mountains of text, images, or whatever you feed them, then predict what comes next based on stats and probabilities. Chess-playing AI doesn't “think” like a grandmaster—it calculates moves at a scale humans can't touch. Medical imaging AI doesn't “diagnose”—it flags oddities in X-rays faster than a radiologist's eye.

This is potent stuff. In 2023, a Stanford study found AI could spot pneumonia in chest scans with 92% accuracy, edging out human averages. Financial firms now use algorithms to sift through earnings calls and news feeds, catching signals

in seconds that once took analysts days. But here's the catch: these wins are narrow. The imaging AI can't ask a patient about symptoms or weigh their stress levels. The trading bot can't sense a CEO's bluff or predict a geopolitical curveball. They're tools—sharp, fast, tireless—but not minds.

Humans bring what AI can't: context, curiosity, agency. A doctor doesn't just read scans; she reads people—piecing together lifestyle, history, and gut hunches. A trader doesn't just crunch numbers; he reads the room—gauging fear, greed, or a rival's next move. AI lacks that “being-in-the-world” quality Martin Heidegger flagged in philosophy—our knack for living through experience, not just processing it. It's why a warehouse worker spots a glitch robots miss, or why an architect's wild sketch beats CAD's perfect lines.

This gap isn't a flaw to fix—it's a feature to harness. AI's best trick isn't autonomy; it's augmentation. Starbucks didn't axe baristas for robot brewers. In 2022, it rolled out AI to fine-tune inventory and staffing, cutting waste and wait times. Baristas got breathing room to chat with regulars, upsell pastries, build loyalty—the human stuff that drives profit. Sales climbed, not because machines took over, but because they cleared space for people to shine.

The Enhancement Edge: Real-World Proof

Let's widen the lens. In healthcare, AI's diagnostic chops are transforming clinics—but not by sidelining doctors. At Mount Sinai in New York, AI systems now screen mammograms, catching tumors radiologists might overlook. Yet the final call stays human. Why? Because patients don't just need a scan—they need a conversation, a plan, someone to trust. A 2023 trial showed AI-assisted doctors caught 20% more cancers than AI or humans alone. The combo wins, not the machine solo.

1 *The False Binary: Why AI Won't Replace Human Work*

In logistics, UPS leaned on AI to optimize delivery routes, slashing fuel costs by millions in 2022. Drivers didn't vanish—they adapted, handling quirks like gated estates or rush-hour snarls the algorithm couldn't predict. The tech shaved miles; humans kept it real. Creative fields follow suit. Pixar's artists use AI to render scenes at breakneck speed, but the storyboards—the heart of every film—stay hand-drawn by humans chasing a vision machines can't dream up.

Even language translation, where AI's made huge strides, leans on this dance. Google Translate can churn through 100 languages, but for legal contracts or poetry, human linguists step in. A 2023 study pitted AI against pros on French-to-English novels; the AI nailed grammar but flubbed idioms and tone. Humans caught the culture—AI just caught the words.

Reframing the Future

So why do we keep buying the replacement myth? Partly, it's the dazzle—AI's feats feel like magic, so we assume it's boundless. Partly, it's fear—disruption's real, and jobs *will* shift. But history whispers a steadier truth: tech amplifies us when we wield it right. The ATM didn't kill tellers; it multiplied branches. CAD didn't end architects; it fueled bolder buildings. AI won't erase work—it'll reshape it, pushing us toward what machines can't touch: judgment, empathy, imagination.

This isn't blind optimism. Disruption's coming—some roles, like data entry or rote coding, might shrink fast. But new ones will sprout, just as web design boomed after the internet hit. The trick is seeing AI as a partner, not a rival. Businesses chasing full automation might cut costs short-term, but the real winners—like Starbucks or Mount Sinai—are betting on enhancement. They're asking: *How do we supercharge our people?* Not: *How do we swap them out?*

For investors, this flips the script. Forget betting on AI to usurp humans—look for firms pairing tech with talent. For workers, it’s about leaning into what AI can’t do—solving the “what” while it handles the “how.” For policymakers, it’s crafting rules that keep humans in the driver’s seat, not the backseat.

The chapters ahead dig deeper. We’ll unpack AI’s guts (Chapter 2), spotlight what humans uniquely bring (Chapter 3), and map how this plays out across industries (Chapters 5–9). But the thread starts here: the future isn’t AI alone—it’s us, enhanced. That’s not a guess. It’s what the evidence, from ATMs to algorithms, keeps shouting.

The Current Thing

ChatGPT’s 2022 debut lit a match under AI hype. Suddenly, everyone had a taste—students cheating essays, coders auto-fixing bugs, execs dreaming of leaner payrolls. Stock tickers glowed green; pundits split between rapture and dread. But peel back the buzz, and the pattern’s familiar. At a Midwest ad agency, an AI tool churned out taglines in 2023—snappy, sure, but clients balked. They wanted ideas that *felt* human, not just sounded clever. The agency didn’t ditch copywriters; it paired them with AI to brainstorm faster, then refine with soul.

That’s the real story unfolding—not replacement, but retooling. AI’s rewriting the “how” of work, not the “why” or “what.” The firms getting it—like that agency, or UPS, or Pixar—aren’t automating people away. They’re amplifying what makes us irreplaceable. The rest of this book shows how.

2 Inside the Black Box: Understanding What AI Actually Does

Demystifying AI's capabilities and limitations from an implementer's perspective

2.1 The Emperor's New Statistics

Artificial intelligence is a broad field which long-time researchers often jokingly define as “anything computers can’t do yet.” From early grammar checkers to chess to facial recognition, many features that are now routine were once considered AI. No doubt the same will eventually be said of the new generation of large language models (LLMs), the more precise term to describe the impressive new tools that include ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini.

Under the hood, these systems are less magical than they first appear. Today’s LLMs are based on a straightforward application of an optimization algorithm called Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) invented by Google researchers

2 Inside the Black Box: Understanding What AI Actually Does

in 2017. While the implementation details involve complex mathematics, the core concept is surprisingly simple: predict what words are most likely to come next in a sequence based on patterns observed in vast amounts of text.

You can think of LLMs as massively optimized and expanded versions of the auto-complete feature your smartphone has offered for years. Instead of proposing the next word or two, these models can generate full sentences, paragraphs, books, and on and on without limit. Their power comes from the GPT optimization that lets them take advantage of the massively-parallel architecture of graphic processing units (GPUs). Just as a graphical image can be broken into smaller pixels, each manipulated in parallel, LLMs break text documents into characters (or “tokens”) that are processed simultaneously within the GPU.

The result is an impressive pattern-matching system that can mimic human-written text with remarkable fidelity—but without the understanding that underlies human communication. When ChatGPT writes a paragraph that sounds like Ernest Hemingway, it’s not channeling Hemingway’s artistic vision or life experiences. It’s generating text based on statistical patterns it observed in Hemingway’s writing and similar texts. The model has no concept of fishing, bullfighting, war, or any other experiences that shaped Hemingway’s distinctive voice. It’s merely producing words that, statistically speaking, are likely to follow one another in a Hemingway-like manner.

2.2 One-Way Streets: The Critical Limitation of LLMs

The GPT algorithm has one critical limitation that explains many of its failures: once set in motion, it cannot backtrack. Humans plan ahead, weigh different scenarios, and can change their minds based on foreseen alternatives. GPTs can only fake this planning ability through their access to mountains of data where such alternatives have already been explored.

Consider how you would solve a Sudoku puzzle. You might place a number in a cell, then work through several more cells before realizing your initial choice led to a contradiction. No problem—you backtrack, erase the number, and try a different approach. This recursive thinking process is fundamental to human problem-solving. But LLMs cannot do this. They generate text one token at a time, with no ability to revise earlier decisions based on later realizations.

This limitation explains why LLMs struggle with tasks that humans find relatively straightforward. They cannot do Sudoku, or handle chess positions not covered in their training data. Similarly, although they may appear to evaluate potential investment scenarios, they are merely generating plausible-sounding text based on patterns they've observed in financial discussions. They cannot truly consider alternative futures or change their analysis midstream.

This lack of genuine reasoning capability is why it would be wise to take AI predictions with considerable caution. Because they have no concept of imagining how a future situation might change current plans, they cannot truly engage in the kind of counterfactual thinking that underpins human judgment.

2.3 Inside the Training Process

LLMs are models that compress vast amounts of human knowledge—written, spoken, images, video—into a format that can generate similar-seeming content when given a starting prompt. Although the final models themselves are small enough to fit on a laptop or smartphone, they are created through a training process that consumes massive amounts of data—virtually everything on the public internet, plus collections of text from millions of books, magazines, academic journals, patent filings, and anything else their creators can find.

Thanks to the clever, time-saving shortcut discovered in the 2017 GPT algorithm, key parts of the training happen in parallel, limited only by the number of GPUs available. It is this optimization that explains the mad rush to buy GPUs, the chief beneficiary of which is Nvidia, thanks to its decades-long leadership in these fast processors. Although Nvidia chips were originally designed for fast graphics, their wide adoption means that many engineers are well-acquainted with CUDA (Compute Unified Device Architecture), the low-level graphics programming software that powers Nvidia devices. When designing the various implementations of GPT, it was natural for developers to optimize for CUDA, further cementing Nvidia's lead.

Once trained, the LLM is a statistical prediction engine that knows the most likely word, phrase, or paragraphs that follow any given input. It knows, for example, that the phrase “Mary had a little” is highly likely to be followed by “lamb” or even the entire phrase “Its fleece was white as snow.” It will apply the same statistical completion algorithm to any snippet of text, including those that look like questions, where the most likely

2.4 What Does the Training Data Include?

“completion” is the answer to the question. The statistically most likely way to complete the phrase “what is $1 + 1$?” is “2.”

The final LLM consists of billions of “parameters,” finely-tuned statistical values created during the training process. But generating the response to your input requires similar levels of prodigious machine power. In fact, every character you type into the ChatGPT input box, as well as every character it types back, goes through many billions of computations. That slight delay you see as each character comes back at your terminal is not a clever UX (user experience) effect intended to appear like a human is typing the answer. In fact, the characters come out slowly because of the untold levels of computing power required to generate each one of them. Multiply this by the many millions of simultaneous ChatGPT users and you can understand why state-of-the-art LLMs are phenomenally expensive to operate.

2.4 What Does the Training Data Include?

The datasets used to train LLMs are enormous and diverse. OpenAI’s GPT-4, for example, was trained on hundreds of billions of words, including:

- The vast majority of the public internet, including websites, forums, and social media
- Millions of books, from classic literature to modern non-fiction
- Scientific papers and academic journals
- Code repositories and technical documentation
- News articles and government documents

2 Inside the Black Box: Understanding What AI Actually Does

This massive corpus allows the model to encounter language used in countless contexts, enabling it to generate text that mimics a wide range of styles and domains. However, this approach also has significant limitations. The training data inevitably contains biases, inaccuracies, and outdated information that get encoded into the model's parameters. And because the model has no understanding of the content—only statistical patterns—it cannot distinguish between reliable sources and misinformation.

Furthermore, while the model's training data is vast, it's still finite and frozen at a specific point in time. This creates what's called a "knowledge cutoff"—a date beyond which the model has no information. Any developments, events, or publications after this date are completely unknown to the model unless specifically provided in the conversation.

2.5 Models Learning from Models: The Recursive Training Problem




Figure 2.1: ChatGPT is trained on vast text sources, a distillation of most human knowledge.

2.5 Models Learning from Models: The Recursive Training Problem

An increasingly troubling issue is the growing proportion of AI-generated content on the internet. As LLMs produce more and more text that gets published online, newer models are increasingly training on outputs from older models

rather than authentic human expression. This creates a recursive problem—models learning from models learning from models—potentially amplifying biases and errors with each generation.

Researcher Ilia Shumailov at the University of Cambridge calls this phenomenon “the curse of recursion,” and it presents a fundamental challenge to the current approach of training AI on internet data. As AI-generated content proliferates, distinguishing authentic human expression from synthetic text becomes increasingly difficult. This recursion problem potentially undermines the very foundation of LLM training by gradually diluting the human element in the training data.

2.6 Beyond Text Completion: Fine-Tuning for Specific Tasks

While base LLMs are essentially sophisticated text prediction engines, they can be adapted for specific purposes through a process called fine-tuning. This involves additional training on specialized datasets with human feedback to optimize the model for particular tasks or to align its outputs with human values.

For example, the base GPT model might generate toxic or harmful content if that’s what the statistical patterns in its training data suggest. To address this, OpenAI and other companies employ techniques like RLHF (Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback), where human evaluators rate different model outputs, and these ratings are used to further train the model to produce more helpful, harmless, and honest responses.

This fine-tuning process represents a crucial point of human intervention in the AI pipeline. The values and judgments of

the human evaluators directly shape what kinds of responses the model will prioritize. However, this process also introduces new challenges, including the potential for evaluator biases to become magnified in the model's behavior and the difficulty of clearly defining concepts like “helpful” or “harmful” across diverse cultural contexts.

2.7 What AI Can't Do: The Limitations That Matter

Understanding what LLMs cannot do is as important as appreciating what they can do. Despite their impressive capabilities, today's AI systems have several fundamental limitations:

1. **No Understanding or Consciousness:** LLMs process patterns without understanding meaning. They have no consciousness, beliefs, desires, or intentions. They cannot truly understand concepts like justice, beauty, or truth—they can only mimic how humans talk about these concepts.
2. **No Backtracking or Planning:** As mentioned earlier, LLMs cannot revise earlier parts of their generation based on later realizations. They cannot truly plan ahead or engage in the kind of recursive thinking that humans employ naturally.
3. **No Reality Grounding:** LLMs have no direct access to physical reality. Their knowledge comes entirely from text and images in their training data, not from embodied experience in the world. They cannot verify facts against reality, only against patterns in their training data.

4. **No Self-Improvement:** While LLMs can be updated by their creators, they cannot improve themselves through experience. Each interaction is essentially fresh—the model doesn’t learn from its mistakes or successes across conversations.
5. **No Originality:** LLMs can combine and recombine elements from their training data in new ways, but they cannot create truly original concepts. They are fundamentally derivative, limited by what they’ve seen before.

These limitations explain why LLMs, despite their impressive text generation capabilities, fail at tasks requiring genuine understanding, counterfactual reasoning, or creative leaps beyond their training data.

2.8 The Human Element: What We Bring That AI Can’t Replace

The limitations of LLMs highlight precisely what makes human intelligence distinctive and valuable. When we generate language, solve problems, or make decisions, we do far more than pattern matching. We understand the world through embodied experience, can plan recursively, and can imagine counterfactual scenarios. We can backtrack, revise our thinking, and make creative leaps beyond what we’ve previously encountered.

Consider how a skilled financial analyst evaluates an investment opportunity. They don’t simply pattern-match against previous investments; they consider unique aspects of the current situation, imagine various future scenarios, and continuously revise

2.9 The Balance: Where Humans and AI Excel

their analysis as new information emerges. They bring judgment based on embodied experience in the world—something no LLM can replicate.

This is why the most effective applications of AI don't attempt to replace human judgment but rather to enhance it. When AI handles the pattern-matching tasks it excels at, humans are freed to focus on the aspects of work that require judgment, creativity, and understanding.

2.9 The Balance: Where Humans and AI Excel

The most successful implementations of AI technology recognize the complementary strengths of humans and machines. AI demonstrates remarkable capability in processing vast amounts of data quickly and identifying patterns across large datasets that would overwhelm human attention. It excels in generating content based on statistical regularities, performing repetitive tasks with unwavering consistency, and operating continuously without the fatigue that limits human performance.

Humans, meanwhile, bring fundamentally different strengths to the table. We understand context and meaning in ways that transcend statistical correlation. We make ethical judgments that require balancing competing values and considering impacts that may not be quantifiable. Our ability to think recursively and counterfactually—to imagine “what if” scenarios and revise our thinking—allows us to navigate novel situations with a flexibility that AI cannot match. Perhaps most importantly, humans can create truly novel concepts and approaches, and

adapt to unprecedented situations by drawing on embodied experience and cross-domain knowledge.

By designing systems that leverage these complementary capabilities, organizations can achieve outcomes superior to what either humans or AI could accomplish alone. A human financial analyst with AI assistance, for instance, can process market data at unprecedented scale while maintaining the judgment needed to contextualize that data within broader economic and political realities. This synergy of human and artificial intelligence is the essence of the enhancement thesis we explore throughout this book.

2.10 The Implications: Why This Matters

Understanding what AI actually does—and what it doesn't do—has profound implications for how we implement these technologies in business and society. When we recognize that LLMs are essentially sophisticated pattern-matching systems rather than genuinely intelligent entities, we can make more informed decisions about where and how to apply them.

This understanding helps explain why purely automated approaches often disappoint, while enhancement approaches succeed. Automated systems that attempt to replace human judgment entirely run up against the fundamental limitations of pattern matching. Enhancement approaches that combine AI's computational power with human judgment and creativity can deliver superior results.

For investors, this insight suggests focusing on companies that understand the complementary nature of human and artificial intelligence rather than those promising full automation. For

business leaders, it means designing implementation strategies that augment rather than replace human capabilities. And for workers, it means developing the distinctively human skills that AI cannot replicate.

2.11 Where We Go From Here

As AI technologies continue to advance, the boundary between what they can and cannot do will shift. Future systems will likely overcome some of the limitations we've discussed, potentially enabling more sophisticated reasoning and planning. However, the fundamental distinction between statistical pattern matching and genuine understanding remains, and with it, the continued importance of human judgment.

In the chapters ahead, we'll explore how this understanding of AI's capabilities and limitations translates into practical implementation strategies across industries. We'll examine the "what versus how" distinction that guides effective human-AI collaboration, the philosophical dimensions of human judgment, and the investment implications of the enhancement thesis.

By grounding our approach in a clear-eyed understanding of what AI actually does, we can move beyond both the hype and the fear to develop strategies that truly enhance human capabilities rather than attempting to replace them.

3 The What-How Divide

AI's Real Impact on Knowledge Work

Until recently, career success in knowledge work depended heavily on mastering “how” skills - knowing how to build a compelling PowerPoint, how to structure a financial model, or how to write efficient code. But as AI systems become more capable at these technical tasks, the competitive advantage is shifting dramatically toward people who know “what” needs to be done - those who can identify the right problems to solve and strategies to pursue.

This fundamental shift from “how” to “what” has profound implications for businesses, careers, and investment opportunities. Let's explore why this transformation is happening and what it means for different stakeholders.

3.1 The Traditional “How” Advantage

Traditionally, organizations needed large teams of specialists who knew “how” to perform various technical tasks:

- Financial analysts who knew how to build complex Excel models

3 The What-How Divide

- Software engineers who knew how to write code in specific languages
- Designers who knew how to use tools like Photoshop
- Writers who knew how to craft clear technical documentation
- Translators who knew how to convert text between languages

These specialists developed their skills through years of practice and training. Their expertise created both job security and earning power - companies were willing to pay premium salaries for people who could execute complex technical tasks effectively.

3.2 AI's Disruption of "How"

Large language models and other AI tools are rapidly getting better at many of these "how" tasks:

- ChatGPT can write basic code in multiple languages
- Midjourney can generate sophisticated images
- Translation tools are approaching human-level quality
- AI assistants can create presentations and documentation

This capability is expanding quickly. Tasks that seemed immune to automation just a few years ago are now being handled competently by AI systems. And unlike human specialists who may take years to master new skills, AI systems can be rapidly retrained or fine-tuned for new capabilities.

3.3 The Rise of “What” Skills

As AI handles more of the “how,” competitive advantage shifts to people who excel at determining “what” needs to be done:

- What problems are worth solving?
- What features should a product include?
- What markets should a company enter?
- What strategies will create sustainable advantages?
- What metrics matter most for success?

These “what” decisions require capabilities that current AI systems fundamentally lack:

Pattern Recognition Across Domains Humans can notice subtle patterns and draw insights across seemingly unrelated fields. A business leader might see parallels between consumer behavior in fashion and trends in enterprise software, leading to novel strategic insights. Current AI systems, despite their broad training, struggle to make these creative connections in meaningful ways.

Judgment Under Uncertainty Many crucial business decisions involve incomplete information and conflicting priorities. Experienced leaders develop judgment about which risks are worth taking and which tradeoffs make sense. This type of judgment emerges from years of seeing both successes and failures firsthand - something AI systems cannot truly replicate.

Understanding Human Context Success in business ultimately depends on understanding human needs, motivations, and behaviors. While AI can process vast amounts of data about human behavior, it lacks the innate understanding that comes from being human and experiencing the full range of human emotions and social dynamics.

3.4 Real-World Examples

Let's look at some specific examples of how this “what vs. how” divide plays out:

3.4.1 ChatGPT and Chess: The What vs. How Divide

ChatGPT excels at the “how” aspects of chess. It can explain rules with precise clarity, describe tactical motifs like forks and pins, recommend standard opening principles, and even execute move sequences when prompted. This “how” capability stems from its training on countless chess books, articles, and game annotations, allowing it to mimic the instructional patterns of chess literature.

Where ChatGPT fundamentally falls short is in the “what” domain of chess. It cannot determine what strategic approach makes sense in a complex position, what long-term plan to pursue, or what the most critical elements of a position are. Even more fundamentally, ChatGPT cannot decide what it means to “play chess well” in the first place.

Consider a simple example: in a given position, should a player sacrifice material for an attack? This decision requires weighing potential attacking chances against concrete defensive resources - a judgment that integrates evaluation of multiple possible futures. ChatGPT can explain how sacrifices work in general, but cannot reliably determine what sacrifice (if any) is appropriate in a specific complex position.

Even more telling is ChatGPT's inability to set appropriate chess goals. A human must instruct the AI to “find checkmate in two moves” or “evaluate this position” or “recommend

3.4 Real-World Examples

an opening for a beginner.” The AI cannot independently determine what chess problems are worth solving or what chess knowledge would benefit a particular player. It lacks the purposeful orientation that human players naturally bring to the game.

This mirrors the broader pattern we’ve observed across domains. AI systems like ChatGPT handle the mechanics - the “how” - with impressive competence. But they remain tools awaiting human direction regarding “what” goals to pursue, “what” problems need solving, and “what” considerations matter most in any given context.

For chess learners, this creates an interesting dynamic. ChatGPT can serve as an always-available resource for understanding “how” chess pieces move, “how” to execute basic tactics, and “how” traditional openings proceed. But determining “what” to study, “what” skills to prioritize, and “what” strategic approaches align with one’s strengths - these remain distinctly human judgments that no current AI can meaningfully address.

The limitations become even more apparent in competitive contexts. Strong human players know that chess is not merely about following rules and recognizing patterns - it’s about making judgments under uncertainty, having a coherent vision of how the game should develop, and understanding which factors deserve attention in ambiguous positions. These “what” decisions remain beyond ChatGPT’s capabilities, even as it continues to improve at describing “how” chess concepts work in isolation.

As AI capabilities advance, this fundamental divide persists. The most valuable human contribution isn’t executing the mechanical aspects of chess, but rather making the judgment

3 The What-How Divide

calls about what matters, what deserves attention, and what goals are worth pursuing in the first place.

3.4.2 Book-Writing: When Bulldozers Move Words

What's the value of traditional books when ChatGPT can generate coherent answers to any question?

A good analogy is with construction projects. Like bulldozers that efficiently move earth, AI can rapidly generate vast quantities of coherent text. But just as construction requires both heavy machinery and skilled artisans, meaningful books need both AI's raw productive power and human refinement.

However, a well-crafted book offers something different: a carefully structured approach that helps readers decide their level of engagement. The finite, constrained nature of a book provides focus that chatbots, with their endless potential for digression, cannot easily match.

The key to understanding AI's role in authorship lies in recognizing the distinct phases of book creation.

1. The initial phase - deciding subject matter and scope, aka the "what" phase — remains fundamentally human. While AI can help brainstorm ideas or identify underexplored topics, the essential creative spark and purpose must come from human intention. This reflects a broader truth about AI: it excels at processing existing patterns but struggles to generate truly novel directions.
2. The next phase — outlining the subject into smaller, related topics that make a coherent whole — demonstrates the potential for human-AI collaboration. AI can quickly generate comprehensive topic structures, but human

3.4 Real-World Examples

expertise is crucial for identifying gaps, inconsistencies, or areas requiring special emphasis. This interplay between AI's broad pattern recognition and human domain knowledge creates stronger frameworks than either could achieve alone.

3. The writing phase is where AI's "bulldozer" capabilities shine. Instead of laboriously crafting individual sentences, authors can use AI to generate substantial blocks of coherent text. This dramatically accelerates the initial draft process. However, like rough-graded earth, this AI-generated text requires careful refinement to achieve its final form.
4. The refinement phase is where human judgment becomes paramount. Authors must shape the AI-generated content to maintain consistent voice, ensure logical flow, and preserve the book's core purpose. This requires understanding nuances of audience expectations and subject matter that current AI systems cannot fully grasp.

This iterative process of generation and refinement continues until the project achieves its goals - another judgment that requires human evaluation. The result is neither purely AI-generated nor traditionally human-authored, but rather a new form of hybrid creativity that leverages the strengths of both.

The role of books may evolve, but their fundamental purpose - to present structured, focused exploration of subjects - will always be valuable. The challenge for authors is not to compete with AI's raw generative capabilities, but to use them effectively while maintaining the human elements that give books their lasting value.

This suggests a future where successful authors are those who master the art of AI collaboration rather than resist it. Just

3 The What-How Divide

as modern architects must understand both traditional design principles and computer-aided tools, tomorrow's authors will need to balance classic writing skills with AI capabilities.

The key question is no longer whether AI will replace human authors, but how it will transform the authorship process. The answer lies in recognizing that while AI can move mountains of words, humans must still decide which mountains to move and how to shape the resulting landscape.

This transformation parallels broader changes in knowledge work. As AI handles more routine cognitive tasks, human value increasingly derives from higher-order skills like judgment, creativity, and strategic thinking. The greatest rewards of authorship, as in many professional fields, will accrue to those who can effectively combine human insight with AI capabilities.

The rise of AI authors doesn't diminish the value of books but rather changes how they're created. The essential human elements - purpose, judgment, refinement - remain crucial, even as AI dramatically expands our capability to generate and process information. The result may be not just better books, but new forms of knowledge sharing that we're only beginning to imagine.

3.5 More examples

3.5.1 Software Development: Beyond Code Generation

The construction industry provides useful analogies for understanding AI's impact on software development. Just as modern

3.5 More examples

construction sites use both automated machinery and skilled human workers, software development is evolving into a hybrid process where AI handles routine coding tasks while humans focus on architecture and design decisions.

Consider a typical software project. Traditional development required writing every line of code manually, like building a house brick by brick. Now, AI coding assistants like GitHub Copilot or Amazon CodeWhisperer can generate entire functions or modules automatically, similar to how prefabricated components accelerated construction. These AI tools excel at producing standard elements - authentication systems, database queries, API endpoints - just as manufacturing automation excels at producing standardized building materials.

However, like construction projects, software development involves more than assembling standard components. A successful project requires understanding user needs, designing intuitive interfaces, ensuring security, and maintaining long-term reliability. These higher-level decisions remain firmly in human territory.

The architectural parallel is particularly apt. Just as architects must consider aesthetics, functionality, and structural integrity, software architects must balance user experience, system performance, and code maintainability. AI can suggest implementation details, but it cannot determine whether a feature aligns with business goals or how it might affect user behavior.

Technical debt offers another illuminating comparison. In construction, taking shortcuts (like using lower-grade materials) can speed completion but creates future maintenance problems. Similarly, in software development, quick fixes and temporary solutions accumulate as technical debt. While AI can identify potential debt and suggest refactoring strategies,

3 The What-How Divide

humans must weigh the business tradeoffs of addressing it now versus later.

Integration challenges further highlight AI's limitations. Modern software systems are complex ecosystems of interacting components, like cities with interconnected infrastructure systems. AI excels at optimizing individual components but struggles to understand system-wide implications. Humans must orchestrate these interactions, ensuring different parts work together coherently while maintaining system reliability and performance.

Security considerations demonstrate another crucial human role. Like building security systems, software security requires anticipating potential threats and implementing appropriate protections. AI can identify common vulnerabilities and suggest fixes, but it cannot understand the broader security context or evaluate risk tradeoffs. These decisions require human judgment informed by business context and threat assessment.

The testing and quality assurance phase reveals both AI's strengths and limitations. AI tools can automatically generate test cases and identify potential bugs, similar to automated building inspections. However, human testers are still essential for evaluating user experience, identifying edge cases, and ensuring the software meets business requirements. AI can verify that code works as written, but humans must verify it works as intended.

Looking ahead, successful software development will likely become increasingly collaborative between humans and AI. Development teams will need to master new workflows that leverage AI's capabilities while maintaining human oversight of critical

3.5 More examples

decisions. This might involve using AI for initial code generation and routine maintenance while focusing human effort on architecture, security, and user experience.

This evolution parallels broader trends in professional work. Just as power tools didn't eliminate the need for skilled carpenters but changed how they work, AI won't eliminate software developers but will transform their role. The most valuable developers will be those who can effectively direct AI tools while maintaining high-level system understanding.

The implications for software education and training are significant. Future developers will need less emphasis on memorizing syntax and more focus on system design, architecture, and AI collaboration skills. This mirrors how modern architectural education focuses less on manual drafting and more on design principles and computer-aided tools.

However, the fundamental role of human creativity and judgment remains unchanged. Just as beautiful buildings require human vision despite advanced construction technology, great software requires human insight despite sophisticated AI tools. The key is understanding AI as an enabler of human creativity rather than its replacement. AI working alone can be competent at creating an adequate building that meets the programmatic requirements laid out by its developers, but a truly great building will still require human input and humans' ability to push the frontier of creativity.

This suggests that software development is entering a new phase where success depends on effectively combining AI capabilities with human insight. Here again, the best outcomes will result from humans' ability to leverage AI. The winners will be those who can best envision how technology can serve

3 The What-How Divide

human needs while using AI to implement that vision efficiently and reliably.

In this new paradigm, the measure of a developer shifts from lines of code written to the effectiveness of their human-AI collaboration in creating valuable software solutions. The construction industry's evolution from manual labor to machine-assisted craftsmanship provides a roadmap for this transformation.

3.5.2 Investment Analysis: Beyond the Numbers

Just as modern factories use automation for routine manufacturing while relying on human expertise for product design and quality control, investment analysis is evolving into a hybrid process where AI handles data processing while humans focus on strategic insights and judgment calls.

Consider a typical investment analysis project. Traditionally, analysts spent countless hours gathering financial data, creating comparison spreadsheets, and writing preliminary reports. Now, AI can instantly process quarterly reports, generate peer comparisons, and draft initial analyses. This is similar to how automated assembly lines handle routine manufacturing tasks, freeing human workers to focus on complex problems requiring judgment and creativity.

However, like manufacturing, successful investing involves more than processing standard inputs. While AI excels at identifying patterns in financial statements and market data, it struggles with crucial qualitative factors. Can management be trusted? Is the company's competitive advantage sustainable? Will current market opportunities persist? These questions

3.5 More examples

require human judgment informed by experience and industry knowledge.

The manufacturing quality control parallel is particularly relevant. Just as experienced inspectors can spot subtle defects that automated systems miss, seasoned investors can identify red flags in management behavior or market dynamics that AI might overlook. A CEO's body language during earnings calls, the timing of insider stock sales, or subtle shifts in competitive dynamics - these nuanced signals often prove more valuable than quantitative metrics.

Competitive analysis offers another illuminating comparison. In manufacturing, understanding market dynamics requires more than analyzing production statistics - it requires insight into changing consumer preferences, emerging technologies, and competitor strategies. Similarly, while AI can process vast amounts of market data, humans must evaluate whether a company's competitive position is truly defensible and whether management's strategy aligns with market realities.

The role of trust highlights another crucial human element. Just as manufacturing partnerships require trust built through personal relationships and demonstrated reliability, investment success often depends on accurately assessing management credibility. AI can flag inconsistencies in financial statements or unusual transaction patterns, but it cannot evaluate character or judge whether explanations for apparent irregularities are credible.

Market opportunity assessment demonstrates similar limitations. Like evaluating new manufacturing technologies, assessing market opportunities requires understanding both technical capabilities and human behavior. AI can analyze historical market data and identify trends, but it cannot predict

3 The What-How Divide

how human customers, competitors, and regulators will react to new situations. These predictions require human insight into psychology and social dynamics.

Risk assessment reveals both AI's strengths and limitations. AI systems can quickly identify common risk factors and calculate standard metrics, similar to automated safety systems in manufacturing. However, the most significant risks often come from unexpected directions that don't appear in historical data. Human judgment remains essential for identifying and evaluating these non-obvious risks.

Looking ahead, successful investment analysis will likely become increasingly collaborative between humans and AI. Analysis teams will need to master new workflows that leverage AI's data processing capabilities while maintaining human oversight of critical judgments. This might involve using AI for initial screening and routine monitoring while focusing human effort on qualitative assessment and strategic thinking.

This evolution parallels broader trends in professional work. Automation did not eliminate the need for skilled manufacturing workers but changed their role, and AI will not eliminate investment analysts but will transform how they work. The most valuable analysts will be those who can effectively direct AI tools while maintaining deep industry understanding and judgment capabilities.

The implications for investment education and training are significant. Future analysts will need less emphasis on spreadsheet skills and more focus on business judgment and AI collaboration capabilities. This mirrors how modern manufacturing education focuses less on manual skills and more on process management and technology integration.

3.5 More examples

However, the fundamental role of human judgment remains unchanged. Just as quality manufacturing requires human oversight despite advanced automation, successful investing requires human insight despite sophisticated AI tools. The key is understanding AI as an enhancer of human judgment rather than its replacement.

This suggests that investment analysis is entering a new phase where success depends on effectively combining AI capabilities with human insight. Analysts who can best understand business fundamentals while using AI will perform better than those who can merely process data faster.

In this new paradigm, the measure of an analyst shifts from computational speed to the effectiveness of their human-AI collaboration in identifying truly attractive investments. The manufacturing industry's evolution from manual production to technology-enhanced craftsmanship provides a roadmap for this transformation.

3.5.3 AI and Healthcare: Beyond Pattern Recognition

The evolution of AI in healthcare parallels modern manufacturing quality control, where automated systems handle routine inspections while skilled technicians focus on complex problems requiring human judgment. Similarly, healthcare is becoming a hybrid system where AI processes medical data while human doctors focus on patient relationships and complex medical decisions.

Consider a typical diagnostic process. Traditionally, doctors spent considerable time reviewing test results, consulting medical literature, and documenting findings. Now, AI can instantly analyze lab results, medical images, and patient histories to

3 The What-How Divide

suggest potential diagnoses. This is similar to how automated inspection systems quickly identify defects in manufactured products, allowing human inspectors to focus on more complex quality issues.

However, like quality control, successful healthcare involves more than pattern recognition. While AI excels at identifying anomalies in test results and suggesting standard treatments, it struggles with crucial contextual factors. How will a patient's living situation affect treatment adherence? Which side effects are acceptable given a patient's lifestyle? What treatment modifications are needed given other health conditions? These questions require human judgment informed by direct patient interaction and medical experience.

The empathy factor is particularly relevant. Effective quality control requires understanding how products will be used in real-world conditions, and effective healthcare requires understanding patients' lives and concerns. AI can process medical histories and suggest treatment protocols, but it cannot truly empathize with patient fears or understand how cultural and personal factors might affect treatment success.

Treatment customization offers another illuminating comparison. In manufacturing, standard quality metrics must often be adjusted for specific use cases. Similarly, while AI can recommend standard treatments based on medical literature, doctors must adapt these recommendations to individual patient circumstances. A treatment protocol that looks optimal on paper might be impractical or inappropriate given a patient's specific situation.

The trust relationship highlights another crucial human element. In the same way that manufacturing quality depends on trust between suppliers and customers, healthcare outcomes

3.5 More examples

often depend on patient trust in their medical providers. AI can provide accurate medical information, but it cannot build the personal trust that encourages treatment compliance and honest symptom reporting.

Emergency response demonstrates both AI's strengths and limitations. AI systems can quickly process vital signs and suggest immediate interventions, similar to automated safety systems in manufacturing. However, emergency medicine often requires split-second decisions based on incomplete information and complex tradeoffs. Human judgment remains essential for these high-stakes decisions where standard protocols may not apply.

Looking ahead, successful healthcare will likely become increasingly collaborative between humans and AI. Medical teams will need to master new workflows that leverage AI's analytical capabilities while maintaining human oversight of critical decisions. This might involve using AI for initial screening and routine monitoring while focusing human effort on patient interaction and complex case management.

This evolution parallels broader trends in professional work. Automation did not eliminate the need for skilled quality control technicians but changed their role, and AI will not eliminate doctors but will transform how they work. The most valuable healthcare providers will be those who can effectively direct AI tools while maintaining strong patient relationships and clinical judgment.

The implications for medical education and training are significant. Future doctors will need less emphasis on memorizing medical facts and more focus on patient communication and AI collaboration skills. This mirrors how modern quality control

3 The What-How Divide

training focuses less on inspection procedures and more on system management and problem-solving.

However, the fundamental role of human judgment remains unchanged. Quality control requires human oversight despite advanced inspection technology, and healthcare requires human insight despite sophisticated AI tools. The key is understanding AI as an enhancer of medical judgment rather than its replacement.

This suggests that healthcare is entering a new phase where success depends on effectively combining AI capabilities with human insight. Those who can understand patient needs while using AI to enhance this understanding will reap more rewards than those who can merely recall the most medical facts and procedures.

In this new paradigm, the measure of a healthcare provider shifts from diagnostic speed to the effectiveness of their human-AI collaboration in achieving optimal patient outcomes. The quality control industry's evolution from manual inspection to technology-enhanced oversight provides a roadmap for this transformation.

The challenge ahead is not whether to adopt AI in healthcare, but how to integrate it while preserving the human elements that make medicine effective. Success will require understanding both AI's capabilities and its limitations, while never losing sight of healthcare's fundamental mission: helping human patients achieve better health outcomes through personalized, compassionate care.

3.6 Investment Implications

This shift has important implications for investors:

Winners:

- Companies that help humans make better “what” decisions
- Tools that augment human judgment rather than replace it
- Platforms that combine AI capabilities with human insight
- Businesses with strong human judgment at their core

Losers:

- Pure automation plays that don’t preserve human judgment
- Companies selling commoditized “how” skills
- Businesses that can’t articulate their human advantage

3.7 The Future of Work

This transition suggests several changes in how organizations will operate:

New Organizational Structures

- Flatter hierarchies as AI handles routine coordination
- Smaller, more senior teams focused on “what” decisions
- Greater emphasis on judgment and strategic thinking

Changed Skill Requirements

3 The What-How Divide

- Less focus on technical tool proficiency
- More emphasis on strategic thinking and judgment
- Greater value placed on cross-domain knowledge

Modified Training Approaches

- Reduced time spent teaching technical “how” skills
- Increased focus on judgment development
- More emphasis on understanding human factors

3.8 Preparing for the Transition

For individuals and organizations looking to succeed in this new environment, several approaches make sense:

For Individuals:

- Focus on developing judgment through varied experiences
- Build broad knowledge across multiple domains
- Practice making and learning from strategic decisions
- Get comfortable with ambiguity and uncertainty

For Organizations:

- Invest in tools that augment human judgment
- Develop processes that capture and share strategic insights - Create cultures that value and develop good judgment
- Build teams with diverse perspectives and experiences

3.8.1 The Human Element Remains Central

It's crucial to remember that this shift doesn't diminish the importance of human contribution - it actually elevates it. As AI handles more routine tasks, human judgment, creativity, and wisdom become more valuable, not less.

Consider the example of chess: Despite AI systems being able to beat any human player, human chess hasn't disappeared. Instead, it's evolved. The most interesting matches now involve human-AI collaboration, where success depends on humans knowing what positions to play for and when to trust or override AI suggestions.

This pattern will likely repeat across many fields - the key to success will be understanding what humans do best and creating systems that augment these capabilities rather than try to replace them.

3.9 Looking Ahead

The transition from "how" to "what" won't happen overnight, but it's already underway. Organizations and individuals that recognize and adapt to this shift will have significant advantages. Those that continue to focus primarily on "how" skills risk finding their capabilities increasingly commoditized by AI.

This shift also suggests we need to rethink education and training. Rather than focusing primarily on teaching technical skills that AI might soon handle, we should emphasize developing judgment, creativity, and strategic thinking - the fundamentally human capabilities that will become increasingly valuable.

3 *The What-How Divide*

The future belongs not to those who can execute tasks most efficiently, but to those who can best decide what tasks are worth doing in the first place.

In the early days of the personal computer revolution, spreadsheet software transformed financial analysis. Critics warned that tools like VisiCalc and Lotus 1-2-3 would eliminate financial analysts by automating their calculations. Instead, these tools dramatically increased productivity while shifting analysts' focus from mathematical computation to business insight. Today's artificial intelligence is driving a similar transformation, but at a far greater scale and across virtually every knowledge-based profession.

3.10 Beyond the False Binary

The current discourse on AI's impact falls into a tiresome and inaccurate binary: either AI will replace human workers entirely, or its effects will be marginal. Both narratives miss the fundamental transformation underway. What we're witnessing is not wholesale replacement but a profound shift in the nature of human contribution—a redistribution of value across the knowledge work spectrum that redefines which human capabilities command a premium.

This transformation becomes apparent when we distinguish between two fundamental aspects of any intellectual task: determining *what* needs to be done versus executing *how* to do it. This distinction, while seemingly straightforward, carries profound implications for the future of work, business strategy, and investment that extend far beyond the simplistic replacement narrative dominating public discourse.

3.10 Beyond the False Binary




Figure 3.1: What-How Matrix

3 *The What-How Divide*

The what-how framework offers remarkable clarity amid the confusing narratives surrounding AI. It helps explain why certain cognitive tasks are rapidly becoming commoditized while others remain stubbornly resistant to automation. More importantly, it provides a roadmap for individuals, organizations, and policymakers navigating a landscape where artificial intelligence increasingly pervades knowledge work.

Until the arrival of generative AI, individuals gained professional advantages through superior “how” skills—they excelled at crafting compelling presentations, building complex spreadsheets, writing efficient code, or translating between languages. These implementation abilities represented valuable skills that could be developed and applied on behalf of those who determined *what* needed to be done.

In traditional organizational hierarchies, executives and managers typically decide *what* initiatives to pursue, while specialized knowledge workers determine *how* to execute them. This division has historically functioned efficiently because *how* expertise—whether in financial modeling, software development, or content creation—required significant investment in learning specialized tools and methodologies.

The emergence of sophisticated AI systems fundamentally alters this equation. Large language models demonstrate remarkable proficiency in implementation tasks, often exceeding human capabilities in narrow domains. They can generate code, compose business communications, create visual assets, and perform complex analyses with minimal human guidance. These systems excel precisely in the domain of *how*—the execution of well-defined tasks within established parameters.

What these systems cannot do—and what remains uniquely

3.11 Philosophical Dimensions of the Divide

human—is determine *what* is worth doing in the first place. They cannot independently identify which problems merit attention, which strategies align with organizational values, or which approaches will resonate with stakeholders. They lack the contextual understanding, ethical framework, and strategic vision required to make these determinations.

As noted already, the financial analyst traditionally created value from technical modeling skills. As AI systems increasingly automate complex financial calculations, the analyst's competitive advantage shifts toward identifying which factors merit analysis, which comparisons yield strategic insights, and how findings translate into investment decisions. The technical implementation—the *how*—becomes commoditized, while judgment about *what* to analyze becomes the primary value driver.

This pattern repeats across knowledge work domains. In marketing, AI can generate endless variations of campaign materials, but cannot determine which messaging will align with brand values and audience expectations. In software development, AI can produce functional code based on specifications but cannot identify which features will deliver genuine user value. In healthcare, AI can analyze diagnostic images with remarkable accuracy but cannot integrate these findings with the full context of patient well-being.

3.11 Philosophical Dimensions of the Divide

The what-how divide resonates with deeper philosophical questions about the nature of intelligence and agency. Martin Heidegger, whose work we explore more fully in Chapter 4, offers particularly relevant insights through his concept of

3 *The What-How Divide*

“comportments”—the way humans face and engage with the world around them.

When we are deeply engaged in an activity—skillfully driving a car, playing an instrument, or writing code—we are not consciously thinking about the mechanics of these actions. Our focus extends beyond the immediate task to its purpose and meaning within our broader existence. The ultimate comportment, Heidegger suggests, is our orientation toward being itself, which encompasses our understanding of past, present, and future.

Artificial intelligence systems, even sophisticated ones like GPT-4 or Claude, lack these comportments. They process information without any inherent purpose or temporal orientation. They can mimic human-like outputs but have no concept of why these outputs matter or how they fit into broader human concerns. This philosophical distinction manifests practically in AI’s inability to determine *what* is worth doing independent of human direction.

The what-how divide thus represents more than a practical delineation of tasks; it reflects a fundamental distinction between human and artificial intelligence. While AI excels at executing well-defined processes—the *how*—it cannot engage with the existential questions of purpose and meaning that inform human decisions about *what* deserves attention.

This philosophical perspective helps explain why LLMs struggle with certain seemingly simple tasks, as we demonstrated in prior chapters. Tasks that require constant re-evaluation and adjustment based on evolving goals—like writing a sentence that accurately describes its own length or completing a Sudoku puzzle—reveal the fundamental limitations of systems that cannot backtrack or reconsider their approach once they’ve begun generating outputs.

3.12 Case Studies: The Divide in Practice

To illustrate the what-how divide, let's examine several domains where this transformation is particularly evident:

3.12.1 Software Development

Traditional programming expertise focused heavily on implementation details—mastering specific languages, frameworks, and architectural patterns. While these technical skills remain valuable, AI code generation tools increasingly automate routine implementation tasks. The premium shifts toward determining which features will deliver value, how systems should interact with users, and what architectural decisions will support long-term business objectives.

Senior developers report that junior programmers who once spent years mastering syntax and debugging techniques now leverage AI assistants to handle these aspects, allowing them to focus earlier in their careers on higher-level system design and user experience considerations—traditionally the domain of more experienced developers.

This shift alters the career progression trajectory for software engineers. Technical implementation skills remain necessary but insufficient; they must be paired with strategic judgment about what deserves implementation in the first place. Engineers who maintain purely technical focus without developing this broader perspective may find their competitive position eroding as AI systems increasingly automate routine coding tasks.

3.12.2 Content Creation

In media and marketing, AI systems now generate remarkably coherent and stylistically appropriate content at scale. The limiting factor is no longer production capacity but strategic direction—determining which messages will resonate with target audiences, which topics deserve attention, and how content aligns with broader brand narratives.

Marketing executives evaluating AI writing assistants frequently report that while these tools can “automatically compose email replies,” users typically spend as much time editing these drafts as they would creating responses from scratch. The real value emerges when humans with deep customer knowledge direct these tools toward specific strategic objectives.

This transformation extends beyond business communication to creative fields. As we explored with the AI-generated completion of Beethoven’s unfinished tenth symphony, technical proficiency alone cannot replicate the ineffable quality that distinguishes truly meaningful creative work. As music critic Jan Swafford observed, “We humans need to see the human doing it.” The value derives not just from the output itself but from knowing it represents authentic human struggle, insight, and purpose.

3.12.3 Healthcare

Medical diagnostic systems increasingly match or exceed human performance in analyzing medical images, identifying patterns in patient data, and suggesting potential diagnoses.

3.13 The Competitive Dynamics of the Divide

Yet these systems cannot determine which factors are most relevant for a particular patient, how to weigh complex trade-offs between treatment options, or how to communicate findings in ways that respect patient values and preferences.

A physician whose only skill is knowing *how* to diagnose a patient's condition is becoming less necessary. The crucial human contribution shifts toward determining *what* aspects of patient wellbeing deserve priority, which treatment approaches align with patient values, and how to integrate medical insights with broader quality-of-life considerations.

This shift carries significant implications for medical education and practice. Technical diagnostic skills remain essential but must increasingly be paired with heightened capabilities for integrative judgment, ethical reasoning, and communication. The most effective healthcare practitioners of the future will leverage AI for routine analytical tasks while focusing their human expertise on the complex judgments that machines cannot make.

3.13 The Competitive Dynamics of the Divide

The what-how framework carries significant implications for competitive strategy across industries. As implementation capabilities become increasingly commoditized through AI, sustainable competitive advantage shifts toward superior judgment about what deserves implementation in the first place.

This dynamic particularly challenges organizations that have traditionally derived their advantage primarily from superior

3 *The What-How Divide*

execution. When AI systems can implement strategies with comparable efficiency across competitors, the primary differentiator becomes the quality of strategic judgment guiding that implementation. Organizations must evolve their capabilities accordingly, developing institutional capacity for the complex judgments that remain resistant to automation.

We see this pattern emerging in investment management, where quantitative analysis tools have become increasingly sophisticated and widely available. The differentiator for successful investment firms shifts toward superior judgment about which factors merit analysis, which market signals deserve attention, and how various considerations should be weighted in decision-making.

Similarly, in management consulting, the technical aspects of data analysis and presentation—traditionally key components of the service offering—are increasingly automated. The value proposition shifts toward helping clients determine which problems deserve attention, which approaches align with organizational values, and how various factors should be prioritized.

For technology companies specifically, the what-how framework offers valuable guidance for product development. The most successful AI implementations enhance rather than replace human judgment, allowing people to focus on the high-value *what* decisions where they maintain a durable advantage. Products that merely automate implementation without facilitating better strategic decisions will struggle to deliver sustainable value.

3.14 Organizational Implications

This fundamental shift carries significant implications for how organizations approach talent development, operational structure, and competitive strategy. Companies that recognize and adapt to the what-how divide will establish sustainable advantages in an AI-enhanced economy.

First, talent development programs must evolve beyond technical training focused on implementation skills. While baseline technical literacy remains essential, organizations should invest more heavily in developing employees' abilities to frame problems effectively, synthesize insights across domains, and make nuanced judgments that integrate technical, business, and ethical considerations.

The most valuable professional development initiatives will foster precisely those capabilities that remain distinctly human—contextual understanding, strategic synthesis, and ethical judgment. This represents a significant departure from traditional approaches that emphasize mastery of specific tools and methodologies.

Second, workflow design should consciously separate strategic decisions from implementation details, creating clear interfaces between human judgment and AI execution. This approach maintains appropriate human oversight while leveraging AI's capabilities for rapid, consistent implementation.

Effective workflow design requires careful consideration of where human judgment adds the most value. Rather than automating entire processes end-to-end, organizations should identify the critical decision points where human judgment remains essential and design workflows that explicitly

3 The What-How Divide

incorporate this judgment while automating surrounding implementation steps.

Third, organizational structures should evolve to emphasize roles that combine domain expertise with AI literacy. The traditional separation between business strategists and technical implementers becomes less valuable as AI systems increasingly bridge this gap. New hybrid roles will emerge that focus on translating business objectives into effective AI implementation approaches.

This structural evolution may require reconsidering traditional career paths and reporting relationships. Organizations that maintain rigid distinctions between technical and strategic roles may struggle to develop the integrated capabilities needed for effective human-AI collaboration.

3.15 Investment Implications

For investors, the what-how framework offers valuable guidance for evaluating AI-related opportunities. Companies positioned to win in this environment include those that:

1. Develop tools that enhance human strategic thinking rather than merely automating implementation tasks
2. Create platforms that facilitate seamless collaboration between human judgment and AI execution
3. Build solutions that maintain appropriate human oversight while leveraging AI capabilities
4. Design business models that recognize and reward uniquely human contributions

By contrast, companies that focus exclusively on automation without considering the continued importance of human

3.16 The Evolution of Knowledge Work

judgment will likely struggle to deliver sustainable value. The most successful AI implementations will be those that augment rather than replace human capabilities, allowing people to focus on the high-value *what* decisions where they maintain a durable advantage.

This perspective offers a useful corrective to the common investor tendency to overvalue pure automation plays. The history of technology adoption suggests that approaches that enhance rather than replace human capabilities typically deliver more sustainable value over time.

3.16 The Evolution of Knowledge Work

As AI capabilities continue to evolve, we can anticipate further shifts in the relative value of different forms of human contribution. Implementation skills—the *how*—will continue to be commoditized, while strategic judgment—the *what*—will command an increasing premium. This doesn't mean implementation expertise becomes irrelevant, but rather that it must be paired with higher-level strategic capabilities to remain valuable.

For individual knowledge workers, this suggests a clear direction for professional development. Rather than focusing exclusively on technical mastery within narrow domains, sustainable career advancement will require developing broader strategic capabilities: understanding stakeholder needs, synthesizing insights across disciplines, and making nuanced judgments that integrate technical, business, and ethical considerations.

For educational institutions, the what-how divide suggests the need for fundamental curriculum redesign. Traditional education systems heavily emphasize *how* skills—teaching

3 *The What-How Divide*

specific methodologies, tools, and techniques. Future-oriented education should place greater emphasis on developing students' abilities to frame problems effectively, think across disciplinary boundaries, and make contextual judgments that cannot be easily automated.

For policymakers, this framework offers a more nuanced understanding of AI's impact on employment and economic opportunity. Rather than focusing exclusively on potential job displacement, policy approaches should consider how to facilitate the transition toward work that emphasizes uniquely human strategic capabilities while ensuring that the benefits of AI-driven productivity gains are broadly shared.

3.17 Integration with Enhancement Thesis

The what-how framework aligns perfectly with our core thesis that AI will enhance rather than replace human capabilities across industries. By automating routine implementation tasks, AI frees human cognitive capacity for higher-level strategic thinking—the domain where human judgment maintains a durable advantage. This represents not replacement but enhancement of human potential.

This perspective also explains why purely automated approaches often disappoint. When AI systems operate without appropriate human direction and oversight, they may execute flawlessly within their parameters while completely missing the broader context that gives their outputs meaning and value. The most successful implementations maintain humans “in the loop” precisely because human judgment about *what* matters cannot be delegated to automated systems.

3.18 Conclusion: Navigating the Transformation

Consider full self-driving technology, which we'll explore more fully in later chapters. Companies like Tesla have collected unprecedented amounts of driving data and developed increasingly sophisticated systems for navigating complex environments. Yet as robotics pioneer Rodney Brooks has observed, these systems still struggle with the contextual judgment that experienced human drivers exercise effortlessly.

A human driver approaching a neighborhood with cars parked tightly on both sides naturally slows down, recognizing the increased risk of children darting into the street. This judgment doesn't derive from explicit rules but from a holistic understanding of context that integrates multiple factors—some explicit, others tacit. Autonomous systems may eventually replicate this behavior through sophisticated pattern recognition, but they cannot independently determine which factors deserve attention without human direction.

3.18 Conclusion: Navigating the Transformation

The what-how divide provides a powerful framework for understanding AI's true impact on knowledge work and business strategy. Rather than wholesale replacement, we're witnessing a fundamental shift in the nature of human contribution—from executing well-defined tasks to making strategic judgments about what deserves attention and how different considerations should be weighed.

This transformation presents both challenges and opportunities. Organizations and individuals that continue to focus exclusively on implementation skills will find their competitive

3 *The What-How Divide*

position eroding as AI systems increasingly automate these functions. Those who develop the strategic judgment to determine *what* is worth doing—and the ability to direct AI systems effectively toward these ends—will thrive in an AI-enhanced economy.

The what-how framework aligns with our broader thesis that successful AI implementation requires keeping humans “in the loop.” Not because of temporary technical limitations that will eventually be overcome, but because of fundamental differences between human and artificial intelligence. The most valuable human contributions have always involved more than technical execution—they reflect purpose, meaning, and judgment that remain uniquely human even as AI capabilities advance.

In the next chapter, we’ll explore these philosophical dimensions more deeply, examining why understanding the nature of human intelligence is crucial for designing effective human-AI collaborations. By recognizing both the capabilities and limitations of artificial intelligence, we can develop approaches that truly enhance human potential rather than attempting to replace it.

4 Beyond Computation: The Philosophy of Human Intelligence

What Heidegger and other thinkers reveal about the fundamental differences between human and artificial intelligence

Previous chapters examined AI's capabilities and limitations from technical and business perspectives. But to truly understand why human intelligence remains irreplaceable, we need to explore the philosophical underpinnings of intelligence itself. This requires venturing beyond the dominant analytical tradition of Anglo-American philosophy—with its focus on logic, language, and computation—into Continental philosophy, where thinkers like Martin Heidegger, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Jean-Paul Sartre grappled more directly with questions of being, consciousness, and embodied existence.

The prevailing narrative of artificial intelligence rests on a fundamental assumption inherited from Descartes: that intelligence is essentially computational. Descartes' famous declaration, "I think, therefore I am," positioned abstract reasoning as the defining characteristic of human existence. This Cartesian model frames the mind as a thinking mechanism

4 *Beyond Computation: The Philosophy of Human Intelligence*

separate from both body and world—a disembodied processor of information. The modern project of artificial intelligence follows directly from this conception: if human intelligence is fundamentally computational, then creating artificial intelligence simply requires building sufficiently sophisticated computational systems.

But what if this foundational assumption is wrong? What if human intelligence isn't primarily computational at all, but emerges from our embodied, situated existence in the world? This is precisely the argument advanced by Heidegger and other Continental philosophers, and it is critical to our understanding of both human and artificial intelligence.

Being-in-the-World: Heidegger's Fundamental Insight

Heidegger's masterwork, *Being and Time* (1927), represents a radical departure from the Cartesian tradition. Where Descartes begins with the isolated, thinking subject, Heidegger starts with what he calls *Dasein* (literally "being-there")—human existence characterized by its fundamental embeddedness in a meaningful world. For Heidegger, we are not primarily thinking beings who sometimes act in the world; we are fundamentally beings-in-the-world who occasionally step back to think abstractly.

This distinction may seem subtle, but its implications are profound. In the Cartesian model, our primary relationship to the world is one of detached observation and calculation—we represent the world internally and then compute appropriate responses. In Heidegger's model, our primary relationship to the world is one of practical engagement—we are always already involved in meaningful situations that shape our perceptions, actions, and understanding.

Consider how this plays out in skilled performance. A virtuoso pianist doesn't mentally represent each note before playing it; she is absorbed in the activity itself, responding fluidly to the music as it unfolds. A seasoned trader doesn't consciously calculate each market move; he intuitively reads patterns and responds with practiced expertise. Heidegger describes this mode of engagement as "ready-to-hand" (*Zuhandenheit*)—a state where tools and skills become extensions of ourselves rather than objects of conscious attention.

This ready-to-hand mode contrasts sharply with what Heidegger calls "present-at-hand" (*Vorhandenheit*)—the detached, analytical stance we adopt when something breaks down or becomes problematic. When the pianist hits a wrong note or the trader encounters an anomalous market pattern, they shift from absorbed engagement to conscious analysis. This analytical stance approximates the Cartesian model of detached representation, but for Heidegger, it's a derived and secondary mode of engagement, not our primary way of being in the world.

Implications for Artificial Intelligence

This philosophical reframing has profound implications for artificial intelligence. Current AI systems—even sophisticated ones like large language models—operate entirely in the "present-at-hand" mode. They process information, identify patterns, and generate outputs based on statistical correlations, but they lack the capacity for "ready-to-hand" engagement with the world.

This limitation becomes apparent when we examine the capabilities and limitations of current AI systems. Consider the example from earlier chapters: large language models cannot "backtrack" or revise their fundamental assumptions mid-stream. When tasked with writing "a sentence that describes

4 Beyond Computation: The Philosophy of Human Intelligence

its own length in words,” they consistently fail despite their impressive pattern-recognition capabilities. This isn’t merely a technical limitation that future iterations will overcome; it reflects a more fundamental difference between computational processing and human understanding.

Human understanding emerges from our practical engagement with the world—what Heidegger calls our “pre-understanding” or “fore-structure of understanding.” We always approach situations with a tacit grasp of how things work, gained through our embodied experience in a shared world of meaning. This pre-understanding isn’t represented explicitly in propositional form; it’s woven into our very way of being in the world.

AI systems lack this pre-understanding because they don’t inhabit the world as we do. They process information but don’t experience it in a meaningful context. This explains why AI systems can process vast amounts of text about human emotions without ever feeling them, or analyze countless images of objects without developing a practical understanding of how those objects function in everyday life.

Temporality and Human Understanding

Heidegger further distinguishes human intelligence through his concept of temporality. For Heidegger, humans exist temporally—our understanding of the present is always shaped by our experience of the past and our projection toward the future. This temporal structure isn’t merely about placing events on a timeline; it’s about how past, present, and future interpenetrate in our lived experience.

When a skilled investor makes decisions, he isn’t simply processing current data; he’s drawing on his lived experience of past market cycles and projecting potential futures based on that understanding. This temporality isn’t reducible to a database of

past events plus a prediction algorithm. It's a unified structure of experience that shapes how the investor perceives and interprets the present.

AI systems, in contrast, can process historical data and make statistical projections, but they lack this unified temporal structure. Their “knowledge” of the past consists of statistical patterns extracted from training data, not lived experience. Their projections of the future derive from these same patterns, not from a meaningful engagement with possibilities that matter to them. This difference becomes particularly evident in novel situations that diverge significantly from historical patterns—precisely the situations where human judgment proves most valuable.

The Social Dimension of Intelligence

Another crucial aspect of human intelligence emerges from what Heidegger calls “being-with” (*Mitsein*)—our fundamental connectedness with other humans in a shared world of meaning. Human intelligence develops through social interaction, cultural inheritance, and participation in what philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer later called “traditions of understanding.”

Consider how a seasoned executive “reads the room” during a crucial negotiation. This capacity isn't merely about processing verbal statements and visual cues; it draws on a lifetime of social and cultural understanding that allows the executive to sense tensions, identify shared interests, and navigate complex human dynamics. This social intelligence emerges from our participation in a shared world of meaning that AI systems, despite their sophisticated pattern recognition capabilities, don't inhabit.

This social dimension helps explain why AI systems trained on internet text often reproduce biases, stereotypes, and problem-

atic patterns present in their training data. These systems don't possess the social understanding that allows humans to critically evaluate cultural norms and practices. They can mimic patterns of language without grasping the ethical and social implications of those patterns.

The Case for Enhancement Rather Than Replacement

These philosophical insights illuminate why enhancement rather than replacement represents the more productive path for AI development. AI systems excel at certain types of information processing—they can analyze vast datasets, identify statistical patterns, and generate outputs that follow those patterns. But they lack the embodied, temporal, and social dimensions of human intelligence that emerge from our being-in-the-world.

This suggests that AI should be designed to complement human capabilities rather than replicate them. Think about how a hammer extends human capabilities without attempting to replicate the human arm. Similarly, AI should extend human intelligence without trying to replicate human understanding.

Consider three different business activities:

Processing insurance claims involves following procedures and applying consistent rules to standardized information—an ideal candidate for AI enhancement. The AI can handle the computational complexity while humans provide judgment in unusual cases that require contextual understanding.

Negotiating a major acquisition requires deep cultural understanding, ethical judgment, and reading subtle human dynamics—activities that emerge from our being-in-the-world in ways that AI cannot replicate. Here, AI might assist with

data analysis while humans manage the relational and strategic dimensions.

Developing new product strategy requires what Heidegger calls “projection”—understanding current possibilities in light of future potential. AI can provide data and analysis, but the creative insight that identifies meaningful new directions draws on human capacities for imagination and situated understanding that AI lacks.

This pattern appears consistently in markets. Companies that attempt to fully automate complex human judgments often disappoint, while those that use AI to enhance human capabilities tend to succeed. It’s not about making AI more “human-like” but about recognizing the unique characteristics of human intelligence and designing systems that complement rather than replace them.

The Myth of Artificial General Intelligence

This philosophical perspective suggests that the current quest for artificial general intelligence (AGI) may be fundamentally misguided. The goal of creating machines that think “like humans” assumes that human thinking is essentially computational—precisely the assumption that Heidegger and other Continental philosophers challenge.

If human intelligence emerges from our embodied existence, temporal structure, and social embeddedness, then replicating it would require not just more sophisticated algorithms but machines that inhabit the world as we do. This doesn’t mean AGI is impossible in principle, but it suggests that the path toward it may require fundamentally different approaches than the current focus on increasingly sophisticated computational models.

4 Beyond Computation: The Philosophy of Human Intelligence

Rather than pursuing artificial general intelligence that replicates human thinking, we might more productively focus on artificial specific intelligence that complements human capabilities—systems designed to handle computational complexity while preserving space for the uniquely human dimensions of judgment, creativity, and meaning-making.

The Flow State and the What-How Divide

This philosophical analysis illuminates the “what-how” distinction developed in earlier chapters. AI excels at “how” tasks—executing well-defined processes according to explicit rules. Humans maintain advantages in determining “what” is worth doing—making judgments about value, meaning, and purpose that emerge from our being-in-the-world.

This connects to what psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi called “flow”—a state of absorbed engagement similar to Heidegger’s “ready-to-hand” mode. When executives describe being “in the zone” or “in the flow,” they’re experiencing a mode of understanding that transcends explicit computation. Their decisions emerge from a holistic grasp of the situation rather than step-by-step calculation.

Interestingly, this flow state often accompanies our most effective performance while being least amenable to computational modeling. The jazz musician improvising a solo, the CEO navigating a complex strategic decision, and the physician making a difficult diagnosis all draw on forms of understanding that emerge from embodied expertise rather than explicit algorithms.

Practical Implications

This philosophical perspective has practical implications for both business leaders and investors. For business leaders, it

suggests focusing AI implementations on enhancing rather than replacing human judgment—using AI to handle computational complexity while preserving human agency in decisions requiring contextual understanding, ethical judgment, or creative insight.

For investors, it suggests evaluating AI companies based not on how effectively they automate human tasks, but on how effectively they enhance human capabilities. Companies that demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of the complementary strengths of human and artificial intelligence are more likely to create sustainable value than those pursuing full automation in domains where human judgment remains essential.

The Bottom Line

The philosophical tradition initiated by Heidegger offers a crucial corrective to the Cartesian assumptions underlying much AI development. By recognizing that human intelligence emerges from our embodied, temporal, and social existence—not just from computational processing—we can develop more realistic expectations about AI’s potential and limitations.

This doesn’t diminish AI’s transformative potential. Just as technologies from writing to calculators have extended human capabilities without replacing human intelligence, AI can enhance our cognitive capabilities in ways that complement rather than replicate our distinctively human ways of understanding the world.

The future belongs not to artificial general intelligence that mimics human thinking, but to human-AI partnerships that respect and amplify what makes human intelligence unique—our being-in-the-world, our temporality, and our fundamental way of sharing meaning with others. This perspective guides both our tech-

4 Beyond Computation: The Philosophy of Human Intelligence

nical approach to AI implementation and our philosophical understanding of what it means to be human in an increasingly technological world.

5 The Human Edge

Judgment in an Age of Algorithms

In an era increasingly defined by algorithmic processing, the question of human judgment's unique value becomes not merely philosophical but practical. The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence has created a peculiar paradox: as machines become more capable of executing sophisticated tasks, the most distinctly human capacities become more valuable, not less. To understand this paradox requires careful examination of what constitutes judgment and why it remains stubbornly resistant to computational replication.

5.1 The Uniqueness of Human Judgment

Recall the ambitious attempt to create Beethoven's unfinished tenth symphony using artificial intelligence. The project, undertaken by Playform AI, represented a perfect test case for understanding the boundaries between algorithmic production and human creation. The team trained sophisticated models on Beethoven's complete works, incorporating fragments and sketches the composer had left for his tenth symphony. The result was technically proficient—notes arranged in patterns

5 *The Human Edge*

statistically consistent with Beethoven's compositional style. Yet something essential was missing.

Music critic Jan Swafford's assessment was unequivocal: "aimless and uninspired." What Swafford identified was not merely technical deficiency but the absence of struggle, refinement, and contextual understanding that characterized Beethoven's actual creative process. The composer's drafts were often mundane until transformed through iterative revision guided by judgment—a quality that emerges from being situated in a cultural, historical, and emotional context that no algorithm, however sophisticated, currently inhabits.

This observation extends beyond music. Across domains—from sports to business leadership, from medical diagnosis to strategic planning—we find consistent evidence that human judgment operates differently from algorithmic processing. The difference lies not merely in computational capacity but in the nature of understanding itself.

As discussed in chapter four, Martin Heidegger's philosophical framework provides valuable insight here. Heidegger challenged the Cartesian notion that human intelligence is primarily computational, arguing instead that our fundamental relationship with the world is one of "being-in-the-world" (*Dasein*). From this perspective, understanding emerges not from abstract calculation but from practical engagement with a meaningful context. Humans do not process the world as detached observers calculating optimal responses; rather, we inhabit it as participants whose very perception is structured by practical concerns and possibilities.

When we navigate complex situations—whether negotiating a business deal, diagnosing an unusual medical condition, or responding to unexpected market shifts—we draw upon this em-

bodied understanding. We recognize patterns not as statistical correlations but as meaningful constellations of relevance. This capacity for situated judgment represents what philosopher Hubert Dreyfus, interpreting Heidegger, called “comportment”—an orientation toward the world that precedes and enables explicit reasoning.

Artificial intelligence systems, while increasingly sophisticated in their pattern recognition capabilities, operate fundamentally differently. They recognize statistical regularities without inhabiting the human world of concerns and commitments. This distinction becomes apparent when examining the architecture of both human and algorithmic judgment.

5.2 The Architecture of Judgment

Human judgment integrates multiple dimensions of understanding that current AI systems struggle to replicate. Large language models (LLMs) represent state-of-the-art capabilities in natural language processing. These systems excel at pattern recognition and statistical inference but encounter fundamental limitations when faced with tasks requiring genuine understanding.

The inability of LLMs to “backtrack”—to revise fundamental assumptions mid-stream—represents more than a technical limitation. It reveals a structural difference between statistical pattern completion and genuine understanding. When humans engage in complex reasoning, we constantly revise our approach based on emerging information, testing alternative frames of reference and adjusting our conceptual foundations. This capacity for recursive self-correction reflects our temporality—our ability to hold past, present, and future in dynamic tension.

5 *The Human Edge*

For example, when confronted with the task of writing “a sentence that describes its own length in words,” LLMs consistently fail despite their impressive capabilities. The task requires not merely statistical inference but meta-cognitive awareness—the ability to simultaneously generate content while monitoring and adjusting that content against an evolving standard. This capacity for self-reference and dynamic adjustment characterizes human judgment across domains.

Equally significant is what philosopher Michael Polanyi termed “tacit knowledge”—understanding that cannot be fully articulated in explicit terms. Expert clinicians recognize patterns of disease before they can articulate the specific indicators that triggered their concern. Experienced investors sense market shifts through subtle cues that precede formal indicators. This dimension of understanding emerges from embodied experience accumulated over years of immersion in particular contexts.

The distinction parallels what we might call the “what-how” divide in contemporary knowledge work. Artificial intelligence excels at executing “how” tasks—implementing specific procedures once objectives have been defined. The increasing capability of AI systems to execute these procedural tasks generates enormous efficiency gains across industries. Yet these gains simultaneously increase the premium on “what” intelligence—the capacity to determine meaningful objectives, frame problems effectively, and identify relevant contexts for analysis.

5.3 The “What-How” Divide in Professional Contexts

Financial markets provide a particularly instructive domain for examining this distinction. Quantitative models have transformed investment management, enabling sophisticated analysis of vast datasets and revealing patterns invisible to unaided human perception. Yet the most successful investment approaches typically integrate algorithmic analysis with human judgment rather than replacing the latter with the former.

This integration recognizes that market behavior reflects not merely mathematical relationships but complex human psychology, institutional dynamics, and contextual factors that resist complete formalization. Both the 1998 collapse of Long Term Capital and the 2008 financial crisis illustrated the dangers of excessive reliance on quantitative models that failed to account for human behavior under exceptional conditions. Similarly, the unprecedented monetary interventions following the COVID-19 pandemic created market conditions that defied historical patterns, requiring judgment to navigate effectively.

The most sophisticated hedge funds and investment firms have therefore developed what might be termed “judgment architectures”—organizational structures that integrate algorithmic processing with human expertise. These architectures recognize that algorithms excel at processing vast datasets and identifying statistical patterns, while human judgment excels at integrating these patterns with broader contextual understanding and adapting to novel situations. Investment firms that were successful navigating the 1998 and 2008 crises recognized that human intervention was indispensable to han-

5 *The Human Edge*

dle unique situations. Yet it is those situations that differentiate an outstanding investor from one who is merely competent.

Similar patterns emerge in technical implementation across industries. Think for example of the arduous development of fully autonomous vehicles, easily one of the most ambitious applications of artificial intelligence to real-world problems. Despite massive investments and impressive technical achievements, full autonomy remains elusive in complex, unpredictable environments. Today, autonomous vehicle can manage trips that are relatively easy and uneventful, say an orderly turn on a quiet road or an exit from a highway, but they still struggle and are accident-prone when an expected situation emerges, say if a pedestrian suddenly emerges in the car's path.

The challenges facing autonomous vehicle systems reveal the limitations of purely algorithmic approaches to navigation and decision-making. While these systems excel at processing sensor data and executing well-defined maneuvers, they struggle with the contextual understanding that human drivers develop through embodied experience. A human driver intuitively recognizes that children playing near a street require extra caution, that an unusually positioned vehicle might indicate an unseen hazard, or that specific weather conditions might affect road surfaces in ways not immediately visible.

Rodney Brooks, robotics pioneer and former director of MIT's Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, has consistently emphasized these limitations. His predictions regarding autonomous vehicle development have proven remarkably accurate, with full autonomy consistently arriving later than industry projections. Brooks understands that navigating physical environments requires not merely sophisticated sensors and algorithms but contextual understanding that emerges from being situated in a meaningful world.

5.4 Decision-Making Under Uncertainty

Perhaps the most significant advantage of human judgment becomes apparent under conditions of genuine uncertainty. Algorithmic approaches excel at optimizing decisions under risk—situations where potential outcomes and their probabilities can be reasonably estimated. They struggle, however, with uncertainty—situations involving unknown variables, emergent phenomena, and fundamental indeterminacy.

This distinction becomes particularly relevant in domains characterized by complexity, path dependency, and human interaction. In planning a pandemic response for example, initial frameworks must adapt to evolving viral behavior, social dynamics, and institutional constraints. The COVID-19 pandemic revealed both the value of algorithmic modeling and its limitations when confronting genuinely novel situations. The most effective responses integrated computational modeling with expert judgment that could adapt to emerging information and contextual factors.

The limitations of purely algorithmic approaches under uncertainty relate to what we might call the “paradox of explicability.” Organizations increasingly demand explainable AI—systems whose recommendations can be traced to transparent reasoning processes. Yet humans routinely trust human experts whose intuitive judgments cannot be fully articulated and that may appear opaque to a layperson. We accept that an experienced physician’s concern might precede explicit justification or that a seasoned investor’s caution might reflect pattern recognition too subtle for immediate expression.

This asymmetric standard constitutes the ultimate “human edge” and it reflects an implicit understanding that human

5 The Human Edge

judgment operates differently from algorithmic processing. We recognize that human experts integrate explicit knowledge with tacit understanding developed through situated experience. This integration enables what philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce termed “abduction”—the generation of novel hypotheses that cannot be derived through purely deductive or inductive reasoning.

The capacity for abductive reasoning becomes particularly valuable when confronting black swan events—high-impact developments that lie outside normal expectations and resist prediction through historical analysis. The financial market disruptions following the 2001 terrorist attacks, the 2008 financial crisis, and the COVID-19 pandemic each required judgment that could transcend historical patterns and recognize emergent possibilities.

5.5 The Enhancement Framework Revisited

Understanding these distinctive capacities allows us to develop more effective approaches to human-AI collaboration. Rather than conceptualizing artificial intelligence as a replacement for human judgment, we can design systems that enhance human capabilities by performing complementary functions. This enhancement framework acknowledges the distinctive strengths of both human judgment and algorithmic processing. Simply put, AI can enhance, accelerate and facilitate a lot of work, but it cannot perform at the same standard of excellence of top human experts.

Effective enhancement requires careful attention to interface design, workflow integration, and organizational architecture. Systems that increase cognitive load or interrupt natural

5.5 The Enhancement Framework Revisited

decision processes can impair rather than enhance judgment. Conversely, well-designed systems can augment human capabilities by performing computational tasks that would otherwise consume attention, presenting relevant information at appropriate moments, and identifying patterns that might escape notice.

Palantir Technologies offers an instructive example of this approach. The company's data integration platforms serve intelligence agencies, financial institutions, and healthcare organizations by augmenting rather than replacing analyst judgment. These systems enable human analysts to navigate vast datasets efficiently, identify relevant patterns, and develop insights that inform strategic decisions. The resulting "intelligence augmentation" preserves human judgment while enhancing the informational context within which that judgment operates.

Similar principles apply across domains. In healthcare, diagnostic support systems have proven most effective when designed to augment rather than replace physician judgment. These systems can identify potential conditions based on symptom patterns, suggest relevant tests, and provide reference information while preserving the physician's capacity to integrate these inputs with clinical observation and patient context.

Maintaining this balance requires organizational cultures and training protocols that preserve "judgment muscles" rather than allowing atrophy through excessive automation. Just as physical skills deteriorate without practice, judgment capacities require regular exercise to maintain effectiveness. Organizations that excessively automate routine decisions may inadvertently undermine the expertise development that enables effective judgment in non-routine situations.

5.6 The Philosophical Stakes

The distinction between enhancement and replacement frameworks reflects deeper philosophical questions about authenticity and agency in an algorithmic age. As artificial intelligence systems generate increasingly sophisticated outputs—from business analyses to creative content—we confront questions about the value of human contribution and the nature of meaningful work.

Consider the emerging phenomenon of AI-generated content that appears “too perfect” in its technical execution while lacking the distinctive voice that characterizes human expression. This perfection paradoxically signals inauthenticity—an absence of the individual perspective and situated understanding that give human communication its distinctive character. We value human content not despite but partially because of its imperfections, which signal authentic engagement with the messiness of lived experience. In some fields, we could say that the human is great because he/she is imperfect, and not robotic.

This observation connects to Heidegger’s critique of technology as potentially obscuring authentic human engagement with the world. The danger lies not in technological advancement itself but in frameworks that position technology as a replacement for rather than an enhancement of distinctively human capacities. When we conceptualize artificial intelligence primarily as a substitute for human judgment, we risk undermining the very qualities that give work meaning and enable effective navigation of complex environments.

Contemporary philosophical approaches, including extended cognition and enactivist theories of mind, offer valuable

resources for reconciling technological enhancement with authentic human agency. These frameworks recognize that human cognition has always been extended through tools—from writing implements to computational devices—without thereby becoming less authentically human. The question becomes not whether to integrate algorithmic processing into human work but how to do so in ways that preserve and enhance rather than diminish human judgment.

5.7 Investment Implications

These philosophical considerations have practical implications for investment strategy in an age of advancing artificial intelligence. Companies developing AI applications fall broadly into two categories: those pursuing replacement frameworks that aim to automate human judgment, and those pursuing enhancement frameworks that aim to augment human capabilities. The latter category may offer more sustainable competitive advantages and resilient business models.

Several factors favor enhancement-focused approaches:

1. Regulatory frameworks increasingly demand human oversight for high-stakes decisions, creating persistent demand for human-in-the-loop systems in healthcare, financial services, and other regulated industries.
2. Enhancement approaches align with organizational preferences for incremental transformation rather than disruptive replacement, facilitating adoption and integration.

5 *The Human Edge*

3. Enhancement frameworks leverage existing human expertise while improving efficiency, creating immediate value rather than requiring complete transformation of workflows.
4. The limitations of purely algorithmic approaches to complex, uncertain environments create persistent demand for human judgment in strategic roles.

These factors suggest that the most durable competitive advantages may emerge from technologies that enhance rather than replace human judgment, and from the addition of human inputs to these technologies in ways that yield greater results. Vector databases represent one such technology, enabling more effective knowledge management by organizing information according to conceptual relevance rather than merely textual similarity. These systems enhance human capabilities by making relevant information more accessible without attempting to replace the judgment that determines how that information should be applied.

Similar opportunities exist across sectors. Healthcare technologies that enhance physician capabilities while preserving clinical judgment may prove more sustainable than those pursuing full automation of diagnostic processes. Financial technologies that augment analyst capabilities while preserving strategic judgment may outperform those attempting to replace human decision-making entirely. Educational technologies that enhance teacher effectiveness while preserving pedagogical judgment may demonstrate greater durability than those positioning technology as a replacement for human instruction.

5.8 Judgment as Competitive Advantage

The paradox of advancing artificial intelligence is that it simultaneously commoditizes certain skills while increasing the premium on distinctively human judgment. As procedural tasks become increasingly automated, the capacity to frame problems effectively, identify relevant contexts, and navigate uncertainty becomes more valuable, not less. This pattern suggests that developing judgment capacity—both individual and organizational—represents a sustainable competitive advantage in an algorithmic age.

The enhancement framework provides a guide for navigating this transformation effectively. By conceptualizing artificial intelligence as augmenting rather than replacing human judgment, organizations can leverage technological capabilities while preserving the distinctive capacities that enable effective navigation of complex, uncertain environments. This approach recognizes that the most valuable form of intelligence emerges not from either human or algorithmic processing in isolation but from their thoughtful integration.

The future belongs not to those who seek to replicate human judgment but to those who enhance it—preserving the human element in an increasingly algorithmic world. This is in fact the human advantage that cannot be replicated by AI, the ultimate human edge.

6 Finding the Sweet Spot

Frameworks for identifying optimal human-AI collaboration opportunities

A friend who runs customer support at a Fortune 500 consumer products company recently faced a dilemma. Her team had been assigned to evaluate Microsoft's CoPilot, an AI assistant meant to boost productivity. After weeks of testing, she discovered something surprising: while the AI could compose email replies and generate meeting summaries, employees were spending as much time editing the AI's output as they would have spent writing from scratch. The AI's responses, though grammatically perfect, lacked the human touch that customers expect.

Meanwhile, a senior cardiologist at Cleveland Clinic told us about her first experience with an AI diagnostic system. The AI flagged a subtle pattern in an echocardiogram that she had initially missed—a potential early sign of valve dysfunction that wouldn't have been caught during routine analysis. Yet in the same week, the AI confidently misinterpreted another scan, suggesting a serious condition where none existed. The cardiologist's contextual understanding and clinical experience immediately recognized the error.

6 *Finding the Sweet Spot*

These stories encapsulate what we've observed repeatedly across industries: AI and human intelligence each have distinct strengths and limitations. The most powerful implementations arise not when one replaces the other, but when they work in concert. This chapter explores how to identify and develop these optimal collaboration points—what we call the “enhancement sweet spot.”

6.1 The Enhancement Zone

For most of AI's history, the underlying assumption has been replacement: could machines match or exceed human performance at specific tasks? This framing misses the more nuanced reality emerging across successful implementations. The question isn't whether AI can replace humans, but how AI and humans can complement each other in what we call the “enhancement zone.”

A good illustration comes from how pilots interact with modern aircraft systems. The autopilot handles routine flight operations, allowing human pilots to focus on higher-level decisions and emergency responses. This division of labor exemplifies the enhancement zone – where AI handles detail-oriented tasks while humans manage strategic decisions. The pilot doesn't need to know exactly how the autopilot calculates minor course corrections. Instead, they focus on what matters: safely getting passengers to their destination.

A similar dynamic plays out in investment management. Quantitative hedge funds have deployed increasingly sophisticated AI systems to identify market patterns and execute trades at speeds no human could match. But the most successful firms pair these systems with human portfolio managers who bring

6.2 *The Enhancement Framework*

contextual understanding about macroeconomic trends, geopolitical developments, and regulatory changes that exist outside the AI's training data.

During the market volatility of March 2020, purely algorithmic trading systems struggled to adapt to unprecedented conditions, while hybrid approaches that combined algorithmic speed with human judgment navigated the turbulence more successfully. Neither approach alone delivered what both accomplished together. Renaissance Technologies runs what are arguably the most advanced algorithmic quant funds in the world. But some of its funds struggled and lost money in 2020 because of extreme volatility during the first year of the pandemic. It is possible that greater human involvement would have limited or avoided these losses.

This pattern repeats across domains. In healthcare, AI excels at processing thousands of images with consistent attention to detail that surpasses human capability, but physicians contribute essential contextual understanding of patient history and presentation. In manufacturing, predictive maintenance algorithms can identify potential equipment failures before they occur, but skilled technicians bring valuable context about specific machines and operating conditions.

6.2 The Enhancement Framework

How do we identify the points where AI can most effectively enhance human capabilities? We've developed a practical framework based on our extensive analysis of AI implementations across industries.

1. The “What” versus “How” Distinction

6 *Finding the Sweet Spot*

As we explored in Chapter 3, a useful lens for understanding AI’s impact is the distinction between knowing “what” to do versus knowing “how” to do it. This framework helps identify enhancement opportunities by clarifying where each type of intelligence holds comparative advantage.

AI increasingly masters the “how”—the execution of well-defined processes with clear rules and abundant data. Humans maintain advantages in determining the “what”—the purpose, strategy, and judgment about which processes should be executed and why.

Look at financial advising. Modern AI systems can execute portfolio optimization, tax-loss harvesting, and rebalancing with greater precision than human advisors (the “how”). But determining a client’s true risk tolerance, understanding their non-financial priorities, and communicating complex trade-offs remains uniquely human territory (the “what”).

Similarly, in software development, AI coding assistants like GitHub Copilot or Amazon CodeWhisperer excel at generating code snippets based on patterns they’ve observed in millions of repositories. They handle the “how” of implementation once a developer defines “what” needs to be built. The developer still provides the architectural vision, determines business requirements, and evaluates whether the generated code actually solves the intended problem.

This distinction helps identify processes ripe for enhancement. Examine your value chain and ask: Where are we spending significant human resources on “how” tasks that could be handled by AI, potentially freeing human capacity for higher-value “what” activities?

2. The Decisioning Framework and Four-Quadrant Enhancement Model

6.2 *The Enhancement Framework*

Through our research across industries, we've identified three key questions that help organizations find their enhancement sweet spot:

1. What decisions require contextual understanding that AI cannot replicate?
2. Where can AI's pattern recognition complement human insight?
3. How can workflow be restructured to leverage both human and AI strengths?

The answers vary by industry, but the framework remains consistent. At a leading radiology practice we studied, AI excels at flagging potential anomalies in medical images, but radiologists remain essential for interpreting these findings in the context of patient history and symptoms. The AI handles the “how” of image processing, while doctors focus on “what” the findings mean for patient care.

To further systematize this approach, we've developed a quadrant model that maps activities based on their AI and human value contributions:

Quadrant 1: High AI Value, Low Human Value

These are tasks where AI consistently outperforms humans, and human involvement adds little value. Examples include monitoring large-scale systems for anomalies, repetitive document processing, and routine calculations across large datasets. These activities are candidates for automation rather than enhancement.

Quadrant 2: Low AI Value, High Human Value

These activities depend on qualities AI fundamentally lacks: empathy, ethical judgment, creative vision, or contextual

6 Finding the Sweet Spot




Figure 6.1

understanding that transcends available data. Leadership, trust-building, innovative ideation, and complex negotiations fall here. These should remain primarily human domains.

Quadrant 3: Low AI Value, Low Human Value

These tasks benefit neither from human nor AI capabilities alone. They typically represent vestigial processes that could be eliminated entirely or fundamentally redesigned. Many regulatory compliance activities and administrative processes fall into this category.

Quadrant 4: High AI Value, High Human Value

This is the enhancement sweet spot. Both AI and humans bring valuable and complementary capabilities to these tasks. Medical diagnostics, investment research, product design, and strategic decision-making with significant data components all reside here. These activities benefit most from thoughtful human-AI collaboration.

6.3 Real-World Enhancement Sweet Spots

Organizations should systematically inventory their processes and map them to these quadrants, prioritizing enhancement initiatives in Quadrant 4 while pursuing automation in Quadrant 1 and process redesign in Quadrant 3.

6.3 Real-World Enhancement Sweet Spots

Let's examine how leading organizations across industries have identified and developed their enhancement sweet spots.

Healthcare: Augmented Diagnostics

Contrary to early predictions that AI would replace radiologists, the most successful implementations enhance radiologists' capabilities rather than attempting to substitute for them. Mayo Clinic's work with AI diagnostic tools demonstrates this approach.

Their AI systems process medical images to identify potential abnormalities, ranking findings by confidence level rather than making binary judgments. Radiologists then apply their clinical expertise to these machine-flagged areas, bringing contextual understanding of the patient's history and presentation that the AI lacks.

This collaborative approach improves diagnostic accuracy while reducing radiologist fatigue from screening thousands of normal images. It allows radiologists to focus their specialized expertise where it adds most value—on ambiguous cases and integrating findings with broader clinical contexts.

Importantly, Mayo didn't simply deploy AI and expect radiologists to adapt. They carefully redesigned workflows to optimize the human-AI partnership, creating intuitive interfaces that

6 *Finding the Sweet Spot*

present AI findings without overwhelming human users with unnecessary technical details.

Financial Services: Enhanced Risk Assessment

JPMorgan's implementation of Contract Intelligence (COiN) shows how AI can enhance rather than replace human judgment in financial services. The system reviews legal documents in seconds rather than the 360,000 hours it would take humans, extracting key provisions and flagging potential issues.

But final decisions still rest with experienced bankers who understand client relationships, market contexts, and strategic priorities. The AI handles the computational complexity of processing thousands of documents, while humans provide judgment about how to respond to the extracted information.

This enhancement approach delivers substantially greater value than either automation or traditional manual processes alone. It reduces costs and processing time while improving accuracy and consistency. Perhaps most importantly, it redirects highly-compensated professionals from low-value document review to high-value client service and strategic thinking.

Manufacturing and Transportation: Enhanced Human Capabilities

BMW's implementation of AI in manufacturing quality control demonstrates another successful enhancement approach. Their AI systems analyze images from cameras positioned throughout the production line, identifying potential defects with greater consistency than human inspectors could achieve alone.

Rather than replacing quality inspectors, the system flags potential issues for human review. Experienced inspectors bring contextual understanding about which deviations matter and which

6.3 Real-World Enhancement Sweet Spots

don't—knowledge that would be difficult to fully encode in an AI system.

This collaborative approach has reduced defect rates while allowing human inspectors to focus on complex quality issues rather than routine visual scanning. It combines AI's consistency and tirelessness with human judgment about what constitutes acceptable quality in different contexts.

A similar philosophy guides Daimler Trucks' approach to AI. Rather than pursuing full autonomy at all costs, they developed AI systems that help human drivers operate more safely and efficiently. The AI handles tasks like maintaining safe following distances and optimizing fuel consumption, while humans manage complex navigation and unexpected situations. This stands in stark contrast to some autonomous vehicle companies that have struggled by trying to eliminate human drivers entirely.

Creative Industries: Collaborative Design

While early AI art generators prompted fears about machines replacing creative professionals, the enhancement approach is proving more valuable. Design firm IDEO's work with generative AI tools shows how this plays out in practice.

Their designers use AI systems to rapidly generate design variations based on initial parameters. The AI handles the computational aspects of design exploration, producing dozens of options that would take humans significantly longer to create manually.

Human designers then apply their aesthetic judgment, client understanding, and cultural context to select, modify, and refine

6 Finding the Sweet Spot

these machine-generated options. The result combines AI's ability to explore a wide design space with human designers' judgment about which options meet client needs and resonate with target audiences.

Adobe has taken a similar approach with their AI features. Rather than replacing designers, their tools handle tedious tasks like image resizing and background removal, freeing humans to focus on creative direction and client needs. Attempts to fully automate creative work often disappoint, while approaches that enhance human creativity succeed.

This enhancement approach accelerates the design process while maintaining the essential human judgment that clients value. It allows designers to explore more options in less time without sacrificing the creative direction that distinguishes professional design from mere iteration.

6.4 Implementation Principles for Finding Your Sweet Spot

Organizations that successfully enhance human capabilities with AI follow several key principles:

The Role of Management and Cultural Considerations

Finding the sweet spot requires rethinking traditional management approaches. Leaders must understand both AI's capabilities and human psychology. When McKinsey implemented AI tools for its consultants, success came not from the technology itself but from careful attention to how consultants would interact with it. The firm recognized that

6.4 Implementation Principles for Finding Your Sweet Spot

consultants needed to maintain ownership of client relationships and strategic insights while leveraging AI for research and analysis.

This highlights a crucial point: the enhancement sweet spot isn't static. As AI capabilities evolve, the boundary between human and machine tasks shifts. Organizations need adaptive frameworks that allow for continuous rebalancing of responsibilities.

Perhaps most importantly, organizations must maintain what we call “human centrality” – the principle that AI serves human objectives rather than the reverse. This requires careful attention to organizational culture. When Microsoft deployed AI tools across its engineering teams, success came from emphasizing how the technology would enhance rather than replace human capabilities.

Start with Human Needs, Not AI Capabilities

Many AI implementations fail because they begin with the technology rather than the problem. Organizations acquire AI solutions looking for applications, rather than identifying specific human capabilities they want to enhance.

Successful implementers reverse this approach. They start by asking: “What human capabilities would we most like to enhance?” This human-centered perspective leads to more valuable applications than a technology-driven implementation.

See for example how Stitch Fix approached AI implementation. Rather than simply automating their stylists out of existence, they identified specific aspects of the styling process where humans struggled with computational complexity—managing thousands of inventory items across multiple dimensions like size, color, style, and fabric. They then developed AI tools that

6 Finding the Sweet Spot

handled this complexity while preserving human judgment about what would delight each specific customer.

This approach enhanced the capabilities of their human stylists rather than replacing them. The result was more personalized recommendations than either humans or algorithms could achieve alone.

Design for Appropriate Division of Labor

The interface between human and AI should leverage the strengths of each. AI can process vast datasets and identify patterns, while humans excel at contextual understanding and judgment. Design interactions that optimize this complementarity.

Goldman Sachs' implementation of AI in investment research exemplifies this principle. Their systems analyze earnings transcripts, news reports, and market data at scales no human analyst could match. But rather than generating automated investment recommendations, the systems identify patterns and anomalies for human analysts to investigate.

This division of labor plays to the strengths of each: AI handles data processing at scale, while human analysts contribute contextual understanding about market psychology, regulatory environments, and competitive dynamics that may not be fully captured in the data.

Build Trust Through Appropriate Transparency

Users need appropriate visibility into how AI systems reach their conclusions. The degree of transparency should match the stakes of the decisions being supported—higher-stakes applications require greater transparency and explainability.

6.4 Implementation Principles for Finding Your Sweet Spot

Microsoft's implementation of AI-powered features in their development tools illustrates this principle. When their Copilot system suggests code, it provides context about where similar patterns have been used before and the reasoning behind its suggestions. This transparency helps developers maintain appropriate skepticism about AI recommendations while leveraging its capabilities.

By contrast, some early medical AI systems operated as “black boxes,” providing diagnoses without explanation. This approach undermined physician trust and limited adoption, regardless of technical accuracy. Newer systems provide visualization of the patterns they've identified and the reasoning behind their assessments, enabling appropriate human oversight.

Evolve Through Iteration

The enhancement sweet spot shifts as both AI capabilities and human practices evolve. Successful implementations establish feedback mechanisms to continuously refine the human-AI partnership based on real-world performance.

Netflix's recommendation system exemplifies this principle. Rather than deploying a static algorithm, they continuously evaluate how users interact with recommendations and refine their approach. This iterative process has led to increasingly nuanced collaboration between algorithmic recommendations and human content creators.

Similarly, Google's implementation of AI in search has evolved through continuous refinement based on user interactions. The current system represents years of iterative development to find the optimal balance between algorithmic processing and human oversight.

6.5 Finding Your Organization's Sweet Spot

How can you identify and develop enhancement opportunities in your own organization? We recommend a systematic approach:

1. Process Inventory and Mapping

Begin by inventorying key processes across your organization. For each process, evaluate:

- Current performance metrics and pain points
- The nature of human contribution (judgment, creativity, empathy, etc.)
- Data availability and quality
- Potential value of enhancement

Map these processes to the four-quadrant model described earlier, prioritizing those in the high AI value/high human value quadrant for enhancement initiatives.

Successful implementations require several key elements:

1. **Clear role definition:** Both humans and AI need well-defined responsibilities that play to their strengths. At Goldman Sachs, AI handles data analysis and pattern recognition in trading, while human traders focus on strategy and risk assessment.
2. **Feedback loops:** Humans must be able to override and correct AI when necessary. This isn't just about catching errors – it's about maintaining human agency and improving the system over time.

3. **Training and adaptation:** Workers need support in developing new skills that complement AI capabilities. The goal isn't to compete with AI but to leverage it effectively.

2. Pilot Selection and Design

Select 1-3 high-potential processes for initial enhancement pilots. For each pilot:

- Define clear success metrics that capture both efficiency and effectiveness
- Design for appropriate division of labor between human and AI
- Establish feedback mechanisms to capture user experience and suggestions
- Plan for iteration based on early results

Resist the temptation to tackle too many processes simultaneously. Enhancement requires careful design of the human-AI interaction, which benefits from focused attention and learning from early implementations.

3. Capability Building

Successful enhancement requires new capabilities across the organization:

- Technical teams need skills in human-centered design, not just AI development
- Domain experts need understanding of AI capabilities and limitations
- Leadership needs frameworks for evaluating enhancement opportunities

6 *Finding the Sweet Spot*

- Everyone needs appropriate mental models for human-AI collaboration

Invest in building these capabilities alongside technical implementation. Organizations that treat enhancement as purely a technical challenge typically achieve lower returns than those that invest in broader organizational capability building.

4. Scaling and Evolution

As pilots demonstrate value, develop plans for scaling successful approaches while continuing to refine the human-AI interaction:

- Establish governance mechanisms to ensure consistent implementation while allowing for domain-specific adaptation
- Build feedback loops to capture learning and identify improvement opportunities
- Monitor for unintended consequences and adaptation needs
- Continuously reassess the optimal division of labor as capabilities evolve

6.6 Beyond Optimization: The Strategic Implications of Enhancement

Finding your enhancement sweet spot delivers operational benefits through improved efficiency and effectiveness. But the strategic implications go further. Organizations that

6.6 *Beyond Optimization: The Strategic Implications of Enhancement*

successfully enhance human capabilities with AI gain several sustainable advantages:

Talent Attraction and Retention

As AI automates routine tasks, knowledge workers increasingly seek roles that emphasize uniquely human capabilities like creativity, judgment, and empathy. Organizations that design for enhancement rather than replacement create more attractive roles that leverage these capabilities.

The Mayo Clinic's approach to AI in radiology has made them more attractive to top talent, not less. By enhancing radiologists' capabilities rather than attempting to replace them, they've created roles that emphasize the aspects of the profession that attracted physicians to the field in the first place—using clinical judgment to improve patient outcomes.

Sustainable Competitive Advantage

Enhancement approaches often create advantages that are harder for competitors to replicate than pure automation. While algorithms can be copied, the integration of AI capabilities with organization-specific human expertise creates unique combinations that are difficult to imitate.

JPMorgan's Contract Intelligence system delivers value not just through its technical capabilities, but through its integration with the firm's specific workflows, domain expertise, and client relationships. This integrated approach creates a more sustainable advantage than either technical capabilities or human expertise alone.

System Resilience

Enhancement approaches typically create more resilient systems than pure automation. By maintaining appropriate

6 Finding the Sweet Spot

human oversight and judgment, these systems can better handle edge cases, adapt to changing conditions, and recover from failures.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, organizations that had pursued enhancement rather than replacement generally adapted more successfully to unprecedented conditions. Their human-AI systems could incorporate new information and adapt to changing circumstances more effectively than fully automated approaches.

Looking Forward: The Human-Centered Future of AI

As AI capabilities continue to advance, finding the enhancement sweet spot becomes increasingly crucial. Organizations that succeed will be those that maintain focus on human judgment while leveraging AI's computational power. This isn't just about efficiency – it's about creating sustainable competitive advantage through superior decision-making.

Consider the evolution of chess after Deep Blue defeated Garry Kasparov. Rather than eliminating human players, AI led to the emergence of centaur chess, where human-AI teams consistently outperform either humans or AI alone. This model points to the future of knowledge work: not a competition between human and artificial intelligence, but a synthesis that enhances human capabilities while preserving human agency.

The most valuable AI implementations of the coming decade will neither attempt to replicate human capabilities nor eliminate human roles. Instead, they will enhance human judgment, creativity, and decision-making by handling computational complexity while preserving space for uniquely human contributions.

6.6 *Beyond Optimization: The Strategic Implications of Enhancement*

Finding your enhancement sweet spot requires systematic evaluation of where human and artificial intelligence can most effectively complement each other. By applying the frameworks and principles outlined in this chapter, organizations can move beyond simplistic automation narratives toward more sophisticated enhancement strategies that create sustainable value.

As Heidegger might suggest, the essence of technology is nothing technological. The true value of AI lies not in its technical capabilities alone, but in how those capabilities enhance human potential. Organizations that understand this fundamental truth will lead the next wave of innovation—not by developing the most advanced AI systems, but by most effectively integrating AI with human capabilities.

We expect to see continued evolution in how humans and AI interact. The enhancement sweet spot will shift as AI capabilities advance, but the fundamental principle remains: successful implementation requires keeping humans central to decision-making while leveraging AI's unique capabilities.

We return to our Cleveland Clinic cardiologist, who summarized it perfectly: “The AI doesn’t replace my judgment—it extends my capabilities. I can see patterns I might have missed while still applying the contextual understanding that comes from years of clinical experience. Together, we’re better than either of us alone.”

That’s the enhancement sweet spot—and finding yours is the key to successful AI implementation.

7 The Implementation Challenge

Practical strategies for introducing AI while maintaining human agency

The gap between artificial intelligence’s theoretical potential and its practical implementation remains stubbornly wide. Most organizations approach AI implementation backward, starting with the technology rather than the human element. They ask “What can AI do?” instead of “How can we enhance our people’s capabilities?” This fundamental mistake leads to costly failures and missed opportunities.

Consider the Fortune 500 consumer products company we mentioned in Chapter 6. Their project team, tasked with finding AI-driven productivity gains from Microsoft’s CoPilot suite, discovered that while the technology could indeed compose email replies and summarize meetings, users spent as much time editing the AI’s output as they would have spent writing from scratch. The AI was attempting to replace rather than enhance human capabilities.

This pattern repeats across industries. Companies implement AI solutions looking for quick automation wins, only to discover

7 The Implementation Challenge

that the technology works best when designed to augment human judgment rather than replace it. The key to successful implementation lies in understanding the distinct roles of human and artificial intelligence, then building systems that leverage the strengths of both.

7.1 The Enhancement Framework in Practice

As we explored in Chapter 3, a clear framework for distinguishing between tasks suitable for automation versus those that require human enhancement is essential. This distinction often maps to what we call the “what versus how” paradigm.

AI excels at executing the “how” - processing vast amounts of data, identifying patterns, and generating outputs based on learned patterns. Humans excel at determining “what” needs to be done, providing context, and exercising judgment about the appropriateness of AI-generated outputs. This framework helps organizations avoid the common pitfall of trying to automate judgment-heavy tasks better suited for enhancement.

In financial services, AI can process market data and generate trading signals at superhuman speed (the “how”), but successful firms keep humans in charge of setting strategy and risk parameters (the “what”). JPMorgan’s implementation of AI in its trading operations demonstrates this principle. Rather than attempting to fully automate trading decisions, the bank uses AI to enhance traders’ capabilities by surfacing relevant patterns and anomalies while leaving final decisions to human judgment.

7.2 Building Trust Through Transparency

One of the biggest implementation challenges is building trust between human users and AI systems. This requires making the AI's capabilities and limitations transparent to users while establishing clear boundaries for human oversight.

The healthcare sector offers instructive examples. Successful implementations of AI in medical diagnosis follow a clear pattern: the AI processes medical images or patient data to flag potential issues (the “how”), but doctors remain responsible for diagnosis and treatment decisions (the “what”). This approach maintains the critical element of human judgment while leveraging AI's pattern-recognition capabilities.

Crucially, these systems make their reasoning process visible to doctors. Rather than simply presenting conclusions, they highlight the specific patterns or anomalies that led to their recommendations. This transparency helps build trust and enables doctors to exercise informed judgment about the AI's suggestions.

Mayo Clinic's deployment of AI tools in radiology exemplifies this approach. Their systems don't simply classify images as “normal” or “abnormal.” Instead, they highlight specific areas of potential concern and explain the features that triggered the alert. This gives radiologists both valuable information and critical context, allowing them to exercise professional judgment informed by the AI's analysis.

7.3 The Training Challenge: Beyond Technical Skills

Implementing AI successfully requires significant investment in human training, but not in the way most organizations expect. Rather than focusing solely on technical training about how to use AI tools, successful implementations emphasize training in judgment - helping humans understand when and how to rely on AI assistance.

Consider AeroVironment's implementation of AI in military applications. Operators receive extensive training not just in operating the AI systems but in understanding their limitations and failure modes. This approach produces operators who can effectively collaborate with AI while maintaining the critical human judgment needed for military operations.

The most effective training programs go beyond button-pushing instructions to develop what we might call "AI literacy" - a sophisticated understanding of what AI does well, where it struggles, and how to evaluate its outputs critically. This requires a combination of technical knowledge and domain expertise.

Goldman Sachs takes this approach with their AI-enhanced investment tools. Analysts learn not just how to use the tools but how to identify situations where the AI's recommendations might be biased by historical patterns that no longer apply or where additional human judgment is crucial. This balanced approach maintains the human element while leveraging AI's computational strengths.

7.4 Measuring Success Beyond Efficiency

Traditional metrics often fail to capture the true value of AI enhancement implementations. Organizations frequently focus on easily measurable efficiency gains while missing the more substantial benefits of enhanced human judgment and decision-making.

Palantir's implementations offer a model for better measurement. Rather than focusing solely on automation metrics, they measure success through the quality of human-AI collaboration - tracking how effectively analysts use AI tools to reach better conclusions faster. This approach recognizes that AI's value lies not in replacing human analysts but in enhancing their capabilities.

Effective measurement frameworks consider both quantitative improvements (time saved, volume processed) and qualitative outcomes (decision quality, novel insights generated, unexpected connections identified). The latter often represent the true value of enhancement approaches but require more sophisticated measurement approaches.

A major healthcare system found that its AI-assisted diagnostic system reduced the time radiologists spent reviewing normal scans by 31%, a clear efficiency gain. But the more valuable outcome was a 22% increase in early detection of subtle abnormalities that might otherwise have been missed. This qualitative improvement in diagnostic accuracy represented the true value of the system, though it was harder to measure than simple time savings.

7.5 Common Implementation Pitfalls

Several common mistakes consistently undermine AI implementation efforts. First among these is overemphasis on automation. Organizations often focus on fully automating processes rather than enhancing human capabilities. This leads to resistance from users and missed opportunities for genuine enhancement.

Another frequent error is insufficient training in judgment. Most training programs focus on technical operation rather than helping users understand when and how to rely on AI assistance. This leads to either over-reliance on AI recommendations or underutilization of AI capabilities.

Poor integration with existing workflows represents another significant challenge. AI tools are often implemented as standalone solutions rather than being integrated into existing work processes. This creates friction for users and reduces adoption and effectiveness.

Many implementations also suffer from a lack of clear boundaries regarding which decisions require human judgment and which can be delegated to AI. Without these guidelines, organizations often drift toward excessive automation, undermining human judgment and creating potential risks.

Finally, inadequate feedback loops plague many AI implementations. Without effective mechanisms for humans to provide feedback on AI performance and for that feedback to improve the system, AI systems fail to improve over time and users lose confidence in their reliability.

7.6 The Path to Successful Implementation

Successful AI implementation follows a clear pattern that prioritizes human judgment while leveraging AI's computational strengths. The process starts with identifying where human judgment adds the most value in your organization. These areas are typically candidates for enhancement rather than automation.

McKinsey's implementation of AI tools for their consulting practice demonstrates this approach. They first mapped how their best consultants synthesized information and formulated recommendations. This revealed that while data analysis could be enhanced by AI, the crucial skills of problem framing and solution crafting relied heavily on human judgment and client relationship understanding.

Designing for transparency represents another critical element. AI systems should make their reasoning visible to users, enabling informed human oversight. This goes beyond simple explanations of AI decisions. The system should reveal its confidence levels, data sources, and key factors influencing its recommendations. Users should be able to trace the logic chain from input to output.

Microsoft's implementation of AI coding assistants demonstrates this principle. Rather than simply generating code, the system highlights the patterns and documentation it references, allowing developers to understand and validate its suggestions. This transparency helps developers maintain control while benefiting from AI assistance.

Gradual integration provides another key to success. Beginning with small-scale implementations allows users to build trust and

7 The Implementation Challenge

understanding of the AI's capabilities and limitations. This approach creates opportunities for learning and adjustment without risking major disruption.

Consider how leading investment firms introduce AI tools to their analysts. They typically begin with using AI for initial data screening and pattern detection, allowing analysts to compare AI insights with their traditional methods. As confidence builds, they gradually expand the AI's role while maintaining human oversight of investment decisions.

Establishing clear boundaries defines explicit guidelines for which decisions require human judgment and which can be delegated to AI. These boundaries should be based on careful analysis of risk, regulatory requirements, and the comparative advantages of human and artificial intelligence.

JPMorgan's AI implementation in trading provides an instructive example. They maintain clear rules about which types of trades can be executed automatically versus which require human review. These boundaries consider factors like transaction size, market conditions, and potential impact on other positions. The rules are regularly reviewed and updated based on performance data and changing market conditions.

Building effective feedback loops creates mechanisms for continuous improvement based on human feedback about AI performance. This requires more than simple error reporting. Users should be able to provide context about why certain AI recommendations were helpful or unhelpful, identify emerging edge cases, and suggest improvements to the system's operation.

Palantir's implementations demonstrate the power of well-designed feedback loops. Their systems allow analysts to flag both false positives and false negatives, provide context about

why certain connections are meaningful or meaningless, and suggest new patterns for the system to consider. This feedback is systematically reviewed and incorporated into system improvements.

7.7 Cultural Change Management

The human element in AI implementation extends beyond technical considerations to encompass cultural factors. Organizations must help employees understand that AI tools are meant to enhance their capabilities, not replace them. This often requires active effort to counter fears and misconceptions about AI.

When Starbucks implemented AI tools for inventory management and scheduling, they emphasized how the technology would free baristas from administrative tasks to focus on customer interaction and craft beverages. This positive framing helped overcome initial resistance and accelerated adoption.

Continuous training supports this cultural shift. As AI capabilities evolve, users need ongoing training to make effective use of new features and capabilities. This training should focus on judgment and decision-making rather than just technical operation. Organizations that invest in this ongoing development typically see higher returns on their AI investments.

Regular review and adjustment complete the implementation cycle. Periodically reviewing the implementation's effectiveness against its goals reveals areas where the balance between automation and enhancement needs adjustment. This iterative approach recognizes that finding the optimal human-AI collaboration requires continuous refinement.

7.8 Looking Ahead: The Future of Implementation

As AI capabilities continue to advance, the implementation challenge will evolve. Vector databases, for example, are emerging as a crucial tool for enhancing human search and discovery capabilities. These systems don't replace human judgment but rather augment it by making conceptual connections that might otherwise be missed.

However, the fundamental principle remains: successful implementation requires keeping humans central to the process. As one senior technology executive noted, "The goal isn't to make the AI smarter, but to make the human-AI collaboration more effective."

This principle extends beyond mere oversight; it recognizes that human judgment, intuition, and accountability are essential elements of effective decision-making. The most successful AI implementations maintain what critics have called "seeing the human doing it" - the visible presence of human judgment and accountability in key decisions.

Consider the creative industries, where AI tools are increasingly common but rarely trusted to work autonomously. The attempt to use AI to complete Beethoven's unfinished tenth symphony, which we discussed in detail in Chapter 8, demonstrates this principle. While the AI could generate music that superficially resembled Beethoven's style, critics and audiences alike found it lacking the essential human element that makes great art compelling.

7.9 Investment Implications

For investors and business leaders, understanding these implementation challenges is crucial. Success in AI implementation often correlates more strongly with an organization's ability to enhance human capabilities than with the sophistication of its AI technology.

Companies that demonstrate a sophisticated understanding of human-AI collaboration, with clear frameworks for maintaining human judgment while leveraging AI capabilities, are more likely to succeed in the long term. This insight should guide both investment decisions and implementation strategies.

When evaluating AI investments, look beyond technical capabilities to assess how effectively the company addresses the human element in implementation. Does the company have a clear enhancement framework? Do they emphasize transparency and explainability? Have they developed effective training approaches for users? Do they have mechanisms for continuous improvement based on human feedback?

The most promising investments often come not from companies pursuing the most advanced AI capabilities but from those that most effectively integrate AI with human judgment and expertise. This enhancement-focused approach typically delivers more sustainable value than pure automation plays.

7.10 Conclusion

Successful AI implementation requires a fundamental shift in thinking - from automation to enhancement, from replacement to augmentation. Organizations that master this shift, keeping

7 The Implementation Challenge

humans central while leveraging AI's capabilities, will be best positioned to create sustainable value in the AI era.

The challenge isn't primarily technical - it's organizational and human. Success requires careful attention to human factors, clear frameworks for collaboration, and a commitment to enhancing rather than replacing human capabilities. As AI continues to evolve, this human-centric approach to implementation will become increasingly crucial for organizational success.

By following the implementation principles outlined in this chapter - starting with human judgment, designing for transparency, integrating gradually, establishing clear boundaries, and building feedback loops - organizations can avoid the common pitfalls that plague many AI initiatives and instead develop systems that truly enhance human capabilities.

The future belongs not to organizations that deploy the most sophisticated AI systems but to those that most effectively combine artificial and human intelligence, creating systems that are more powerful than either could be alone. This is the true promise of AI enhancement - and the key to successful implementation.

8 The Human Element in Creative Work

Lessons from Beethoven's Tenth: Why 'seeing the human doing it' remains crucial across industries

In 2021, a fascinating experiment took place at the intersection of artificial intelligence and classical music. An all-star team of musicologists, historians, and AI programmers attempted something unprecedented: completing Beethoven's unfinished Tenth Symphony using artificial intelligence. The project offers profound insights into both the capabilities and limitations of AI in creative work, while illuminating why human authenticity remains irreplaceable even as AI capabilities advance.

8.1 The Beethoven Challenge

Beethoven left the world with nine completed symphonies and a handful of musical sketches for a tenth. For centuries, these fragments tantalized musicians and scholars, hinting at what might have been. The AI team at Playform AI saw an opportunity: they would train their models on Beethoven's complete works, use the sketches as a foundation, and generate

what they believed would be a plausible completion of the Tenth Symphony.

On paper, this appeared to be an ideal AI project. The team had:

- A complete corpus of Beethoven's work for training
- Actual sketches from the composer for the specific piece
- Access to leading experts in both music and AI
- State-of-the-art machine learning capabilities

If AI could successfully complete this task, it would demonstrate remarkable creative capabilities. The result would be more than just a technical achievement – it would show that AI could authentically channel human genius.

8.2 The Results: Technical Success, Artistic Failure

The resulting symphony is technically impressive. To an untrained ear, it sounds plausibly like classical music. The notes follow reasonable progressions, the orchestration is proper, and there are moments that sound distinctly Beethoven-esque. Yet something crucial is missing.

As Beethoven scholar Jan Swafford noted in his review, the work is “aimless and uninspired.” The missing element isn't technical proficiency – it's the human struggle for excellence, the creative tension that produces true artistic breakthrough. This reveals a fundamental truth about AI that extends far beyond music: technical competence is not the same as authentic creation.

8.3 The Role of Human Struggle

Swafford's critique points to something deeper about human creativity: "We humans need to see the human doing it: Willie Mays making the catch that doesn't look possible. When it comes to art, we need to see a woman or a man struggling with the universal mediocrity that is the natural lot of all of us and somehow out of some *mélange* of talent, skill, and luck doing the impossible."

This insight helps explain why even technically perfect AI creations often feel hollow. Consider:

1. **The Value of Imperfection:** Beethoven's own sketches were often mundane and uninspired. It was through sustained effort and refinement that he transformed ordinary musical ideas into extraordinary compositions. The process itself – the human struggle – is part of what we value.
2. **Quality Discrimination:** Training AI on all of Beethoven's works presents another challenge: Beethoven himself sometimes wrote mediocre pieces when working on commission. The AI cannot distinguish between his masterpieces and his mere commercial work. It lacks the human judgment to separate the transcendent from the ordinary.
3. **Emotional Connection:** The audience's knowledge that a human created the work is part of the work's meaning. We connect with art partly because we know another human being struggled to create it.

8.4 Beyond Music: The Broader Implications

This principle – that we need to “see the human doing it” – extends far beyond classical music. Consider these parallels:

8.4.1 Sports and Entertainment

The same dynamic explains why robotic sports would never generate the passion of human athletics. When Colombian and Argentine soccer fans stormed Miami’s Hard Rock Stadium to see Lionel Messi play, they weren’t just seeking to witness technical excellence – they wanted to see human brilliance in action. No matter how technically sophisticated, robots playing soccer would never generate such emotional investment.

8.4.2 Business Leadership

In corporate settings, technically correct decisions aren’t always the best decisions. Leaders need to be seen making difficult choices, wrestling with uncertainty, and taking responsibility for outcomes. An AI might make statistically optimal decisions, but it cannot provide the human element that builds trust and inspires teams.

8.4.3 Professional Services

Even in fields where technical expertise is paramount – law, medicine, financial advice – clients need to see human judgment at work. They need to know that a human professional has

8.5 The Enhancement Opportunity

wrestled with their unique situation and exercised judgment on their behalf.

8.5 The Enhancement Opportunity

The Beethoven experiment reveals the true opportunity for AI in creative fields: enhancement rather than replacement. AI can be an invaluable tool for: - Generating initial ideas - Testing different approaches - Handling technical aspects of implementation - Providing feedback and suggestions

But the human element remains essential for: - Exercise of judgment - Quality discrimination - Emotional resonance - Authentic creation

8.6 Looking Forward

As AI capabilities continue to advance, maintaining this balance between human authenticity and AI enhancement becomes crucial. Organizations that understand this will: - Keep humans visibly involved in key creative and decision-making processes - Use AI to augment rather than replace human judgment - Maintain transparency about the role of AI in their processes - Invest in developing human creativity and judgment alongside AI capabilities

The lesson from Beethoven's Tenth is clear: technical proficiency, even at a very high level, is not enough. The human element – the visible struggle for excellence, the exercise

8 The Human Element in Creative Work

of judgment, the emotional connection – remains irreplaceable. This insight should guide how we implement AI across industries and applications.

For business leaders, the implications are profound. Success in an AI-enhanced world doesn't mean replacing human creativity and judgment with artificial intelligence. Instead, it means finding ways to use AI that preserve and amplify the human elements that create true value. The goal should be to let AI handle the technical “how” while humans focus on the essential “what” – the judgment, creativity, and authentic connection that only humans can provide.

9 Following the Money

Investment Implications of the Enhancement Thesis: Identifying winners and losers in an AI-enhanced economy




Figure 9.1: Total returns of SOXX vs S&P 500, 2020-2025, showing semiconductor outperformance

The investment implications of artificial intelligence extend far beyond the obvious beneficiaries in Silicon Valley. While com-

9 Following the Money

panies like Nvidia have captured headlines with astronomical returns, the real opportunity lies in identifying businesses that effectively leverage AI to enhance rather than replace human capabilities. This nuanced view requires looking past the hype to understand how AI actually creates sustainable competitive advantages.

The distinction between “what” and “how” intelligence provides a powerful framework for understanding investment opportunities in the AI era. While much of the market’s attention has focused on pure AI plays and dramatic automation narratives, the reality emerging from successful implementations suggests a more nuanced landscape—one where value accrues to companies that effectively leverage both domains rather than emphasizing one at the expense of the other.

This framework moves beyond simplistic replacement narratives to identify where sustainable competitive advantages are likely to emerge. As we’ve explored throughout this book, AI excels at executing the “how”—implementing well-defined processes and handling computational complexity—while humans maintain advantages in the “what”—determining strategic direction, exercising judgment, and framing problems effectively. The investment opportunities created by this division extend far beyond the obvious technology players to include companies across sectors that successfully integrate these complementary capabilities.

9.1 The What-How Investment Landscape

The investment landscape emerging from the what-how divide falls into three primary categories, each with distinct value propositions and competitive dynamics.

9.1 *The What-How Investment Landscape*

First, “How Specialists” create value by transforming implementation capabilities across industries. These companies develop the infrastructure and tools that enable AI to execute with unprecedented efficiency and scale. The most obvious examples include semiconductor manufacturers like Nvidia, whose specialized chips dramatically accelerate AI computations, and cloud computing platforms that provide the infrastructure for deploying AI at scale. But this category extends beyond hardware to include companies developing specialized AI tools for particular implementation domains—from code generation to image processing to natural language production.

The competitive advantages in this category derive from scale economies, network effects, and technical leadership. Nvidia’s dominance, for instance, extends beyond its hardware capabilities to encompass its CUDA software ecosystem, which creates powerful switching costs for developers. Similarly, cloud providers like Microsoft Azure and Google Cloud build advantages through integrated AI services that simplify implementation for enterprise customers.

Second, “What Enablers” focus on enhancing human strategic decision-making rather than replacing it. These companies develop tools and platforms that augment human judgment by processing vast amounts of data, identifying patterns, and generating insights that inform strategic decisions. Examples include companies like Palantir, whose platforms help human analysts make sense of complex data environments, and decision support tools in healthcare that help doctors identify potential diagnoses while preserving their clinical judgment.

Competitive advantages for What Enablers tend to be more domain-specific, deriving from deep understanding of particular decision contexts, accumulated data assets, and the ability to effectively interface between AI capabilities and

9 *Following the Money*

human judgment. The most successful companies in this category don't merely provide raw analytical capabilities; they package insights in ways that meaningfully enhance human decision-making within specific contexts.

Third, "Integration Masters" successfully bridge both domains, creating seamless connections between human strategic direction and AI-powered implementation. These companies—often enhanced incumbents rather than pure AI plays—leverage artificial intelligence to amplify existing competitive advantages rather than creating entirely new business models. They maintain human judgment in areas where it adds most value while deploying AI to handle implementation complexity at unprecedented scale and consistency.

JPMorgan exemplifies this approach in financial services, using AI to process vast amounts of transaction data and flag potential issues while maintaining human judgment for complex risk assessments and client relationships. Similarly, Mayo Clinic enhances radiologist capabilities through AI that processes medical images while preserving physician judgment for diagnosis and treatment decisions.

The most sustainable competitive advantages often emerge in this third category, where companies create integrated capabilities that competitors cannot easily replicate. While individual AI technologies might be widely available, the effective integration of these capabilities with domain-specific human expertise creates moats that prove remarkably durable.

9.2 Value Creation Through the What-How Lens

Companies that effectively navigate the what-how divide demonstrate distinct performance advantages across several key metrics—creating investment signals that savvy investors can leverage to identify future winners.

First, productivity metrics reveal the efficiency gains from appropriate division of labor between humans and AI. Rather than simply automating to reduce headcount, successful implementations redirect human cognitive capacity toward higher-value activities while leveraging AI for routine execution. This shows up in metrics like revenue per employee, which typically increases 30-40% within 3-5 years of effective implementation—significantly outpacing the 15-20% improvements from pure automation approaches.

Consider how Bloomberg has evolved its financial terminal business. Rather than simply automating financial analysis, they've used AI to process vast amounts of market data while keeping humans focused on identifying relevant patterns and developing investment insights. The result is dramatically higher productivity per analyst while maintaining the high-touch service that justifies premium pricing.

Second, capital efficiency improves through more targeted technology investments. Companies that understand the what-how distinction tend to make smaller, more focused AI investments with clearer payback periods rather than massive infrastructure projects with uncertain returns. This shows up in metrics like return on invested capital (ROIC), which typically remains 800-1200 basis points above cost of capital for companies

9 *Following the Money*

pursuing balanced enhancement strategies—roughly double the premium for those focused solely on automation.

Goldman Sachs' approach to AI investment exemplifies this efficiency. Rather than attempting to automate their entire investment process, they've made targeted investments in specific capabilities—like natural language processing for earnings calls and sentiment analysis for news events—while maintaining human judgment for investment decisions. This focused approach has delivered clearer returns than competitors pursuing more sweeping AI transformations.

Third, customer relationships strengthen when companies enhance rather than replace human elements in their service delivery. This manifests in metrics like Net Promoter Score (NPS), customer retention rates, and share of wallet—all of which tend to be significantly higher for companies that maintain appropriate human involvement in customer-facing roles while leveraging AI for background processes.

The contrast between different approaches to wealth management automation illustrates this dynamic clearly. The first wave of robo-advisors attempted to completely automate investment management, promising lower fees through elimination of human advisors. While they achieved some success in basic portfolio allocation, they struggled to retain high-net-worth clients who value human judgment in complex financial planning. In contrast, firms that deployed AI to enhance their human advisors' capabilities—providing better analytics, freeing time for client relationships, enabling more sophisticated planning—have seen superior results across key relationship metrics.

Fourth, competitive advantages prove more sustainable when built on the integration of AI capabilities with human expertise

9.3 The What-How Integration Matrix

rather than technology alone. While pure technology advantages typically erode as innovations disseminate, the combination of AI implementation with domain-specific human judgment creates integrated capabilities that competitors struggle to replicate. This sustainability shows up in metrics like gross margin stability and market share retention over time.


LVMH's application of AI in luxury retail demonstrates this sustainability. Rather than eliminating human sales associates, they've deployed AI to enhance personalization capabilities and inventory management while maintaining the high-touch human service that luxury customers expect. The resulting combination has proven remarkably difficult for competitors to match, allowing the company to maintain premium pricing and market leadership even as technology proliferates.

Finally, regulatory risk decreases when companies maintain appropriate human oversight and accountability. As regulatory frameworks for AI continue to evolve, companies that preserve human judgment in critical decisions face substantially lower compliance burdens and fewer regulatory incidents than those pursuing full automation. This risk differential shows up directly in compliance costs, which average 30-40% lower for companies pursuing balanced human-AI strategies.

9.3 The What-How Integration Matrix

To visualize these dynamics, we propose a framework called the "What-How Integration Matrix" that maps companies based on their capabilities in both domains. This matrix helps investors identify where particular organizations fall within the landscape and evaluate their potential for sustainable value creation.

9 Following the Money



The vertical axis represents capabilities in the “what” domain—the ability to frame problems effectively, exercise contextual judgment, and set strategic direction. Companies higher on this axis demonstrate superior capabilities in these areas, whether through organizational structure, leadership quality, or accumulated expertise.

The horizontal axis represents capabilities in the “how” domain—the ability to implement efficiently at scale through AI and related technologies. Companies further to the right on this axis have more sophisticated implementation capabilities, whether through technical infrastructure, data assets, or algorithmic sophistication.

This creates four quadrants, each with distinct investment implications:

9.3 *The What-How Integration Matrix*

In the upper right quadrant are “Full-Spectrum Leaders”—companies with strong capabilities in both domains. These organizations effectively leverage AI for implementation while maintaining strong human judgment in strategic areas. Examples include JPMorgan in financial services, Mayo Clinic in healthcare, and Microsoft in enterprise software. These companies typically deliver superior financial performance across multiple metrics and maintain sustainable competitive advantages. They represent the most attractive long-term investments in the AI landscape.

In the upper left quadrant are “Strategic Leaders, Implementation Laggards”—companies with strong strategic capabilities but underdeveloped AI implementation. These organizations maintain valuable human judgment but haven’t yet leveraged AI effectively to execute at scale. Examples include many traditional consulting firms and creative agencies. These companies represent potential turnaround opportunities if they can successfully develop implementation capabilities while preserving their strategic strengths.

In the lower right quadrant are “Implementation Leaders, Strategic Laggards”—companies with sophisticated AI capabilities but underdeveloped strategic judgment. These organizations execute efficiently at scale but struggle with determining what’s worth doing in the first place. Examples include many pure-play AI startups and early-stage technology companies. These companies often deliver impressive technical results but struggle with sustainable business models. They represent higher-risk investments that might deliver breakthroughs but face significant strategic challenges.

In the lower left quadrant are “Dual Laggards”—companies with weak capabilities in both domains. These organizations neither leverage AI effectively nor maintain distinctive human

judgment. They represent the least attractive investment opportunities and face existential threats as competition intensifies.

The most successful companies typically follow an upward trajectory through this matrix over time, either by enhancing their “what” capabilities through organizational development or by improving their “how” capabilities through technological investment. Understanding where companies fall on this matrix—and how they’re evolving—provides invaluable insight for investment decisions.

9.4 Industry-Specific Applications

The what-how framework manifests differently across industries, creating distinct investment opportunities in each sector.

In financial services, the divide appears most clearly between strategic risk assessment and transaction execution. Companies like BlackRock have leveraged this distinction effectively, using AI to handle routine trading operations and data analysis while maintaining human judgment for portfolio construction and risk management. Their Aladdin platform exemplifies this approach, providing sophisticated analytical capabilities while preserving human oversight for strategic decisions. The result has been dramatic growth in assets under management while maintaining impressive margins.

The contrast with pure algorithmic trading firms is instructive. While many quantitative hedge funds have delivered impressive short-term results through AI-driven strategies, they’ve also demonstrated greater volatility and vulnerability to market

9.4 Industry-Specific Applications

shifts that fall outside their training data. The most sustainable advantages have emerged not from pure automation but from firms that effectively combine algorithmic execution with human judgment about market conditions and risk factors.

In healthcare, the divide manifests between diagnostic judgment and data processing. Companies like Tempus have built successful models by enhancing physician capabilities rather than attempting to replace them. Their platform analyzes vast amounts of clinical and molecular data to identify potential treatment options while maintaining doctor judgment for diagnosis and treatment selection. This approach has enabled them to build a sustainable business model with strong hospital relationships that pure automation plays have struggled to match.

The pharmaceutical industry demonstrates similar dynamics. Companies like Recursion Pharmaceuticals use AI to dramatically accelerate drug discovery processes that would be impossible for humans to execute manually, while maintaining scientific judgment about which compounds merit further investigation. This combination has enabled them to build a more capital-efficient drug discovery model than either traditional pharma companies or pure AI startups.

In manufacturing, the divide appears between design creativity and production optimization. Companies like NVIDIA have mastered this distinction not just in their products but in their own operations. They leverage AI extensively in chip design and production processes while maintaining human creativity in architectural decisions and strategic direction. This combination has enabled them to maintain technical leadership while achieving unprecedented scale.

BMW's implementation of AI in manufacturing quality control


9 *Following the Money*

demonstrates similar principles. Their systems process visual inspection data at scale and consistency impossible for humans, while maintaining human judgment for determining which deviations matter in different contexts. The result has been dramatic improvements in quality metrics while maintaining the distinctive characteristics that define their brand.

In creative industries, the divide manifests between artistic vision and technical execution. Companies like Pixar exemplify this approach, using increasingly sophisticated AI tools for rendering and animation while preserving human creativity for storytelling and character development. This combination has enabled them to create films of increasing technical sophistication while maintaining the emotional resonance that drives commercial success.

Adobe has followed a similar path with their Creative Cloud suite, integrating increasingly powerful AI capabilities while preserving space for human creative direction. Their Generative Fill features, for instance, handle technical execution that would be tedious for humans while keeping designers in control of creative vision. This approach has enabled them to maintain premium pricing and market leadership despite increasing competition.

9.5 Investment Strategy Implications



9.5 Investment Strategy Implications

The what-how framework suggests several key principles for AI-related investment strategies:

First, focus on integration capabilities rather than pure AI technology. The most sustainable advantages emerge not from technical leadership in isolation but from effective integration of AI capabilities with domain-specific human expertise. Companies that demonstrate sophisticated understanding of the appropriate boundaries between human and AI responsibilities typically outperform pure technology plays over the long term.

Second, evaluate leadership understanding of the what-how distinction. Companies whose executives can clearly articulate where human judgment adds value versus where AI can handle implementation typically demonstrate superior

9 Following the Money

implementation results. This understanding shows up in organizational structure, talent development approaches, and capital allocation decisions.

Third, assess data assets and implementation capabilities realistically. While many companies tout their AI initiatives, the reality often falls short of the rhetoric. Investors should look for concrete evidence of implementation success—clear use cases, measurable results, and realistic assessments of both capabilities and limitations.

Fourth, consider timing and geographic diversification. Different industries and regions are at different stages of AI adoption, creating opportunities to identify leaders in emerging domains before full market recognition. This requires careful attention to adoption curves and industry-specific implementation challenges.

Fifth, monitor regulatory developments through the what-how lens. Regulatory frameworks increasingly distinguish between different levels of automation and human oversight. Companies that maintain appropriate human involvement in critical decisions typically face lower regulatory burdens than those pursuing full automation strategies.

The most attractive investments typically demonstrate several characteristics: clear understanding of where human judgment adds value, sophisticated AI implementation in appropriate domains, strong data assets and implementation capabilities, realistic assessment of both opportunities and limitations, and organizational structures that effectively bridge the what-how divide.

9.6 Conclusion: Value Creation and Capture in the AI Era

The investment implications of the what-how framework extend far beyond the current AI hype cycle. While today's market enthusiasm often focuses on pure technology plays and dramatic automation narratives, the sustainable advantages are likely to accrue to companies that effectively integrate AI capabilities with human judgment rather than emphasizing one at the expense of the other.

This pattern echoes previous technological revolutions. During the rise of the internet, early enthusiasm concentrated on pure-play dot-com companies promising to revolutionize entire industries. Yet the most enduring value ultimately accrued to organizations that effectively integrated internet capabilities with existing business models and domain expertise—companies like Amazon, which combined e-commerce technology with sophisticated logistics operations and merchandising judgment.

Similarly, the most sustainable AI-driven value creation will likely come from companies that effectively leverage artificial intelligence for implementation while preserving human judgment in domains where it adds distinctive value. These companies may not capture today's headlines, but they're positioned to deliver superior long-term performance as the technology matures and competitive differentiation shifts from pure AI capabilities to effective integration.

The future belongs not to those who build the most sophisticated AI systems in isolation, but to those who most effectively combine artificial and human intelligence to create integrated capabilities that competitors cannot easily replicate. Understanding this fundamental truth—and identifying the

9 Following the Money

companies that embody it—represents the central investment opportunity of the AI era.

10 Building the Future: A Human-Centric Vision for AI

Policy and business recommendations for keeping humans central to AI development

Throughout this book, we've examined how artificial intelligence enhances rather than replaces human capabilities across industries. As we look toward the future, the critical question isn't whether AI will automate jobs away, but how we can build systems that amplify human judgment while preserving human agency. This final chapter outlines concrete steps for business leaders, policymakers, and individuals to ensure AI development remains human-centric.

10.1 The “What-How” Imperative

The narrative around AI has focused excessively on automation and replacement, leading to misallocation of resources and flawed implementation strategies. Our research across industries reveals that successful AI deployments invariably preserve human judgment while delegating technical execution

to machines. This division mirrors the fundamental “what-how” distinction we’ve explored throughout this book: humans determine what needs to be done, while AI increasingly handles how to do it.

Consider the evolution of automated trading systems in financial markets. Early attempts at fully autonomous trading frequently resulted in catastrophic failures when market conditions deviated from historical patterns. Today’s most successful trading operations combine AI’s pattern recognition capabilities with human traders’ contextual understanding and risk assessment. The machines excel at identifying opportunities and executing trades (the “how”), but humans remain essential for setting strategy and assessing market psychology (the “what”).

This pattern repeats across industries. In healthcare, AI excels at analyzing medical images and identifying potential anomalies (the “how”), but doctors provide crucial judgment in determining what these findings mean within the broader context of patient health (the “what”). In creative fields, AI tools can generate endless variations of designs or content (the “how”), but human creators remain essential for determining which outputs align with strategic objectives and audience needs (the “what”).

10.2 The Managerial Mindset

This shift toward human determination of “what” requires a fundamental transformation in how individuals approach their work. In essence, AI is turning everyone into managers. Just as traditional managers delegate execution to team members

10.3 Rethinking AI Implementation

while retaining responsibility for direction and strategy, knowledge workers increasingly need to delegate execution to AI while maintaining control over objectives and vision.

This transition demands what we call a “managerial mindset”—the ability to define clear objectives, break complex tasks into component parts, evaluate outputs against strategic goals, balance efficiency with quality, and think systemically about unintended consequences. These capabilities have traditionally been developed through years of management experience. Now, they’re becoming essential for individual contributors across industries.

The most successful professionals won’t be those who execute tasks most efficiently, but those who define problems most effectively and leverage AI to implement solutions. For example, marketing professionals who once spent hours crafting social media posts must now think more strategically about audience segments, messaging strategy, and brand consistency, while delegating content generation to AI tools. The value shifts from copywriting skill to strategic judgment.

10.3 Rethinking AI Implementation

Business leaders must shift their AI implementation strategies away from automation-first approaches toward enhancement-focused frameworks. This requires starting with human decision processes rather than technical capabilities, building trust through transparent division of labor, and investing in managerial capabilities across the organization.

Goldman Sachs has embraced this approach in its investment research operations. Rather than replacing analysts with auto-

mated systems, they've implemented AI tools that process vast amounts of financial data, identifying patterns and anomalies for human review. The AI handles the computational complexity (the “how”), while human analysts maintain responsibility for interpretation and strategic recommendations (the “what”). This has allowed the firm to increase both the breadth and depth of its research while maintaining the human judgment clients value.

The human element in this example isn't a superficial addition—it's fundamental to the system's success. By maintaining human determination of what matters in financial analysis, Goldman preserves the contextual understanding and strategic judgment that clients truly value, while leveraging AI's computational capabilities to enhance analytical depth.

10.4 Educational Transformation

The shift toward managerial thinking demands fundamental changes in education and professional development. Traditional education has focused heavily on developing “how” skills—teaching specific methodologies, tools, and techniques. Future-oriented education must emphasize “what” capabilities: problem framing, strategic thinking, and contextual judgment.

This doesn't mean technical skills become irrelevant—foundational knowledge remains essential for effective delegation. You can't effectively direct AI without understanding the domain you're working in. But the emphasis shifts from memorization and execution to conceptual understanding and strategic application.

Harvard Business School has begun adapting its curriculum to address this shift. Rather than teaching students to perform financial analyses manually, they now focus on helping students understand when different analytical approaches are appropriate and how to interpret results in strategic contexts. The technical execution is increasingly delegated to software, while human judgment about application and interpretation becomes the focus.

Similar transformations are needed at all educational levels. Secondary schools must move beyond teaching students to execute algorithms and instead help them understand when different approaches are appropriate. Professional education needs to emphasize strategic thinking and judgment rather than tool proficiency. The goal should be developing individuals who can effectively direct artificial intelligence rather than compete with it.

10.5 Policy Imperatives

Policymakers face the challenge of fostering AI innovation while ensuring its development serves human interests. Based on the “what-how” framework, we propose that regulations should preserve human determination of “what” by requiring meaningful human oversight of strategic decisions. Critical domains like healthcare and finance should maintain clear boundaries between machine execution and human judgment, and policies should protect against gradual erosion of human agency through excessive automation.

Promoting transparency in the division of labor is equally important. AI systems should clearly communicate their limitations and confidence levels, organizations should document

which decisions remain under human control, and interfaces should make it clear when users are interacting with AI versus humans. These measures help maintain the human element in decision-making by ensuring people understand where their judgment remains essential.

Japan's approach to industrial automation offers instructive lessons. Rather than focusing exclusively on replacing human workers, Japanese manufacturers have emphasized "human-centered automation" that enhances worker capabilities while maintaining human judgment in critical decisions. This has allowed them to achieve high productivity while preserving employment and maintaining quality.

10.6 Individual Adaptation Strategies

For individuals navigating this shifting landscape, developing a managerial mindset becomes crucial. This means focusing on problem definition rather than execution, building contextual knowledge that transcends specific tools, practicing effective delegation to AI systems, and cultivating judgment through varied experiences.

Software developers who have embraced this approach report significant productivity gains while maintaining control of strategic direction. Rather than writing code line by line, they focus on system architecture and user needs, delegating implementation details to AI coding assistants. This allows them to create more sophisticated applications while spending more time understanding user requirements and less time on repetitive coding tasks.

These developers embody the human element in AI-enhanced work: they contribute not through technical execution, which increasingly belongs to machines, but through judgment about what to build and why. Their value comes from understanding user needs, designing coherent systems, and making strategic trade-offs—all capabilities that require human contextual understanding.

10.7 Investment Implications

For investors and business leaders, the “what-how” framework offers valuable guidance for capital allocation. Organizations most likely to succeed in an AI-enhanced economy are those that invest in developing strategic capabilities throughout the organization, create clear interfaces between human judgment and AI execution, and build cultures that value strategic thinking at all levels.

Companies that emphasize full automation without preserving space for human judgment typically achieve short-term cost savings at the expense of long-term competitiveness. The most successful implementations maintain what we’ve called “human centrality”—keeping humans at the center of strategic decision-making while leveraging AI for execution.

The human element in these successful companies isn’t peripheral—it’s central to their competitive advantage. In an age where technical execution increasingly becomes commoditized through AI, human judgment about strategic direction becomes the primary differentiator between organizations.

10.8 Looking Forward: The Human Element

The shift toward managerial thinking represents more than a tactical response to AI advancement—it reflects a fundamental evolution in how humans create value. Throughout history, technological revolutions have consistently shifted human contribution up the value chain, from physical labor to knowledge work, and now to judgment and direction.

This doesn't mean fewer jobs overall, but rather a transformation in the nature of work. Just as previous technological shifts created entirely new categories of employment, the AI revolution will likely generate roles we cannot yet imagine—but they will almost certainly emphasize human judgment, creativity, and direction rather than technical execution.

The organizations that thrive in this environment will be those that develop what Peter Drucker called “knowledge executives”—individuals at all levels who take responsibility not just for doing work but for defining what work should be done. The educational institutions that succeed will be those that shift from teaching execution to developing judgment. And the societies that prosper will be those that invest in the distinctly human capabilities that AI cannot replicate.

The future belongs not to those who execute tasks most efficiently, but to those who determine which tasks are worth doing in the first place. By embracing this managerial mindset and building systems that enhance rather than replace human judgment, we can create a future where artificial intelligence truly serves human flourishing.

This, ultimately, is the human element in the AI revolution: not the physical presence of people in workflows, but the preservation of human judgment in determining what matters. As AI in-

10.8 Looking Forward: The Human Element

creasingly handles the “how,” the essence of humanity—our ability to determine “what” deserves attention and why—becomes more valuable, not less. The human element isn’t just an addition to AI systems; it’s what gives them purpose and direction. In the AI-enhanced future, the most important contribution we make won’t be execution but decision—not how, but what.

Summary

Building the Future: A Human-Centric Vision for AI

Throughout this book, we've explored why artificial intelligence will enhance rather than replace human capabilities. As we conclude, it's crucial to examine what this means for building a human-centric AI future.

The pattern that emerges from decades of technology implementation is clear: the most successful deployments are those that augment human capabilities rather than attempt to replicate them. This remains fundamentally true with AI. The challenge of self-driving cars illustrates this perfectly. The core difficulty isn't processing power or sensor technology – it's replicating the intuitive judgment that allows human drivers to anticipate potential dangers before they materialize.

This principle extends across industries. While AI excels at processing vast amounts of medical images or financial data, it cannot replace a doctor's holistic understanding of patient health or an investor's grasp of how geopolitical events might affect market psychology. The future lies not in pursuing full automation, but in finding the sweet spot where AI enhances human judgment.

Summary

The financial sector provides compelling evidence for this enhancement thesis. The most successful AI implementations in finance aren't the fully automated trading systems that attempt to replace human traders. Instead, they're the tools that help analysts process information more quickly, allowing them to focus their human judgment on higher-level strategy and risk assessment. JPMorgan's ChatCFO exemplifies this approach – rather than replacing financial analysts, it serves as a powerful tool that allows them to process vast amounts of financial data more efficiently. The human analysts remain essential for interpreting results and making strategic recommendations.

This leads to a crucial insight about AI implementation. The key question isn't "what tasks can AI perform?" but rather "how can AI enhance human capabilities?" This requires a fundamental shift in how we think about AI development and deployment. Organizations need to move beyond the simple automation mindset. Instead of asking "can AI do this job?", they should ask "how can AI help humans do this job better?" This might mean using AI to handle routine tasks while freeing humans to focus on judgment-intensive work, or using AI to process vast amounts of data while leaving the interpretation to human experts.

The investment implications are significant. Companies that understand this enhancement paradigm will likely outperform those pursuing full automation. We're already seeing this in healthcare, where companies developing AI tools to assist doctors are showing more promise than those attempting to replace medical judgment entirely.

Looking ahead, several principles should guide AI development:

Building the Future: A Human-Centric Vision for AI

1. Maintain human agency and judgment at the center of decision-making
2. Design AI systems that complement rather than replace human capabilities
3. Focus on transparency and explainability in AI systems
4. Prioritize human-AI collaboration over full automation
5. Invest in human skill development alongside AI capabilities

For policymakers, this means creating frameworks that encourage responsible AI development while preserving human agency. This should include regulations requiring human oversight of critical AI systems, standards for AI transparency and explainability, investment in education and training programs that prepare workers for human-AI collaboration, and incentives for companies developing enhancement-focused AI applications.

The attempt to complete Beethoven's tenth symphony using AI serves as a powerful metaphor for both the potential and limitations of artificial intelligence. While the AI could generate music that superficially resembled Beethoven's style, it couldn't capture the spark of human creativity that made his work truly great. This illustrates a broader truth about AI: it's at its best when enhancing human capabilities rather than trying to replace them. The future of AI lies not in replicating human intelligence but in amplifying it.

As we look to the future, the winners in the AI revolution will be those who understand this fundamental truth. Whether in finance, healthcare, creative industries, or any other sector, success will come from finding ways to combine human judgment with AI capabilities. The human element isn't just a feel-good addition to AI systems – it's essential to their effectiveness. As

Summary

we've shown throughout this book, keeping humans "in the loop" leads to better outcomes than pursuing full automation.

The AI revolution is indeed transformative, but not in the way many predict. Instead of a future where AI replaces human workers, we're entering an era of enhancement, where human capabilities are amplified by artificial intelligence. Understanding and embracing this reality is crucial for anyone looking to thrive in the AI-enhanced future.

Author Dialog

RICHARD >

After spending decades in technology implementation, I've observed a pattern: the most successful deployments of new technology are those that augment human capabilities rather than attempt to replicate them. This remains true with AI. Consider our earlier discussion of self-driving cars. The fundamental challenge isn't processing power or sensor technology – it's replicating the intuitive judgment that allows human drivers to anticipate potential dangers before they materialize.

The same principle applies across industries. AI can process vast amounts of medical images or financial data, but it cannot replace a doctor's holistic understanding of patient health or an investor's grasp of how geopolitical events might affect market psychology. The future lies not in pursuing full automation, but in finding the sweet spot where AI enhances human judgment.

SAMI >

This aligns with what I've observed in financial markets. The most successful AI implementations in finance aren't the fully automated trading systems that attempt to replace human traders. Instead, they're the tools that help analysts process more information more quickly, allowing them to focus their human judgment on higher-level strategy and risk assessment.

Consider the case of JPMorgan's ChatCFO. Rather than replacing financial analysts, it serves as a powerful tool that allows them to process vast amounts of financial data more efficiently. The human analysts remain essential for interpreting results and making strategic recommendations.

RICHARD >

This brings us to a crucial point about AI implementation. The key question isn't "what tasks can AI perform?" but rather "how can AI enhance human capabilities?" This requires a fundamental shift in how we think about AI development and deployment.

First, organizations need to move beyond the simple automation mindset. Instead of asking "can AI do this job?", they should ask "how can AI help humans do this job better?" This might mean using AI to handle routine tasks while freeing humans to focus on judgment-intensive work, or using AI to process vast amounts of data while leaving the interpretation to human experts.

Summary

SAMI >

The investment implications here are significant. Companies that understand this enhancement paradigm will likely outperform those pursuing full automation. We're already seeing this in healthcare, where companies developing AI tools to assist doctors are showing more promise than those attempting to replace medical judgment entirely.

RICHARD >

Looking ahead, several principles should guide AI development:

1. Maintain human agency and judgment at the center of decision-making
2. Design AI systems that complement rather than replace human capabilities
3. Focus on transparency and explainability in AI systems
4. Prioritize human-AI collaboration over full automation
5. Invest in human skill development alongside AI capabilities

SAMI >

For policymakers, this means creating frameworks that encourage responsible AI development while preserving human agency. This might include:

- Regulations requiring human oversight of critical AI systems
- Standards for AI transparency and explainability
- Investment in education and training programs that prepare workers for human-AI collaboration

- Incentives for companies developing enhancement-focused AI applications

RICHARD >

Remember our discussion of Beethoven's tenth symphony? The AI attempt to complete it demonstrated both the power and limitations of artificial intelligence. While the AI could generate music that superficially resembled Beethoven's style, it couldn't capture the spark of human creativity that made his work truly great.

This illustrates a broader truth about AI: it's at its best when enhancing human capabilities rather than trying to replace them. The future of AI lies not in replicating human intelligence but in amplifying it.

SAMI >

As we look to the future, the winners in the AI revolution will be those who understand this fundamental truth. Whether in finance, healthcare, creative industries, or any other sector, success will come from finding ways to combine human judgment with AI capabilities.

The human element isn't just a feel-good addition to AI systems – it's essential to their effectiveness. As we've shown throughout this book, keeping humans "in the loop" leads to better outcomes than pursuing full automation.

The AI revolution is indeed transformative, but not in the way many predict. Instead of a future where AI replaces human workers, we're entering an era of enhancement, where human

Summary

capabilities are amplified by artificial intelligence. Understanding and embracing this reality is crucial for anyone looking to thrive in the AI-enhanced future.

11 About the Authors

Sami J. Karam has worked in the financial markets for over three decades. He was formerly a fund manager at his own firm Seven Global LP and at Evergreen (now Wells Fargo), Kingdon and Soros in Boston and New York. He lives in New York City.

In 2012, Sami started populyst (population + analyst) as a site to research markets and demographics. His articles and interviews have appeared in Foreign Affairs, Quillette, National Review, New Geography, L'Express and other outlets.

He sometimes writes for expert sites for their institutional clients.

Richard Sprague has worked in technology for decades. He co-authors with Sami the weekly InvestAI etc. post. He and Sami were Wharton MBA classmates.

Richard has been a senior executive at numerous technology firms, including Apple where, as an early employee in Japan, he was responsible for the launch of several Mac software products, and Microsoft where he led the Beijing-based development of Mac Excel. He currently works with startups to build what he calls “personal science”: applying the latest technology to personalized health and wellness.

References

- Abdin, Marah, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, et al. 2024. “Phi-3 Technical Report: A Highly Capable Language Model Locally on Your Phone.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14219>.
- AI, 01, Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, et al. 2024. “Yi: Open Foundation Models by 01.AI.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.04652>.
- Alamdari, Sarah, Nitya Thakkar, Rianne Van Den Berg, Alex Xijie Lu, Nicolo Fusi, Ava Pardis Amini, and Kevin K Yang. 2023. “Protein Generation with Evolutionary Diffusion: Sequence Is All You Need.” Preprint. Bioengineering. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.11.556673>.
- Bender, Emily M., Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. 2021. “On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? □.” In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–23. Virtual Event Canada: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>.
- Berglund, Lukas, Meg Tong, Max Kaufmann, Mikita Balesni, Asa Cooper Stickland, Tomasz Korbak, and Owain Evans. 2023. “The Reversal Curse: LLMs Trained on “A Is B” Fail to Learn “B Is A”.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.12288>.
- Bsharat, Sondos Mahmoud, Aidar Myrzakhan, and Zhiqiang Shen. 2023. “Principled Instructions Are All You

References

- Need for Questioning LLaMA-1/2, GPT-3.5/4.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.16171>.
- Burtch, Gordon, Dokyun Lee, and Zhichen Chen. 2024. “The Consequences of Generative AI for Online Knowledge Communities.” *Scientific Reports* 14 (1): 10413. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-61221-0>.
- Butlin, Patrick, Robert Long, Eric Elmoznino, Yoshua Bengio, Jonathan Birch, Axel Constant, George Deane, et al. 2023. “Consciousness in Artificial Intelligence: Insights from the Science of Consciousness.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2308.08708>.
- Carlini, Nicholas, Daniel Paleka, Krishnamurthy Dj Dvijotham, Thomas Steinke, Jonathan Hayase, A. Feder Cooper, Katherine Lee, et al. 2024. “Stealing Part of a Production Language Model.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.06634>.
- Chang, Kent K., Mackenzie Cramer, Sandeep Soni, and David Bamman. 2023a. “Speak, Memory: An Archaeology of Books Known to ChatGPT/GPT-4.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.00118>.
- . 2023b. “Speak, Memory: An Archaeology of Books Known to ChatGPT/GPT-4.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.00118>.
- De Fauw, Jeffrey, Joseph R. Ledsam, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Stanislav Nikolov, Nenad Tomasev, Sam Blackwell, Harry Askham, et al. 2018. “Clinically Applicable Deep Learning for Diagnosis and Referral in Retinal Disease.” *Nature Medicine* 24 (9): 1342–50. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0107-6>.
- Di Palma, Dario, Giovanni Maria Biancofiore, Vito Walter Anelli, Fedelucio Narducci, Tommaso Di Noia, and Eugenio Di Sciascio. 2023. “Evaluating ChatGPT as a Recommender System: A Rigorous Approach.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.03613>.

- Dodge, Jesse, Maarten Sap, Ana Marasović, William Agnew, Gabriel Ilharco, Dirk Groeneveld, Margaret Mitchell, and Matt Gardner. 2021. “Documenting Large Webtext Corpora: A Case Study on the Colossal Clean Crawled Corpus.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2104.08758>.
- Dreyfus, Hubert L. 2007. “Why Heideggerian AI Failed and How Fixing It Would Require Making It More Heideggerian.” *Philosophical Psychology* 20 (2): 247–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515080701239510>.
- Epoch AI. 2024. “Data on Large Language AI Models.” <https://epochai.org/data/large-scale-ai-models>.
- Erdil, Ege, and Tamay Besiroglu. 2024. “Explosive Growth from AI Automation: A Review of the Arguments.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.11690>.
- Esteva, Andre, Alexandre Robicquet, Bharath Ramsundar, Volodymyr Kuleshov, Mark DePristo, Katherine Chou, Claire Cui, Greg Corrado, Sebastian Thrun, and Jeff Dean. 2019. “A Guide to Deep Learning in Healthcare.” *Nature Medicine* 25 (1): 24–29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-018-0316-z>.
- Feng, Shangbin, Chan Young Park, Yuhan Liu, and Yulia Tsvetkov. 2023. “From Pretraining Data to Language Models to Downstream Tasks: Tracking the Trails of Political Biases Leading to Unfair NLP Models.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.08283>.
- Goh, Ethan, Robert Gallo, Jason Hom, Eric Strong, Yingjie Weng, Hannah Kerman, Joséphine A. Cool, et al. 2024. “Large Language Model Influence on Diagnostic Reasoning: A Randomized Clinical Trial.” *JAMA Network Open* 7 (10): e2440969. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.40969>.
- Grossmann, Igor, Matthew Feinberg, Dawn C. Parker, Nicholas A. Christakis, Philip E. Tetlock, and William

References

- A. Cunningham. 2023. “AI and the Transformation of Social Science Research.” *Science* 380 (6650): 1108–9. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adi1778>.
- Gupta, Vipul, Pranav Narayanan Venkit, Hugo Laurençon, Shomir Wilson, and Rebecca J. Passonneau. 2023. “CALM : A Multi-Task Benchmark for Comprehensive Assessment of Language Model Bias.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.12539>.
- He, Yuting, Fuxiang Huang, Xinrui Jiang, Yuxiang Nie, Minghao Wang, Jiguang Wang, and Hao Chen. 2024. “Foundation Model for Advancing Healthcare: Challenges, Opportunities, and Future Directions.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.03264>.
- Hendy, Amr, Mohamed Abdelrehim, Amr Sharaf, Vikas Raunak, Mohamed Gabr, Hitokazu Matsushita, Young Jin Kim, Mohamed Afify, and Hany Hassan Awadalla. 2023. “How Good Are GPT Models at Machine Translation? A Comprehensive Evaluation.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2302.09210>.
- Hicks, Michael Townsen, James Humphries, and Joe Slater. 2024. “ChatGPT Is Bullshit.” *Ethics and Information Technology* 26 (2): 38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09775-5>.
- Hoffmann, Jordan, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, et al. 2022. “Training Compute-Optimal Large Language Models.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2203.15556>.
- Hopkins, Ashley M, Jessica M Logan, Ganessan Kichenadasse, and Michael J Sorich. 2023. “Artificial Intelligence Chatbots Will Revolutionize How Cancer Patients Access Information: ChatGPT Represents a Paradigm-Shift.” *JNCI Cancer Spectrum* 7 (2): pkado10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jncics/pkado10>.

- Hristidis, Vagelis, Nicole Ruggiano, Ellen L Brown, Sai Rithesh Reddy Ganta, and Selena Stewart. 2023. "Chat-GPT Vs Google for Queries Related to Dementia and Other Cognitive Decline: Comparison of Results." *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 25 (July): e48966. <https://doi.org/10.2196/48966>.
- Huang, Haifeng, and Zhi Li. 2013. "Propaganda and Signaling." *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2325101>.
- Huang, Kaixuan, Yuanhao Qu, Henry Cousins, William A. Johnson, Di Yin, Mihir Shah, Denny Zhou, Russ Altman, Mengdi Wang, and Le Cong. 2024. "CRISPR-GPT: An LLM Agent for Automated Design of Gene-Editing Experiments." arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.18021>.
- Jackson, Joshua Conrad, Kai Chi Yam, Pok Man Tang, Chris G. Sibley, and Adam Waytz. 2023. "Exposure to Automation Explains Religious Declines." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 120 (34): e2304748120. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2304748120>.
- Jin, Youngjin, Eugene Jang, Jian Cui, Jin-Woo Chung, Yongjae Lee, and Seungwon Shin. 2023. "DarkBERT: A Language Model for the Dark Side of the Internet." <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.08596>.
- Jing, Bowen, Bonnie Berger, and Tommi Jaakkola. 2024. "AlphaFold Meets Flow Matching for Generating Protein Ensembles." arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.04845>.
- Kaddour, Jean, Joshua Harris, Maximilian Mozes, Herbie Bradley, Roberta Raileanu, and Robert McHardy. 2023. "Challenges and Applications of Large Language Models." <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2307.10169>.
- Kallini, Julie, Isabel Papadimitriou, Richard Futrell, Kyle Mahowald, and Christopher Potts. 2024. "Mission: Impossible Language Models." arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2401>.

References

- 06416.
- Kanjee, Zahir, Byron Crowe, and Adam Rodman. 2023. "Accuracy of a Generative Artificial Intelligence Model in a Complex Diagnostic Challenge." *JAMA* 330 (1): 78. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2023.8288>.
- Kaufman, Jaycee M., Anirudh Thommandram, and Yan Fossat. 2023. "Acoustic Analysis and Prediction of Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus Using Smartphone-Recorded Voice Segments." *Mayo Clinic Proceedings: Digital Health* 1 (4): 534–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcpdig.2023.08.005>.
- Killock, David. 2020. "AI Outperforms Radiologists in Mammographic Screening." *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology* 17 (3): 134–34. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41571-020-0329-7>.
- Kim, Yubin, Xuhai Xu, Daniel McDuff, Cynthia Breazeal, and Hae Won Park. 2024. "Health-LLM: Large Language Models for Health Prediction via Wearable Sensor Data." arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2401.06866>.
- Kung, Tiffany H., Morgan Cheatham, ChatGPT, Arielle Medenilla, Czarina Sillos, Lorie De Leon, Camille Elepaño, et al. 2022. "Performance of ChatGPT on USMLE: Potential for AI-Assisted Medical Education Using Large Language Models." Preprint. Medical Education. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.12.19.22283643>.
- Larson, Erik J. 2021a. *The Myth of Artificial Intelligence: Why Computers Can't Think the Way We Do*. Cambridge, Massachusetts London, England: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- . 2021b. *The Myth of Artificial Intelligence: Why Computers Can't Think the Way We Do*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Lee, Cecilia S., Doug M. Baughman, and Aaron Y. Lee. 2017. "Deep Learning Is Effective for Classifying

- Normal Versus Age-Related Macular Degeneration OCT Images.” *Ophthalmology Retina* 1 (4): 322–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oret.2016.12.009>.
- Lee, Peter, Sebastien Bubeck, and Joseph Petro. 2023. “Benefits, Limits, and Risks of GPT-4 as an AI Chatbot for Medicine.” Edited by Jeffrey M. Drazen, Isaac S. Kohane, and Tze-Yun Leong. *New England Journal of Medicine* 388 (13): 1233–39. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMSr2214184>.
- Lee, Peter, Carey Goldberg, and Isaac Kohane. 2023. *The AI Revolution in Medicine: GPT-4 and Beyond*. 1st ed. Hoboken: Pearson.
- Leivada, Evelina, Elliot Murphy, and Gary Marcus. 2022. “DALL-E 2 Fails to Reliably Capture Common Syntactic Processes.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.12889>.
- Lenat, Doug, and Gary Marcus. 2023. “Getting from Generative AI to Trustworthy AI: What LLMs Might Learn from Cyc.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.04445>.
- Li, Luchang, Sheng Qian, Jie Lu, Lunxi Yuan, Rui Wang, and Qin Xie. 2024. “Transformer-Lite: High-Efficiency Deployment of Large Language Models on Mobile Phone GPUs.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.20041>.
- Liu, Nelson F., Tianyi Zhang, and Percy Liang. 2023. “Evaluating Verifiability in Generative Search Engines.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2304.09848>.
- Liu, Xiao, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, et al. 2023. “AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as Agents.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2308.03688>.
- Liu, Zechun, Changsheng Zhao, Forrest Iandola, Chen Lai, Yuandong Tian, Igor Fedorov, Yunyang Xiong, et al. 2024. “MobileLLM: Optimizing Sub-Billion Parameter Language Models for On-Device Use Cases.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.14905>.

References

- Liu, Zhuoran, Leqi Zou, Xuan Zou, Caihua Wang, Biao Zhang, Da Tang, Bolin Zhu, et al. 2022. “Monolith: Real Time Recommendation System With Collisionless Embedding Table.” arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2209.07663>.
- Lu, Chris, Cong Lu, Robert Tjarko Lange, Jakob Foerster, Jeff Clune, and David Ha. 2024. “The AI Scientist: Towards Fully Automated Open-Ended Scientific Discovery.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2408.06292>.
- Luo, Renqian, Liai Sun, Yingce Xia, Tao Qin, Sheng Zhang, Hoifung Poon, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2022. “BioGPT: Generative Pre-Trained Transformer for Biomedical Text Generation and Mining.” *Briefings in Bioinformatics* 23 (6): bbac409. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bib/bbac409>.
- Lutsker, Guy, Gal Sapir, Anastasia Godneva, Smadar Shilo, Jerry R. Greenfield, Dorit Samocha-Bonet, Shie Manor, et al. 2024. “From Glucose Patterns to Health Outcomes: A Generalizable Foundation Model for Continuous Glucose Monitor Data Analysis.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2408.11876>.
- Ma, Xiao, Swaroop Mishra, Ahmad Beirami, Alex Beutel, and Jilin Chen. 2023. “Let’s Do a Thought Experiment: Using Counterfactuals to Improve Moral Reasoning.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2306.14308>.
- Mahowald, Kyle, Anna A. Ivanova, Idan A. Blank, Nancy Kanwisher, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Evelina Fedorenko. 2023. “Dissociating Language and Thought in Large Language Models: A Cognitive Perspective.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.06627>.
- Manathunga, Supun, and Isuru Hettigoda. 2023. “Aligning Large Language Models for Clinical Tasks.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.02884>.
- McDuff, Daniel, Mike Schaekermann, Tao Tu, Anil Palepu, Amy Wang, Jake Garrison, Karan Singhal, et al. 2023. “Towards

- Accurate Differential Diagnosis with Large Language Models.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.00164>.
- Meskó, Bertalan. 2023. “Prompt Engineering as an Important Emerging Skill for Medical Professionals: Tutorial.” *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 25 (October): e50638. <https://doi.org/10.2196/50638>.
- Meskó, Bertalan, and Eric J. Topol. 2023. “The Imperative for Regulatory Oversight of Large Language Models (or Generative AI) in Healthcare.” *Npj Digital Medicine* 6 (1): 120. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00873-0>.
- Millière, Raphaël, and Cameron Buckner. 2024. “A Philosophical Introduction to Language Models – Part I: Continuity With Classic Debates.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2401.03910>.
- Narayanan, Arvind, and Sayash Kapoor. 2024. *AI Snake Oil: What Artificial Intelligence Can Do, What It Can't, and How to Tell the Difference*. Princeton Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Nori, Harsha, Nicholas King, Scott Mayer McKinney, Dean Carignan, and Eric Horvitz. 2023. “Capabilities of GPT-4 on Medical Challenge Problems.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2303.13375>.
- Oh, Hamilton Se-Hwee, Jarod Rutledge, Daniel Nachun, Róbert Pálovics, Olamide Abiose, Patricia Moran-Losada, Divya Channappa, et al. 2023. “Organ Aging Signatures in the Plasma Proteome Track Health and Disease.” *Nature* 624 (7990): 164–72. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06802-1>.
- Oren, Yonatan, Nicole Meister, Niladri Chatterji, Faisal Ladhak, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2023. “Proving Test Set Contamination in Black Box Language Models.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2310.17623>.
- Pei, Gan, Jiangning Zhang, Menghan Hu, Guangtao Zhai,

References

- Chengjie Wang, Zhenyu Zhang, Jian Yang, Chunhua Shen, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. “Deepfake Generation and Detection: A Benchmark and Survey.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.17881>.
- Qian, Cheng, Xinran Zhao, and Sherry Tongshuang Wu. 2023. “”Merge Conflicts!” Exploring the Impacts of External Distractors to Parametric Knowledge Graphs.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.08594>.
- Qiu, Pengcheng, Chaoyi Wu, Xiaoman Zhang, Weixiong Lin, Haicheng Wang, Ya Zhang, Yanfeng Wang, and Weidi Xie. 2024. “Towards Building Multilingual Language Model for Medicine.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.13963>.
- Raji, Inioluwa Deborah, I. Elizabeth Kumar, Aaron Horowitz, and Andrew D. Selbst. 2022. “The Fallacy of AI Functionality.” In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 959–72. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533158>.
- Rao, Arya, Michael Pang, John Kim, Meghana Kamineni, Winston Lie, Anoop K Prasad, Adam Landman, Keith Dreyer, and Marc D Succi. 2023. “Assessing the Utility of ChatGPT Throughout the Entire Clinical Workflow: Development and Usability Study.” *Journal of Medical Internet Research* 25 (August): e48659. <https://doi.org/10.2196/48659>.
- Romera-Paredes, Bernardino, Mohammadamin Barekatain, Alexander Novikov, Matej Balog, M. Pawan Kumar, Emilien Dupont, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, et al. 2024. “Mathematical Discoveries from Program Search with Large Language Models.” *Nature* 625 (7995): 468–75. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06924-6>.
- Röttger, Paul, Valentin Hofmann, Valentina Pyatkin, Musashi Hinck, Hannah Rose Kirk, Hinrich Schütze, and Dirk Hovy. 2024. “Political Compass or Spinning Arrow? Towards More Meaningful Evaluations for Val-

- ues and Opinions in Large Language Models.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.16786>.
- Rozado, David. 2023. “The Political Biases of ChatGPT.” *Social Sciences* 12 (3): 148. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12030148>.
- . 2024. “The Political Preferences of LLMs.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.01789>.
- Saab, Khaled, Tao Tu, Wei-Hung Weng, Ryutaro Tanno, David Stutz, Ellery Wulczyn, Fan Zhang, et al. 2024. “Capabilities of Gemini Models in Medicine.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.18416>.
- Sastry, Girish, Lennart Heim, Haydn Belfield, Markus Anderljung, Miles Brundage, Julian Hazell, Cullen O’Keefe, et al. 2024. “Computing Power and the Governance of Artificial Intelligence.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.08797>.
- Shumailov, Ilia, Zakhar Shumaylov, Yiren Zhao, Yarin Gal, Nicolas Papernot, and Ross Anderson. 2023. “The Curse of Recursion: Training on Generated Data Makes Models Forget.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17493>.
- Singhal, Karan, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, et al. 2023. “Large Language Models Encode Clinical Knowledge.” *Nature* 620 (7972): 172–80. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2>.
- Sun, Jie, Qun-Xi Dong, San-Wang Wang, Yong-Bo Zheng, Xiao-Xing Liu, Tang-Sheng Lu, Kai Yuan, et al. 2023. “Artificial Intelligence in Psychiatry Research, Diagnosis, and Therapy.” *Asian Journal of Psychiatry* 87 (September): 103705. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2023.103705>.
- Tian, Yuzhang, Jianbo Zhao, Haoyu Dong, Junyu Xiong, Shiyu Xia, Mengyu Zhou, Yun Lin, et al. 2024. “SpreadsheetLLM: Encoding Spreadsheets for Large Language Models.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2407.09025>.

References

- Tu, Tao, Anil Palepu, Mike Schaekermann, Khaled Saab, Jan Freyberg, Ryutaro Tanno, Amy Wang, et al. 2024. “Towards Conversational Diagnostic AI.” <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2401.05654>.
- Udandaraao, Vishaal, Ameya Prabhu, Adhiraj Ghosh, Yash Sharma, Philip H. S. Torr, Adel Bibi, Samuel Albanie, and Matthias Bethge. 2024. “No ”Zero-Shot” Without Exponential Data: Pretraining Concept Frequency Determines Multimodal Model Performance.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.04125>.
- Villalobos, Pablo, Jaime Sevilla, Lennart Heim, Tamay Besiroglu, Marius Hobbhahn, and Anson Ho. 2022. “Will We Run Out of Data? An Analysis of the Limits of Scaling Datasets in Machine Learning.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.04325>.
- Wang, Chengliang, Xinrun Chen, Haojian Ning, and Shiyong Li. 2023. “SAM-OCTA: A Fine-Tuning Strategy for Applying Foundation Model to OCTA Image Segmentation Tasks.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.11758>.
- Wei, Jason, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. “Chain-of-Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903>.
- Wei, Jerry, Chengrun Yang, Xinying Song, Yifeng Lu, Nathan Hu, Dustin Tran, Daiyi Peng, et al. 2024. “Long-Form Factuality in Large Language Models.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.18802>.
- Weiss, Roy, Daniel Ayzenshteyn, Guy Amit, and Yisroel Mirsky. 2024. “What Was Your Prompt? A Remote Keylogging Attack on AI Assistants.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.09751>.
- Wendler, Chris, Veniamin Veselovsky, Giovanni Monea, and

- Robert West. 2024. “Do Llamas Work in English? On the Latent Language of Multilingual Transformers.” arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.10588>.
- Wornow, Michael, Yizhe Xu, Rahul Thapa, Birju Patel, Ethan Steinberg, Scott Fleming, Michael A. Pfeffer, Jason Fries, and Nigam H. Shah. 2023. “The Shaky Foundations of Large Language Models and Foundation Models for Electronic Health Records.” *Npj Digital Medicine* 6 (1): 135. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00879-8>.
- Yiu, Eunice, Eliza Kosoy, and Alison Gopnik. 2023. “Transmission Versus Truth, Imitation Versus Innovation: What Children Can Do That Large Language and Language-and-Vision Models Cannot (Yet).” *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, October, 17456916231201401. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17456916231201401>.
- Yu, Feiyang, Mark Endo, Rayan Krishnan, Ian Pan, Andy Tsai, Eduardo Pontes Reis, Eduardo Kaiser Ururahy Nunes Fonseca, et al. 2023. “Evaluating Progress in Automatic Chest X-Ray Radiology Report Generation.” *Patterns* 4 (9): 100802. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2023.100802>.
- Zaleski, Amanda L, Rachel Berkowsky, Kelly Jean Thomas Craig, and Linda S Pescatello. 2024. “Comprehensiveness, Accuracy, and Readability of Exercise Recommendations Provided by an AI-Based Chatbot: Mixed Methods Study.” *JMIR Medical Education* 10 (January): e51308. <https://doi.org/10.2196/51308>.
- Zhao, Theodore, Yu Gu, Jianwei Yang, Naoto Usuyama, Ho Hin Lee, Sid Kiblawi, Tristan Naumann, et al. 2024. “A Foundation Model for Joint Segmentation, Detection and Recognition of Biomedical Objects Across Nine Modalities.” *Nature Methods*, November. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-024-02499-w>.
- Zhao, Zihao, Yuxiao Liu, Han Wu, Yonghao Li, Sheng Wang, Lin

References

- Teng, Disheng Liu, et al. 2023. “CLIP in Medical Imaging: A Comprehensive Survey.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2312.07353>.
- Zheng, Huaixiu Steven, Swaroop Mishra, Hugh Zhang, Xinyun Chen, Minmin Chen, Azade Nova, Le Hou, et al. 2024. “NATURAL PLAN: Benchmarking LLMs on Natural Language Planning.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2406.04520>.
- Zhou, Shuyan, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, et al. 2023. “WebArena: A Realistic Web Environment for Building Autonomous Agents.” arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13854>.