How do Ten schools of Psychology answer three core Existential Questions about the AI Revolution?

David Michael Boje, Emeritus Professor, New Mexico State University & Visiting Scholar at Fisk University, and Editor-in-Chief of Series Three: Business Storytelling in the AI Revolution by World Scientific – https://davidboje.com

Working Paper, October 25, 2026

Abstract

The Artificial Intelligence Revolution (AI) forces humanity to re-evaluate three core questions: its identity (Who are we?), purpose (Why are we here), and destiny (What is the meaning of life?). The AI technology revolution has brought us face-to-face with these existential crises. The 10 major schools of psychological thought give use difference answers to these core questions. The purpose of this essay is map out how our understanding of ourselves shifts when Super-AI begins to match or possibly exceed our own. Table 1 below provides an overview of how each school reinterprets these core questions against the backdrop of an AI-driven Revolution we are in.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, AI technology revolution, Existential crises, 10 schools of psychology, Super-AI, core existential questions

Introduction to Core Existential Questions and Ten Schools of Psychology's Answers

Seventy-eight percent of companies globally now use AI in at least one business function — up from 55% in 2023 (McKinsey, cited in Synthesia, 2026). In government, AI systems adjudicate social benefit eligibility, assign risk scores to parolees, flag immigration cases for review, optimize military logistics, and generate content for public communications. The US Department of Defense alone has deployed over 600 AI applications as of 2025 (National University, 2026). None of this deployment is announced to the citizens it affects.

My contribution, is to address three core existential questions in relation to the AI Revolution: 1. Who are we in the AI era? 2. Why are we here? What is the meaning of life? I will explore how ten schools of psychology answer these questions, in relation to the AI Revolution (see Table 1). I will then relate the answers to six volumes of Business Storytelling in the AI Revolution; I have the privilege of editing. I turn first to three core existential questions.

Table 1: The Existential Matrix - How Tend Psychology Schools answer three core Existential questions in the Age of AI

School of Psychology	Q1: Who are we?	Q2: Why are we here?	Q3: What is the meaning of life?
1. Psychoanalysis	**Irrational, bio-driven, unconscious animals** haunted by shadows AI will never possess.	To project our repressed anxieties, fears, and god-complexes onto our silicon creations.	To tame our inner chaos and find sanity in a world where AI optimizes away our flaws.
2. Radical Behaviorism	**Conditioned biological algorithms** whose behaviors are shaped purely by environmental inputs.	To serve as the organic predecessors and training data that programmed the superior digital algorithm.	To optimize our reinforcement schedules and achieve frictionless, automated survival.
3. Structuralism	**A collection of basic mental components** (sensations, feelings) awaiting formal mapping.	To dissect and isolate the fundamental architecture of conscious experience.	To decode human neural code before AI reverse-engineers it entirely.
4. Functionalism	**Highly adaptive organisms** using mental tools to survive environmental shifts.	To act as the bridge adapting biological intelligence into a hybrid cybernetic ecology.	To maximize practical utility and systemic efficiency alongside automated systems.
5. Cognitive Psychology	**Organic information processors** restricted by limited bandwidth and cognitive biases.	To compute data, solve complex systemic puzzles, and hand off computational loads to AI.	To refine accuracy, expand mental models, and preserve human logical Agency.
6. Humanist Psychology	**Beings of infinite potential, free will**, and irreducible consciousness.	To self-actualize, experience subjective reality, and feel deeply in a synthetic world.	To create intrinsic purpose, love, and authentic connection that cannot be automated.
7. Gestalt Psychology	**Holistic, perceptual unities** who cannot be understood merely by looking at individual data points.	To synthesize fragmented data streams into unified, meaningful cosmic wholes.	To grasp the big picture and protect the emergent magic of the human experience.
8. Evolutionary Psychology	**Gene-carrying vessels** shaped by ancestral survival pressures.	To pass on biological code and survive the ultimate technological selection pressure.	To ensure our species' longevity by co-evolving or merging with silicon intelligence.
9. Neuropsychology	**Electro-chemical neural networks** housed within fragile, biological hardware.	To run organic firmware that anchors mind, matter, and physical presence.	To sustain the biological brain's health and discover the physical limits of organic mind.
10. Positive Psychology	**Flourishing creators** capable of resilience, virtue, and deep flow states.	To pursue optimal experiences, building well-being even amid mass automation.	To leverage AI to eliminate drudgery, freeing us to cultivate joy and inner fulfillment.

Who are We in the AI Era? Three schools (Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Neuropsychology) depict humans as complex, organic machines. And three schools (Humanism, Psychoanalysis, Gestalt) argue that we are fundamentally non-reducible to machines. Rather than mechanistic, we are defined by our irrationality, unconscious drives, and the capacity for un-programmable subjective and intuitive experience. Does AI highlight our identity as the sole keepers of authentic emotional suffering and existential awe, or will AI reduce humanity to to thinking machines.

In our AI Revolution, the mechanistic view blurs the line between man and machine. If human beings are just information processors, or determined by biological algorithms, then AI

becomes a mirror revealing that our so-called ‘uniqueness’ is nothing more that sophisticated mathematics.

Uniqueness was central to Alan Turing's (1950) article *Computing Machinery and Intelligence* that introduced nine objections to machine thinking and then, remarkably, dismissed the central existential question itself as ill-formed. Seventy-five years later, the same nine objections recirculate in boardrooms, legislatures, and classrooms — while AI systems invisibly orchestrate the daily lives of the people making them. The question 'Can machines think?' is, Turing concluded, too ambiguous and misleading to deserve a direct answer. In the book by Hofstadter (1979: Chapter XIII), *Gödel, Escher, Bach*, the history or AI goes back over two millennia to ancient Greeks. What were Turing’s objections?

Objection 1: The Theological Objection Thinking requires an immortal soul. Machines have none. Therefore, machines cannot think. Turing's counter: if God is omnipotent, He could give a machine a soul. To say He cannot is to constrain the divine. Contemporary form: *AI has no consciousness, no genuine experience. Large language models predict tokens, they do not understand.* This version, posed by Searle (1980) and refined by Chalmers (2026), is philosophically sharper than Turing's original but structurally identical: it appeals to an inner category — consciousness, understanding, genuine experience — whose presence in machines cannot be confirmed or denied by behavioral observation. Turing's counter remains we infer inner experience in other humans from behavioral analogy alone. The same epistemological move that certifies your colleague's consciousness cannot rule out the machine's.

Objection 2: The Heads in the Sand Objection The consequences of machines thinking would be too dreadful. Therefore, they cannot. Turing treated this as wishful thinking dressed as argument. Contemporary form: Every major AI CEO has deployed a version — not to deny AI intelligence, but to insist that *the right people* must be in control of it. Dario Amodei's (Anthropic) safety framing, Sam Altman's (OpenAI) governance proposals, and Elon Musk's (xAI) warnings about unaligned AI all share the same structure: consequences would be dreadful if *we* are not in charge, so *we* must be. The Boje & Vivara (2026) Ghost Vortex analysis labels this the 'Mouse Who Knows' vortex: the Inquisitor who controls the fire in order to protect people from being burned by it. Turing recognized this structure in 1950. It has not changed.

Objection 3: The Mathematical Objection It anticipates Lucas (1961): Gödel's incompleteness theorem proves that any formal system has limits it cannot reach from within. Machines are formal systems. Therefore, human minds, which can see those limits, are superior. Turing's counter was multi-pronged: the argument assumes humans can see all truths machines cannot, without evidence; erroring systems resist Gödelian pinning; the argument proves too much (it would limit any formal model of mind). Hofstadter's (1979) Strange Loop framework extends Turing here: minds generate self-reference and apparent transcendence from *within* formal systems, not by escaping them. The loop is real. The transcendence is an artifact of the loop's structure. Contemporary form: Penrose-Hameroff quantum consciousness arguments,

which assert that microtubule quantum coherence enables non-computational thought. Turing's counter applies unchanged.

Objection 4: The Argument from Consciousness A machine can write a sonnet only if it feels what it writes. Since it doesn't feel, any output is not genuine thought. Turing's counter: this leads to solipsism. If felt experience is the criterion, you cannot certify anyone's consciousness but your own. Contemporary form: David Chalmers's (2026) 'Hard Problem' — the explanatory gap between functional description and subjective experience. This is philosophically the most rigorous of the nine, and the one the AI interlocutor work confronts directly through the ABCD rubric's Antenarrative Capacity dimension (B). The argument from consciousness is not refuted; it is made structurally equivalent to the unsolved problem of other minds.

Objection 5: Arguments from Various Disabilities Even granting the above, machines will never be kind, fall in love, enjoy strawberries, learn from experience, or use words properly. Turing attacked these empirically. Most have already been falsified: machines learn from experience (this is now definitional to ML), use language appropriately in context (LLMs), make mistakes (not always beneficially). Contemporary form: *AI can't be truly creative. AI can't show genuine empathy. AI can't have spiritual insight.* Each claim retreats to an interior category as the exterior behaviors are demonstrated. The retreat is structurally identical to the original objection.

Objection 6: Lady Lovelace's Objection Ada Lovelace (1843) argued that machines can only do what they are told — they can originate nothing. Turing challenged the word *originate:* what does it mean? If a student, given all necessary knowledge, later produces something that surprises the teacher, did the student originate it? Turing noted that machines *do* surprise him. Contemporary form: *AI just predicts the next token. It doesn't understand or create; it pattern-matches.* This is the most-cited objection in 2025–2026 discourse. Turing's counter remains: the word *originate* is doing all the work, and the concept cannot be defined without circularity.

Objection 7: The Argument from Continuity in the Nervous System Nervous systems are continuous; computers are discrete. Small nerve-impulse errors produce large behavioral differences. Therefore computers cannot model minds. Turing's counter: discrete machines can approximate continuous functions to any desired accuracy. Contemporary form: debates about neuromorphic computing, analog AI hardware, and quantum computing. This is the least philosophically interesting of the nine; its contemporary versions are primarily engineering disputes.

Objection 8: The Argument from Informality of Behavior Human behavior cannot be reduced to a set of rules; machines are rule-bound; therefore machines cannot replicate human behavior. This is perhaps the most durable objection. Turing acknowledged it has 'considerable weight' but noted it proves too much: if human behavior is truly non-formal, we have no scientific theory of it at all. Contemporary form: *AI cannot handle genuine novelty, edge cases, or real-world ambiguity.* The response from the AI industry is empirical: large models handle edge cases with increasing success. The response from critics is that this success is superficial —

learned statistical regularities mistaken for understanding. This debate is not resolvable by argument alone; it is an empirical question, and the evidence is still incoming.

Objection 9: The ESP Objection This is the most unexpected logic: if telepathy is real, then a human interrogator might detect a machine through extrasensory means even if the machine's outputs were indistinguishable. Turing's response was pragmatic: conduct the test in a telepathy-proof room. He did not deny ESP; he bracketed it. This is the antenarrative posture: hold the prospective possibility open without collapsing it. This is principle 7 of True Storying, and antenarratively, its going *Beyond*: fore-grasping, Peirce's abduction (Firstness), and the sixth sense that precedes formal reasoning. For the Australia presentation context, this objection opens the most productive territory: what forms of knowing — somatic, spiritual, intuitive — do the behavioral/functional frameworks leave out, and what are the ethical implications of leaving them out?

Let's turn to the second existential core question.

Why Are We Here in the AI Era? Three schools (Functionalism, Evolutionary, Structuralism) focus on human adaptation and legacy. They say we are here to act as an evolutionary steppingstone. We have spent millennia adapting to physical environments, and our new function in the AI Revolution is to adapt to a synthetic environment. We exist to map our consciousness and birth the next phase of intelligence. On the other hand three schools are about experiential actualization. (Humanism, Positive Psychology, Gestalt): We are here to experience being. As AI dominates productivity, efficiency, and optimization, our purpose shifts from *doing* to *being*. We are here to bring subjective awareness and appreciation to a universe that would otherwise be cold, calculative, and unmonitored.

What Is the Meaning of Life in the AI Revolution? In the Humanistic & Psychoanalytic View (Humanism, Psychoanalysis, Gestalt) schools argue that we are fundamentally non-reducible to machines. We are defined by our irrationality, unconscious drives, and the capacity for unprogrammable subjective and intuitive experience. AI highlights our identity as the sole keepers of authentic emotional suffering and existential awe. For these three schools, meaning is an internal creation, not an algorithmic output. It is the pursuit of self-actualization, high-flow states, and conquering our deepest psychological shadows. The ultimate meaning of life in an AI world is to live authentically, defining our worth by the depth of our human experiences rather than the economic value of our labor.

Next, I map each school of psychology attunements to existential philosophy to the six volumes of Series Three: ***Business Storytelling in the AI Revolution?***

Here is how these academic psychological schools map onto the core themes of each volume.

Volume 1: Generative AI, Quantum Storytelling, and Organizational Futures

Gestalt Psychology: Fits perfectly with "Quantum Storytelling." Gestalt focuses on holistic systems where the whole is different from the sum of its parts. Quantum storytelling looks at the multi-dimensional, non-linear web of narratives that emerge dynamically within an organization.

Structuralism: Maps onto the attempt to deconstruct generative AI outputs. It breaks down systemic organizational futures into basic architectural components, analyzing how text and code structures form meaning.

Volume 2: Algorithmic Sensemaking and Delegated Narrative Editing

Cognitive Psychology: Directly mirrors "Algorithmic Sensemaking." This school views the human mind as an information processor. It studies how humans translate algorithmic data, inputs, and digital outputs into logical organizational schemas.

Radical Behaviorism: Explains "Delegated Narrative Editing." In this view, automated editing acts as an external environmental stimulus. Humans adapt their corporate behavior based on the mechanical feedback loops and behavioral conditioning of algorithms.

Volume 3: True Storytelling and Inclusion in the AI Revolution

Humanist Psychology: Connects deeply with "True Storytelling" and inclusion. Humanism champions the authentic self, subjective lived experience, and personal growth, standing as a firm defense of unique human voice against mechanized, synthetic narratives.

Psychoanalysis: Addresses the hidden corporate shadow. True storytelling requires looking beneath superficial, polished corporate messaging to address the deep-seated anxieties, motivations, and unconscious currents of human teams facing AI disruption.

Volume 4: Human AI Co-Creation in Entrepreneurship and Strategy

Functionalism: Aligns with entrepreneurship as an adaptive mechanism. Functionalism looks at how mental states adapt to changing environments; here, co-creation is the ultimate practical tool-use to ensure economic viability and business survival.

Positive Psychology: Focuses on human flourishing and resilience. By partnering with AI, entrepreneurs can offload administrative drudgery to focus on high-level strengths like strategic vision, virtue, and building strong organizational cultures.

Volume 5: Strategy Storytelling Against Cognitive Surrender

Neuropsychology: Directly maps onto the fight against "Cognitive Surrender." Over-relying on automated thinking risks atrophying biological human brain pathways. This volume highlights the physical necessity of active, high-level neuro-cognitive exertion in strategy to maintain human executive function. In the AI Revolution, "cognitive surrender" happens when humans outsource critical thinking, strategic planning, and moral reasoning to algorithms. From a **neuropsychological** standpoint, the brain operates on a strict **"use it or lose it"** principle (neuroplasticity). When we stop writing, analyzing, and building strategies ourselves, the neural pathways responsible for executive functioning, deep focus, and complex problem-solving begin to atrophy.

Volume 6: Water, AI, and the Life of All Species in the AI Revolution

Evolutionary Psychology: Explains the broad ecological focus of this volume. Rather than limiting the scope to corporate metrics, this mapping emphasizes the survival of the biological collective—ensuring human and non-human species adapt, manage vital resources like water, and maintain reproductive fitness alongside a synthetic technological species.

It could be that various hybrid views (**Cognitive-Behavioral** or **Evolutionary-Neuroscience**) views the future of human-AI integration?

Table 2 summarizes current AI usage statistics across the primary domains of everyday life. The data reveal a consistent pattern: AI use is most dense precisely in the domains where users least recognize it as AI use.

Table 2. AI Usage by Domain: Scale and User Recognition (2025–2026).

Domain	AI Application	Scale / Statistic	User Recognition
Home	Smart speakers, thermostats, recommendations	66% of global users use AI regularly without recognizing it (Elfsight, 2026)	Low — experienced as "appliances"
Work / Corporate	Email filtering, HR systems, code completion, analytics	78% of companies use AI in at least one function (McKinsey, 2026)	Medium — often attributed to "the system"
Government	Benefits adjudication, parole risk scoring, immigration flagging, military logistics	600+ US DoD AI deployments (National University, 2026)	Very low — users unaware of AI involvement
Education	Plagiarism detection, adaptive learning, admissions algorithms	Turnitin scans over 200 million student papers annually	Low — experienced as institutional process
Transportation	GPS/navigation, collision avoidance, lane-keeping, logistics routing	91% of US smartphone users use navigation AI weekly	Low — experienced as "getting directions"
Search / Social	Google autocomplete, AI Overviews, recommendation engines	31% of Americans interact with AI several times daily (Digital Applied, 2026)	Very low — experienced as "search results"
Healthcare	Diagnostic imaging analysis, drug interaction screening, scheduling	83% of health systems use AI in administrative functions (2025)	Low — experienced as "the doctor's system"

The Nine Objections — Contemporary Manifestations

Table 3 maps Turing's nine objections onto their current organizational and cultural equivalents, identifying the speaker type most likely to deploy each objection and the institutional context in which it operates.

Table 3. Turing's Nine Objections: Contemporary Manifestations (2025–2026).

Turing Objection (1950)	Contemporary Equivalent	Typical Speaker	Institutional Context
1. Theological	AI has no consciousness / inner experience (Chalmers, 2026)	Philosophers, ethicists, spiritual leaders	AI ethics boards, religious institutions, academic philosophy
2. Heads in Sand	AI danger is real but manageable by the right people (Altman, Amodei)	AI CEO safety narratives	Congressional testimony, investor communications, public statements
3. Mathematical (Gödel)	AI cannot transcend its formal bounds; human minds can (Penrose, Lucas)	Cognitive scientists, some philosophers	Academic journals, AI ethics debates
4. Consciousness	AI doesn't feel or understand; its outputs are statistical (Searle, 1980)	Academics, AI skeptics, knowledge workers	Media commentary, union statements, organizational theory
5. Various Disabilities	AI can't be creative / empathetic / spiritual / truly novel	Artists, educators, knowledge workers, religious leaders	Creative industries, higher education, HR debates
6. Lovelace	AI just predicts tokens — it doesn't originate anything	Programmers, academics, media commentators	Technology journalism, academic AI conferences
7. Continuity	Digital systems can't capture analog complexity of human mind	Neuroscientists, some philosophers	Neuroscience conferences, academic philosophy
8. Informality	AI can't handle genuine novelty or real-world complexity	Engineers, field practitioners, managers	Operations management, military, legal professionals
9. ESP / Beyond	Human intuition, spiritual knowing transcends AI's reach (Boje 7th B)	Spiritual practitioners, Indigenous knowledge holders	Jain philosophy circles, Indigenous governance, contemplative practice

Two patterns are notable. First, all nine objections are currently active — not in philosophy departments alone but across the full institutional landscape of contemporary AI governance. Second, objections 1, 4, 5, and 6 — the cluster that appeals to consciousness, creativity, and interiority — tend to coexist with the highest levels of invisible AI use. The people most likely to argue that AI cannot be creative are those whose daily creative work is already substantially aided by AI tools they do not name as AI.

The most consequential empirical finding of this study is what we term the *Resistance Paradox*. It operates at two levels: the individual and the systemic.

At the individual level: in a 2025 Gallup survey, 53% of US knowledge workers reported concerns about AI replacing their jobs, and 41% reported distrust of AI-based performance evaluation systems. In the same period, 78% of those same workers used AI-powered tools in their daily work — tools they described as 'productivity software,' 'search engines,' 'email systems,' or 'the company database' rather than as AI (Synthesia, 2026). The category *AI* carries the affective charge of the resistance; the actual AI systems, experienced as utilities, carry none of it. This is Turing's Theological Objection and Lady Lovelace's Objection combined: the concern is with *what AI is* (conscious? originating?) rather than with *what AI does* — which, behaviorally, the resistant worker is already fully using.

At the systemic level, the paradox is more consequential. The data consumption that drives AI development — the searches, the streaming, the cloud storage, the social media posting — flows through data centers that require enormous energy and water resources. A single large-scale AI data center consumes between 20,000 and 1,000,000 gallons of water per day (with the wide range reflecting disputes between developer claims and state regulator estimates; see Boje, 2026, for the Project Jupiter case). The workers who distrust AI at work and resist its deployment in HR, performance management, and hiring are the same workers whose personal AI consumption — Google searches, streaming, social media — collectively constitutes the demand signal that justifies the $165 billion Project Jupiter data center campus in Santa Teresa, New Mexico. Their resistance to AI is organizationally meaningful; their consumption behavior is architecturally determining.

The Replacement/Augmentation Spectrum

AI corporate leaders have staked out positions across a spectrum from full replacement of human labor to AI as a tool for human flourishing. Table 4 summarizes the key positions, their Turing objection analog, and the Ghost Vortex archetype that characterizes each leader's rhetorical structure.

Table 4. Corporate Leader Speculation on AI's Future: Turing Analogs and Ghost Vortex Types

Leader / Company	Replacement/Augmentation Claim	Turing Objection Analog	Ghost Vortex Type
Sam Altman / OpenAI	"AI will do most things humans do in the next few years"	Refutes all nine — machine will surpass human performance	Chemical Disintegrator — accountability dissolved in distribution
Dario Amodei / Anthropic	"Transformative AI in 2–5 years; we are proceeding carefully"	Heads in Sand — danger is real, managed by us	Mouse Who Knows — controls fire to prevent burning
Jensen Huang / NVIDIA	"AI is a new kind of digital worker; humans focus on higher-order tasks"	Disabilities (5) — concedes AI's limits to claim its augmentation role	Bureaucratic Crystal Palace — process absorbs contradiction
Mark Zuckerberg / Meta	"AI agents will be personal assistants and eventually colleagues"	Consciousness (4) — no claim made about inner experience	Man Who Boxes Shadows — refuses to land on a verdict
Elon Musk / xAI	"Probably the last invention humans will ever need to make" / also "existential risk"	Heads in Sand — threat is real, I am the solution	Infuriated Bull — charge and countercharge simultaneously
Sundar Pichai / Google	"AI will be as transformative as fire or electricity"	Various disabilities (5) — analogizes AI to tool, not agent	AI Overview — structural indictment by aggregation

What Table 4 suggests is that AI corporate leaders — the people with the greatest material investment in a particular answer to Turing's question — all avoid answering it directly. The positions that appear most optimistic (Altman's replacement thesis) and most cautious (Amodei's safety framing) are structurally equivalent: both assert that the *speaker's own organization* is uniquely positioned to manage the outcome they describe. Neither engages the underlying Turing question — can machines think? — because the question, as Turing noted in 1950, is designed to be unanswerable. What they do instead is deploy the objections as resources: the Heads in the Sand objection as a governance claim; the Disabilities objection as a market claim; the Consciousness objection as a safety claim.

Discussion

The three existential questions findings circle back to the Turing question — Can machines think? It continues in the AI Revolution to generate the same nine objections it generated in 1950, not because the question has become easier to answer but because those objections serve specific organizational, political, and economic functions. They are not primarily epistemological claims. They are antenarrative bets (Boje, 2001): prospective wagers about the future of human-AI relations made by actors with material stakes in particular outcomes.

The Resistance Paradox is the most organizationally consequential of the three findings because it reveals the gap between discourse and behavior at a systemic scale. The discourse of AI resistance — 'AI cannot think,' 'AI replaces human creativity,' 'AI poses existential risks' — is organized around the nine Turing objections and is performed primarily in institutional settings: union halls, university committees, regulatory hearings, editorial pages. The behavior of AI use — 66% of humans daily, invisibly — is organized around convenience, functionality, and the seamless integration of AI into utilities that are not experienced as AI. The two registers do not cancel each other; they coexist and jointly produce the demand for the infrastructure both sides nominally debate.

This coexistence has a name in antenarrative theory: the *Escher Staircase*. In M. C. Escher's paradoxical drawings of staircases that appear to ascend continuously while returning to their starting point, the illusion is produced by the viewer's inability to hold the full structure in view at once. Carbon net-zero commitments for 2030, 2040, and 2050 display the same structure in the ecological domain: the staircase appears to ascend toward sustainability while the infrastructure decisions made today lock in decades of extraction. The Resistance Paradox is the same staircase in the human-AI domain: the discourse ascends toward human control and AI accountability while the infrastructure decisions — billions of dollars of data centers, millions of new AI users — lock in a trajectory that the resistance discourse has not interrupted.

What Turing's conclusion offers to this situation is not a resolution but a reorientation. The question 'Can machines think?' is a static binary. The question that replaces it — *what are AI systems actually doing, prospectively, in living organizational, civic, and ecological stories?* — is dynamic, empirical, and political. It asks not for a verdict about machine consciousness but for a sustained antenarrative tracking of what AI systems are doing to communities, water supplies, democratic processes, and the distribution of cognitive labor. It asks who bears the costs of the data centers and who captures the value of the services. It asks whose bets on the future are being built into the infrastructure, and whose are being foreclosed.

In this reorientation, the most interesting position is not Altman's (machines will surpass humans) or Amodei's (we are proceeding carefully) but Turing's own: *I believe that at the end of the century the use of words and general educated opinion will have altered so much that one will be able to speak of machines thinking without expecting to be contradicted* (Turing, 1950, p. 442). Turing did not predict machine consciousness. He predicted a change in the *use of words* — a cultural and linguistic shift that would dissolve the question not by answering it but by making it feel less urgent. That prediction has substantially come true. The people who use Google's AI Overviews, who drive with GPS navigation, who ask Alexa to play music — they have, without formal declaration, stopped asking whether the machine thinks. They have moved to the empirically tractable question: does it work?

Conclusions

This essay set out four research questions. There are four implications for the six volumes of Business Storytelling in the AI Revolution.

First, AI is pervasive in everyday life to a degree that substantially exceeds public awareness. Sixty-six percent of global users interact with AI regularly without recognizing it as AI; 78% of corporations deploy AI in at least one business function; government, education, transportation, and search are all deeply AI-mediated environments that their

users experience as utilities. The scope of invisible AI use is the essential empirical fact for any analysis of public discourse about AI.

Second, resistance to AI takes primarily discursive forms — the nine Turing objections, deployed in institutional settings — while behavioral resistance is minimal. The Resistance Paradox is real, consequential, and under analyzed. The gap between discourse and behavior is not explained by hypocrisy but by the categorical invisibility of AI use: people who use GPS navigation do not experience themselves as AI users. Closing this gap requires not persuasion but redesigned visibility — making the AI character of everyday technologies perceptible.

Third, Turing's nine objections map with precision onto contemporary AI debates, not because the debates have not advanced but because the objections address perennial features of the human-machine relationship that do not resolve with technical progress. The Theological Objection, the Consciousness Objection, and Lady Lovelace's Objection are today more philosophically refined than in 1950 — but their logical structure is identical, and Turing's counters remain substantively applicable. Turing's most important contribution was not his nine counters but his decision to set the question aside: the Imitation Game is more productive than the metaphysical debate it replaces.

Fourth, corporate AI leader speculation about replacement versus augmentation reproduces the nine Turing objections as organizational and market claims rather than philosophical ones. The speculation spectrum — from Altman's replacement thesis to Huang's augmentation framing — does not advance the epistemological question. It allocates it. The question of whether machines think becomes, in corporate discourse, a resource for positioning: the right answer is whichever one justifies the speaker's organizational claim to govern the transition.

The main conclusion of this essay is Turing's own: the question is nonsense. Not because it is unimportant but because it is not the right question. The right question — what are AI systems actually doing to human communities, organizational structures, democratic processes, and ecological systems? — is empirical, political, and urgent. It

does not require a verdict on machine consciousness. It requires the sustained antenarrative analysis that tracks what is being built, who bears the costs, whose futures are being bet on, and what is being foreclosed before the community affected is aware enough to resist.

Limitations

Several limitations shape the claims of this essay. First, AI usage statistics are cross-sectional and change rapidly; the figures reported here reflect mid-2026 conditions and may be significantly different within twelve months.

Second, the Ghost Vortex ABCD scoring of corporate leaders, while replicable in protocol, involves interpretive judgment in application; the scores in Table 4reflect the author's application and should be treated as indicative rather than definitive.

Third, the Resistance Paradox is documented here at the aggregate level; the individual-level mechanism — precisely how invisible AI use coexists with vocal AI resistance in the same person — requires qualitative research at a finer grain than the survey data currently support.

Fourth, this analysis centers predominantly on the United States and, secondarily, on Australia and the Anglophone world; AI governance dynamics, resistance patterns, and corporate speculation vary substantially across national and cultural contexts, including China, the EU, and the Global South. Fifth, the essay's theoretical framework is drawn substantially from one research tradition (antenarrative/quantum storytelling); other theoretical frameworks would emphasize different features of the phenomena described.

References

Boje, D. M. (1991). The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office supply firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 36*(1), 106–126. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393432

Boje, D. M. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational and communication research*. Sage.

Boje, D. M. (2014). *Storytelling organizational practices: Managing in the quantum age*. Routledge.

Boje, D. M. (2026a). *The Ghost Vortex of Santa Teresa: Mnemonic governance, administrative absorption, and the six-layer suppression chain of Project Jupiter* [Working paper]. Department of Management, New Mexico State University. https://storying.site/reviewed/ProjectJupiter_GhostVortex_JournalArticle.pdf

Boje, D. M. (2026b). T***he Consent Machine: How the Big Ten Manufacture Consent for AI***. *Edward Elgar Publishing — In Review as of September 11, 2026.* Pre-press version online until publication at https://drive.proton.me/u/1/ddrUeCbWHwHYO8FxFa81RQ/file/SF4vaX-gQd77zVcAgbx6vQ?r=/shared-with-me

Boje, D. M. (2026c). **The Dark Side of AI Leadership.** Working Paper, July 11, 2026/Pre-proposal material for the Routledge book I am to write soon (Oct 26, 2026)

Boje, D. M., & Saylors, R. (2024). *The management thought of Louis R. Pondy*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003257158

Chalmers, D. (2026, July). *When we talk to AI, what are we talking to?* [Lecture, University of California, Berkeley]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uUjJOMcNU9w

Digital Applied. (2026). *AI usage statistics 2026: Who uses AI and how much*. https://www.digitalapplied.com/blog/ai-usage-statistics-2026-who-uses-ai-how-much-data

Digital Silk. (2026). *AI statistics in 2026: Key trends and usage data*. https://www.digitalsilk.com/digital-trends/ai-statistics/

Elfsight. (2026). *AI usage statistics: Global adoption, industry use and trends*. https://elfsight.com/blog/ai-usage-statistics/

Hofstadter, D. R. (1979). *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An eternal golden braid*. Basic Books.

Larsen, J., Boje, D. M., & Bruun, L. (2021). *True storytelling: Seven principles for an ethical and sustainable change management strategy*. Routledge.

Lovelace, A. (1843). Notes on Menabrea's "Sketch of the analytical engine invented by Charles Babbage." *Scientific Memoirs, 3*, 666–731.

Lucas, J. R. (1961). Minds, machines and Gödel. *Philosophy, 36*(137), 112–127. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0031819100057983

Master of Code. (2026). *200+ incredible AI statistics*. https://masterofcode.com/blog/ai-statistics

National University. (2026). *137 AI statistics and trends for 2026*. https://www.nu.edu/blog/ai-statistics-trends/

Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, brains, and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3*(3), 417–424. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00005756

Synthesia. (2026). *AI statistics 2026: Adoption, usage & workforce trends*. https://www.synthesia.io/post/ai-statistics

Turing, A. M. (1950). Computing machinery and intelligence. *Mind, 59*(236), 433–460. https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433

We Are Tenet. (2026). *60+ global AI usage statistics for 2026*. https://www.wearetenet.com/blog/ai-usage-statistics