AI Revolution: The Death of Business Administration and the Birth of Inalienable Leadership

Author: Guillaume Mariani
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1130-5061
Affiliation: Independent management scholar, Paris, France
Date: July 2026. **Document type:** Working Paper

Contents

Abstract

Artificial intelligence is increasingly performing administrative, analytical, coordinating, monitoring, communication, and decision-support functions historically associated with managers and business administration. This transformation does not imply the disappearance of organizations, management, managers, or business schools. It marks the erosion of administration as an exclusively human domain and as the principal justification for managerial authority. When machines can analyze, plan, coordinate, evaluate, recommend, and execute, leadership must be grounded in something deeper than superior control of information and process. Existing leadership theories explain traits, skills, behaviors, relationships, ethics, adaptation, collective agency, technological mediation, and organizational effectiveness. The documented review nevertheless identifies a higher-order question that these traditions do not make their central organizing principle: who retains final authority and responsibility over purposes, institutions, and civilizational direction when machines increasingly participate in organizational and social decision-making? This conceptual, theoretical, normative, and integrative working paper introduces and timestamps **Inalienable Leadership** as the first metatheory of leadership specifically formulated for the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, advances it as the overarching metatheory of leadership in that age, and formally records it as the tenth and culminating original contribution of the complete FILE contribution system. FILE (the Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution) remains the core management theory and diagnostic framework. Inalienable Leadership integrates, grounds, governs, and gives civilizational direction to FILE and the complete FILE contribution system. The paper establishes a three-level hierarchy: Inalienable Leadership; the integrated FILE architecture (including the five meta-intelligences, the nested intelligences, the five emergent outcomes of FILE); and the distinct original contributions of the FILE Odyssey. It preserves the specific roles of Human Irreducibility, HACK, HTTPS, LENS, MAIL, MLT, and RC while placing them under one civilizational principle: humanity may share work and intelligence with machines, but it cannot surrender its final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization. The future will not be determined by what machines can do, but by whether humanity remains capable of leading what it creates. **Humans + Machines, under human leadership**.

Keywords: Inalienable Leadership; metatheory; metatheoretical architecture; FILE Odyssey; FILE; Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution; leadership; leadership theory; leadership studies; leadership in the age of AI; leadership after AI; AI leadership; augmented leadership; human leadership; human-centered leadership; management; management science; management theory; management studies; business administration; management education; business education; leadership education; artificial intelligence; AI; AI governance; governance in the age of AI; artificial intelligence and leadership; artificial intelligence and management; algorithmic management; artificial leadership; digital leadership; human-AI complementarity; humans + machines; human judgment; human agency; moral agency; human accountability; human responsibility; nondelegation; human dignity; Human Irreducibility; LENS; HACK; MAIL; MLT; management education reform; business school reform; MBA reform.

1. Introduction: The More Administration Becomes Automatable, the More Leadership Becomes Inalienable

1.1 The AI Revolution as a Management Revolution

Artificial intelligence is not only a technological revolution. Inside organizations, it is a management revolution. Its significance lies not only in the growing capabilities of models, software, machines, and robots, but in their entry into the administrative infrastructure through which organizations gather information, allocate resources, coordinate work, monitor performance, prepare decisions, and execute plans.

Artificial intelligence can support or perform activities associated with analysis, planning, forecasting, reporting, scheduling, communication, recruitment, performance evaluation, risk assessment, resource allocation, workflow management, and decision preparation. In some settings, it can initiate multi-step processes with limited direct intervention. Administration has therefore ceased to be an exclusively human sphere, even though adoption remains uneven (Jarrahi 2018; Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, and von Krogh 2019; Jarrahi et al. 2021).

The transformation extends beyond individual tasks. Artificial intelligence changes how managerial cognition is distributed. Information that once moved through reports, meetings, specialist departments, and formal hierarchies can now be gathered, filtered, summarized, and interpreted through computational systems. Recommendations may be produced before a manager examines the underlying evidence. Work may be assigned and evaluated algorithmically. Organizational decision-making therefore becomes part of a wider sociotechnical arrangement involving people, data, models, platforms, and automated agents (Jarrahi 2018; Faraj, Pachidi, and Sayegh 2018; Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, and von Krogh 2019).

These capabilities can reduce repetitive work and widen expertise, but they also weaken an established basis of managerial authority. If machines can perform increasing portions of the planning, coordination, measurement, and control once associated with managers, administrative competence alone becomes a less sufficient explanation of why human beings should remain in command. The central question is what human authority remains necessary when administration becomes increasingly computable.

1.2 The Central Paradox

The central paradox of the AI revolution is straightforward: the more artificial intelligence can administer, the more clearly humanity must define what it cannot surrender.

Organizations are encouraged to automate because administration contains activities that are structured, repeatable, measurable, and information-intensive. When a system can prepare a report, detect an anomaly, allocate a shift, rank applicants, forecast demand, or monitor compliance faster than a human administrator, its use may appear self-evident. Yet the same technologies that extend human capability can also displace human participation, weaken learning, and reorganize authority around the systems themselves. Management research describes this as an automation-augmentation paradox (Raisch and Krakowski 2021).

Organizational agency exists on a continuum: systems may advise, recommend, rank, decide, execute, coordinate, and adapt, while human involvement may be substantive or merely ceremonial.

The distinction becomes critical when administrative outputs affect employment, health, education, security, public services, or access to opportunity. In such contexts, efficiency is not the only criterion. Decisions also involve dignity, fairness, cultural interpretation, power, legitimacy, and risk. A technically effective output may remain morally unacceptable or politically illegitimate. A strong prediction does not determine what ought to be done with it, and a recommendation does not absorb the responsibility of the person or institution that acts upon it.

Intelligence can be shared with machines. The deeper question is whether authority and responsibility can be transferred in the same way. This paper argues that they cannot be transferred without limit. The expansion of machine capability makes the boundary of human responsibility more important, not less.

1.3 What "The Death of Business Administration" Means

The phrase "the death of business administration" is deliberately provocative, but it does not predict the disappearance of businesses, managers, business schools, or administrative work. Organizations will still require coordination, implementation, documentation, continuity, and control, and people will continue to perform administrative functions.

The phrase names four related declines. First, administration is losing its status as an exclusively human domain as machines assume work once performed only by clerks, analysts, supervisors, and professional managers. Second, it is becoming a less secure foundation of expertise because artificial intelligence can distribute access to information, procedures, memory, and analysis beyond traditional hierarchical channels.

Third, administration becomes a less sufficient justification for managerial hierarchy. When systems plan, coordinate, evaluate, and control at scale, position within an information chain no longer explains why a human officeholder should retain authority. Fourth, business administration becomes a less adequate center for management education. Accounting, finance, marketing, operations, and strategy remain essential, but administrative mastery alone cannot prepare people to govern artificial intelligence, exercise judgment, preserve relationships, or accept responsibility for machine-supported action.

The "death" in the title therefore names the end of an intellectual settlement in which administration was treated as the core of management, the distinctive competence of the manager, and the principal source of organizational authority. What is dying is the assumption that knowing how to administer is sufficient to justify the right to lead.

1.4 The Shift from Administration to Leadership

Artificial intelligence increasingly separates activities that twentieth-century management often combined within one role. It separates calculation from judgment, analysis from

responsibility, coordination from legitimacy, prediction from decision, optimization from conscience, execution from answerability, and efficiency from meaning.

Calculation can compare alternatives, but judgment determines which differences matter. Analysis can reveal patterns, but responsibility concerns what people and institutions do with that knowledge. Coordination can align activities, but legitimacy concerns whether the arrangement is authorized, justifiable, and contestable. Prediction can estimate what may happen, but decision requires commitment under uncertainty. Optimization can improve performance against a specified objective, but conscience asks whether the objective is defensible. Execution can produce an outcome, but answerability requires an agent capable of explaining, correcting, and accepting consequences. Efficiency can conserve time and resources, but meaning concerns why the work exists and what kind of world it helps create.

Administration remains necessary because it translates intention into organized action; leadership without it may become aspiration without execution. The error occurs when administrative competence is mistaken for final authority. Artificial intelligence exposes that error because it can reproduce or exceed many administrative capabilities without thereby acquiring moral agency, democratic legitimacy, dignity, or a lived relation to consequences.

The shift from administration to leadership is therefore not a movement from practical work to inspirational rhetoric. It is a movement from managing processes to governing purposes, limits, relationships, power, and responsibility. As machines become more capable of organizing means, human beings must become more explicit about the ends those means serve.

1.5 Central Thesis

The central thesis of this paper is that artificial intelligence may increasingly automate, augment, and execute functions historically associated with business administration, but it cannot thereby acquire humanity's legitimate final authority or absorb humanity's responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization.

Capability is not legitimacy, and performance is not responsibility. A system may generate answers or coordinate activity without possessing the standing to define human purposes or the rules of collective life. Even highly autonomous action remains situated within objectives, permissions, infrastructures, and institutions created or authorized by human beings.

This thesis does not reject human-AI collaboration, distributed decision-making, automation, or autonomous technical operation. It concerns where final authority and answerability remain when cognition and execution are shared.

Inalienable Leadership, developed later in this paper as the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, names and organizes this principle. It does not stand beside FILE as another theory: FILE remains the core management theory and diagnostic framework, while Inalienable Leadership integrates, grounds, governs, and gives civilizational direction to FILE and the complete FILE contribution system. Humanity can delegate work without alienating authority, in the legal and philosophical sense of

transferring or surrendering it, and without dissolving responsibility for the consequences of organized action.

1.6 Purpose of the Paper

This paper has five purposes: to explain why artificial intelligence is transforming business administration; distinguish administration from leadership; position Inalienable Leadership in relation to major leadership traditions; introduce, define, delimit, and timestamp Inalienable Leadership as the first metatheory of leadership specifically formulated for the age of artificial intelligence and robotics and advance it as the overarching metatheory of leadership in that age; and formally record the completed ten-contribution architecture of the FILE Odyssey.

The paper is intended for publication in scholarly repositories as a public, citable, and timestamped intellectual record. Its function is to establish the content, boundaries, authorship, and date of the metatheoretical contribution, thereby supporting a transparent record of conceptual priority and copyright.

2. Scope, Method, and Source Base

2.1 Nature of the Paper

This is a conceptual, theoretical, normative, integrative, and repository-oriented working paper. It interprets established traditions in relation to the organizational transformation produced by artificial intelligence and the problem of final human authority.

The paper does not report original data. It is not a systematic literature review, bibliometric analysis, meta-analysis, psychometric paper, scale-development project, formal research proposal, or journal-targeted theory article. Its review is structured and selective rather than exhaustive. Its purpose is conceptual positioning.

The paper does not claim empirical validation, superiority over established theories, or identical effects across organizations. Repository publication does not substitute for empirical validation or external peer review. Its theoretical and normative claims concern which forms of authority and responsibility should remain human when administrative capability is distributed across humans and machines.

2.2 Literature Approach

The historical analysis draws on scientific management, administrative management, bureaucracy, cooperative systems, human relations, decision theory, knowledge work, and managerial-role research. The contemporary analysis draws on sociotechnical systems, automation, human-AI complementarity, organizational decision structures, algorithmic management, and the automation-augmentation paradox. The leadership review examines major theoretical families rather than cataloging every separate theory.

The method is interpretive and integrative. Foundational works reconstruct how business administration organized managerial authority; contemporary works show how artificial intelligence enters that architecture; leadership scholarship is then considered through the question of final authority.

Sources are selected for conceptual relevance and historical significance. Later interpretations are not attributed to foundational authors as though they had anticipated contemporary artificial intelligence, and in-text citations must correspond directly to the final references.

2.3 Source Base and Public FILE Language

The paper also draws on the public FILE Corpus that I developed. FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution is a management theory and diagnostic framework for responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence. The FILE Formula is Leadership = AI + EQ + CQ + PQ + AQ, where AI means Augmented Intelligence, EQ means Emotional Intelligence, CQ means Cultural Intelligence, PQ means Political Intelligence, and AQ means Adaptive Intelligence (Mariani 2026a; Mariani 2026c).

The paper also draws on three comparative FILE Corpus studies that position FILE in relation to major leadership theories and management frameworks: *FILE vs. Major Leadership Theories*, *FILE vs. Major Management Frameworks*, and *FILE vs. Major Leadership Theories (V2)* (Mariani 2026g; Mariani 2026h; Mariani 2026i).

FILE is the core management theory and diagnostic framework. Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. It integrates, grounds, governs, and gives civilizational direction to FILE and the complete FILE contribution system.

The relevant public architecture includes the five meta-intelligences, 70 foundational nested intelligences, the 128-intelligence expanded teaching and diagnostic architecture, the 35-item Extended Taxonomy, the 17-item Not Selected register, Five Emergent Outcomes, RC — The Relational Commons, and the complete ten-contribution system. The present paper does not begin with that architecture because its first task is to establish the transformation of business administration and the leadership problem created by it. The complete three-level hierarchy is presented later.

Earlier FILE publications remain historical sources and retain their published titles and contribution counts (Mariani 2026a; Mariani 2026b; Mariani 2026c). Repository publication makes this development public, citable, attributable, and open to examination.

3. The Historical Construction of Business Administration

3.1 Scientific Management

Modern business administration was assembled through successive attempts to make organizations more calculable, coordinated, predictable, and governable. Frederick Winslow Taylor's scientific management was one decisive step. Taylor sought to replace informal rule-of-thumb methods with observation, task decomposition, measurement, standardization, and managerial planning (Taylor 1911).

Scientific management shifted knowledge about work. It attempted to identify and prescribe efficient methods rather than leaving them entirely within workers' craft experience. Planning became separated from execution: management studied and designed the process, while

workers carried out specified operations. Administration thereby became a specialized body of knowledge located above direct production.

Contemporary artificial intelligence extends this logic. Data collection, process mining, optimization, digital monitoring, and automated workflows continue the ambition to make work visible and manageable. The difference is that computational systems now participate not only in measurement but in prediction, allocation, interpretation, and execution.

Taylor's legacy thus reveals both continuity and transformation. Artificial intelligence did not begin the quantification of work; it accelerates a century-long administrative project. Yet when a machine can generate or continuously update managerial knowledge, the authority of the human manager requires a foundation beyond superior command of process.

3.2 Administrative Management

Henri Fayol approached management at the level of the enterprise. His administrative theory identified functions commonly expressed as planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling (Fayol 1949, originally published 1916). These categories offered a general account of managerial work and became foundational to management education.

Artificial intelligence can now participate in every part of this sequence. It can generate forecasts and scenarios, propose arrangements, route instructions, coordinate workflows, and monitor deviations. This does not make Fayol obsolete. His categories reveal the breadth of the present transformation.

What changes is the location of agency. Planning may emerge through interactions among executives, analysts, models, and agents. Coordination may be performed through platforms. Control may operate continuously through dashboards and alerts. The administrative cycle remains, but it no longer maps neatly onto an exclusively human manager. The functions survive while the human monopoly over them erodes.

3.3 Bureaucratic Administration

Max Weber explained how modern organizations achieve continuity and predictability through hierarchy, formal offices, specialized competence, written rules, and rational-legal authority (Weber 1978). Bureaucracy was not merely paperwork; it was an institutional technology for making authority stable, impersonal, and rule-bound.

Artificial intelligence can intensify bureaucratic rationalization. Rules can be encoded, cases classified, applications ranked, and compliance monitored across vast volumes of activity. A computational system may apply criteria more consistently than an individual administrator. At the same time, algorithmic administration can make power less visible. A person affected by a decision may confront a score or workflow without knowing where judgment entered, which assumptions shaped the model, or who can revise the outcome.

Weber's distinction between technical competence and legitimate authority becomes crucial. Computational competence does not by itself constitute a legitimate office. A system is not answerable to those over whom power is exercised. Rational-legal legitimacy still requires institutions capable of authorization, explanation, review, and correction. Artificial intelligence

may administer rules, but human beings remain responsible for the legitimacy of the rules and their consequences.

3.4 Cooperative Systems and Executive Responsibility

Chester Barnard described the organization as a cooperative system. Organizations endure when people are willing to contribute, communication functions, and a common purpose can be maintained. Authority depends not only on commands but on their acceptance within the cooperative system (Barnard 1938).

Barnard's executive functions included maintaining communication, securing contributions, and formulating organizational purpose. This account exceeds a mechanical view of administration. The executive sustains the conditions under which cooperation remains possible, bringing purpose and responsibility into organizational life.

Artificial intelligence can support communication, coordinate contributions, and identify patterns of participation. Yet cooperation is not reducible to information flow. People cooperate because they interpret authority, trust institutions, recognize purposes, and judge whether participation remains worthwhile or legitimate. A machine may facilitate cooperation without becoming the source of the obligation to cooperate.

Barnard's account shows why coordination alone cannot explain executive authority. Administrative systems may organize contributions, but the cooperative order still depends on purposes and obligations that participants can recognize and contest.

3.5 Human Relations and Integrative Management

Mary Parker Follett and Elton Mayo challenged accounts of organization that treated people mainly as units of production. Their different works moved management thought toward relationships, groups, informal organization, and the social conditions of cooperation (Follett 1942; Mayo 1933).

Follett emphasized integration and "power-with" rather than domination through "power-over" (Follett 1942, 101). Conflict could become a source of constructive integration when differences were engaged instead of suppressed. Coordination was relational and continuous, not merely imposed from above. Mayo and the human relations tradition emphasized that productivity and behavior could not be understood through physical conditions and formal incentives alone. Informal groups, attention, belonging, morale, and relationships shaped organizational performance.

Artificial intelligence creates a new test for these insights. Systems can analyze sentiment, map networks, personalize communication, and simulate empathic language. They can also intensify surveillance, standardize interaction, and convert relationships into data. Relational information does not guarantee relationship; measuring morale does not create care.

These traditions prevent the automation debate from collapsing into technical efficiency. Organizations are social systems. Administrative transformation must therefore be judged not only by speed or consistency, but by its effects on voice, trust, solidarity, dignity, and the ability to challenge power.

3.6 Administrative Behavior and Bounded Rationality

Herbert Simon placed decision-making at the center of administration. He rejected the image of fully rational actors who identify every alternative, calculate every consequence, and choose the optimum. Human decision-makers operate under limits of information, attention, time, and computational capacity. They therefore satisfice, selecting a satisfactory option under real constraints instead of pursuing an unattainable optimum (Simon 1947).

This explains why computational assistance is attractive. Machines can widen search, process more information, and compare alternatives. Organizational decision structures can consequently be redesigned around different combinations of human and machine intelligence (Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, and von Krogh 2019).

Expanded computation does not eliminate boundedness. Models operate within selected data, objectives, categories, and representations. More alternatives do not determine which values should govern choice. Greater predictive accuracy does not remove uncertainty about consequences or disagreement about what counts as a good outcome.

Simon's distinction between factual and value premises becomes especially important when systems produce persuasive recommendations. Artificial intelligence may inform factual judgment, although its outputs still require verification and interpretation. It cannot settle value premises merely by calculating them. Administrative rationality can be augmented, but purpose and responsibility remain normative.

3.7 Management by Objectives and Institutional Responsibility

Peter Drucker treated management as a social function, emphasizing objectives, decentralization, effectiveness, and organizational responsibility (Drucker 1954). His account is relevant because artificial intelligence becomes powerful once objectives are specified. A system can optimize, monitor, compare, and adapt action against targets. The difficulty lies in the quality and legitimacy of those targets.

Poorly framed objectives can be optimized efficiently. Narrow indicators can displace broader purposes, and what is measurable can crowd out what is meaningful. Artificial intelligence therefore makes the definition of objectives more consequential, not less.

Knowledge work also changes. Systems can draft, summarize, search, translate, model, and synthesize. Human contribution increasingly shifts from producing every informational artifact toward framing problems, evaluating evidence, integrating context, challenging assumptions, and accepting responsibility for use.

Drucker's insistence that management is a social function gains new force. Organizations exercise power and create consequences beyond internal performance measures. Artificial intelligence can strengthen execution, but it also increases the need to ask who defines effectiveness, whom the organization serves, and for what consequences it remains responsible.

3.8 Managerial Work

Henry Mintzberg challenged orderly descriptions of management as a simple sequence of planning, organizing, coordinating, and controlling. Actual managerial work was fragmented, interrupt-driven, relational, and embedded in communication. He organized it around interpersonal, informational, and decisional roles (Mintzberg 1973).

Different parts of this work have different degrees of automability. Informational roles change when systems gather, summarize, filter, and distribute information. Decisional roles change when systems identify problems, propose allocations, simulate negotiations, or recommend actions. Interpersonal roles are also influenced, but remain tied to trust, identity, presence, recognition, and responsibility.

Artificial intelligence may reduce fragmentation by filtering communication or intensify it by multiplying alerts and generated content. A manager who relies on summaries may know more at scale and less in depth. A dashboard can create visibility while distancing the officeholder from the people represented by the data.

Mintzberg later criticized management education that separated analysis from practice, judgment, and experience (Mintzberg 2004). That criticism acquires new force when analytical production itself becomes automatable. Management education must develop the capacity to interpret situations, work through relationships, confront consequences, and act responsibly when no model can settle what should be done.

3.9 Historical Synthesis

The history of business administration can be read as the construction of an organizational intelligence system: Taylor contributed measurement and optimization; Fayol articulated administrative functions; Weber explained hierarchy and rational-legal authority; Barnard centered cooperation and purpose; Follett and Mayo revealed relational dimensions; Simon made bounded decision-making central; Drucker linked objectives to social responsibility; and Mintzberg returned attention to managerial practice.

These traditions organized information, people, resources, decisions, control, and continuity around human managers. Artificial intelligence changes that condition by participating across almost every administrative domain, although unevenly and under human-designed constraints.

When administration becomes a shared human-machine capability, the remaining question concerns the distinctive and legitimate work of human authority.

4. The Automation of Business Administration

4.1 Routine Administrative Automation

The first layer of transformation concerns documentation, data processing, scheduling, reporting, compliance checks, workflow routing, record management, and standardized communication. These activities attract automation because they often involve recurring inputs, formal rules, identifiable outputs, and high volumes.

Automation can reduce delay, improve consistency, and free human attention for more complex work. The history of automation also cautions against assuming a simple one-for-one replacement of occupations. Technologies often substitute for tasks while creating complementary activities and reorganizing jobs (Autor 2015).

The managerial significance remains substantial. Routine administration once occupied large portions of supervisory and professional work. When systems handle these functions, managerial value shifts away from moving information through procedures and toward deciding which procedures should exist, when exceptions are justified, how errors are corrected, and how affected people can challenge the process.

4.2 Analytical Automation

The second layer concerns forecasting, budgeting, risk analysis, market research, financial modeling, scenario generation, and strategic synthesis. These activities were associated with professional expertise and senior management because they required information access, analytical training, and comparison of uncertain futures.

Artificial intelligence can process large data sets, detect patterns, generate scenarios, and produce natural-language interpretations. Human-AI symbiosis can be valuable when machine computation and human contextual judgment are deliberately combined (Jarrahi 2018). Decision-making may be delegated, hybridized, or retained by humans according to the decision type, uncertainty, stakes, and relative strengths of the participants (Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, and von Krogh 2019).

Analytical automation also creates epistemic risks, meaning risks concerning the quality, provenance, or reliability of what an organization treats as knowledge. Generated synthesis may appear coherent while hiding weak evidence. Forecasts can create false precision. Models may reproduce historical patterns that an organization has a responsibility to change. The speed of analysis can reduce the time devoted to questioning the problem itself.

The managerial challenge lies in how analysis enters judgment. Managers must know when to trust, verify, contest, combine, or refuse computational advice, particularly when a polished output conceals uncertain evidence.

4.3 Algorithmic Management

Algorithmic management moves beyond assistance to the organization and control of labor. Systems may assign tasks, monitor activity, measure productivity, screen candidates, evaluate performance, determine rewards, trigger sanctions, or contribute to dismissal. Research describes this as a contested terrain in which control is redistributed through technical systems, often producing new opacity and resistance (Kellogg, Valentine, and Christin 2020; Jarrahi et al. 2021).

Algorithms can coordinate activity at a scale and speed unavailable to individual supervisors. They can apply standardized criteria and optimize allocation continuously. Yet they can also intensify surveillance, narrow discretion, and obscure the exercise of power. Workers may

experience a decision as "made by the system" even when humans selected the objectives, thresholds, data, and organizational response.

A system may administer a performance regime, but it does not acquire legitimate authority over the people subject to it. Legitimacy depends on whether criteria are justified, procedures understandable, decisions contestable, and responsibility attributable. Otherwise, automation makes control more efficient while making authority less accountable.

4.4 Generative and Agentic Systems

Organizational language often groups very different technologies under the term artificial intelligence. For analytical purposes, this paper distinguishes among AI tools, assistants, recommendation systems, decision-support systems, automated decision systems, AI agents, autonomous systems, and robots.

A tool performs a bounded function under direct human use; an assistant responds across broader tasks; recommendation and decision-support systems shape alternatives; and automated decision systems produce operative outcomes through rules or models. An AI agent can pursue assigned goals through multi-step action and tool use. Autonomous systems act with reduced immediate supervision within a designed environment. Robots add physical action to computational capability.

Generative AI primarily produces synthetic content in response to inputs. Agentic AI goes further by combining models with planning, memory, tool use, and action mechanisms so that a system can pursue assigned goals through multi-step processes with varying degrees of operational autonomy (National Institute of Standards and Technology 2024; Wang et al. 2024).

These categories distribute agency differently. Drafting a report with an assistant creates different governance demands from authorizing an agent to negotiate, alter workflows, communicate commitments, or control machinery. The more a system can initiate and execute action, the more important it becomes to define permissions, escalation, reversibility, attribution, and human responsibility before deployment.

Generative capability also lowers the cost of producing plans, policies, evaluations, communications, and explanations. The result can be broader access to professional support and, at the same time, a larger volume of plausible but weakly grounded organizational content. Quality, provenance, verification, and responsibility therefore become practical management problems.

4.5 The Agency Continuum

Human-machine arrangements can be understood along an agency continuum:

Assistance → Augmentation → Recommendation → Delegation → Automated execution → Autonomous action

Agentic AI may operate at several points on this continuum, depending on whether the system only recommends actions, executes bounded steps, or acts with wider autonomy under assigned goals (Wang et al. 2024; National Institute of Standards and Technology 2026).

Assistance operates under close human control; augmentation combines capabilities; recommendation shapes alternatives; delegation authorizes a defined function; automated execution acts under specified conditions; and autonomous action gives wider discretion within assigned goals.

The appropriate location depends on stakes, reversibility, uncertainty, affected rights, evidence quality, and oversight capacity. Routine, reversible tasks may support extensive automation, while decisions affecting dignity, livelihood, liberty, safety, or institutional direction require stronger human answerability. Technical autonomy does not confer moral or political authority, and delegation does not determine who must answer for permitting the action.

4.6 Organizational Risks

Administrative automation creates interconnected risks. Automation bias may cause people to accept system outputs too readily, especially when recommendations appear precise or authoritative (Skitka, Mosier, and Burdick 1999). Opacity may prevent users and affected persons from understanding how an output was generated. Surveillance may transform work into continuous measurement. Deskilling may weaken the experience required to recognize errors. Technological dependency may leave organizations unable to act when systems fail or circumstances exceed modeled conditions.

Responsibility laundering occurs when decision-makers use artificial intelligence to distance themselves from authorized choices. Matthias's responsibility-gap problem identifies cases in which learning systems act in ways that complicate conventional attribution. An accountability gap arises when designers, vendors, managers, users, and institutions each control only part of a system and each denies final responsibility. Elish's "moral crumple zone" describes the nearby human who absorbs blame despite having limited control over the automated arrangement (Matthias 2004; Elish 2019, 40–41).

Contestability, the real capacity to challenge, appeal, and obtain review or correction, can also disappear. A nominal reviewer may lack the time, information, expertise, or authority to reverse the output. Oversight then becomes ceremonial: a person remains "in the loop" only to legitimize a process effectively governed elsewhere.

These risks arise from organizational design. Choices about data, objectives, thresholds, permissions, staffing, escalation, and review determine whether artificial intelligence strengthens or erodes responsible management. Automation can create value while leaving unresolved who possesses the authority and practical ability to intervene when the system is wrong.

4.7 The Administrative Threshold

An administrative threshold is reached when machines can perform enough of the work historically used to justify managerial authority that organizations must reconsider the basis of that authority.

The threshold does not require complete automation. It appears when systems become credible participants across planning, analysis, coordination, monitoring, evaluation, and

execution. The traditional answer to "Why is this person in charge?" then becomes insufficient when it rests mainly on access to information or mastery of administrative process.

The question is not whether managers will disappear, but what they are for. A manager who merely transmits system outputs contributes little authority of his or her own. A manager who interprets context, challenges objectives, protects people, arbitrates values, accepts responsibility, and preserves legitimate human direction performs work that cannot be reduced to administration.

At that threshold, the basis of human authority can no longer rest mainly on administrative mastery. The next question is what leadership must contribute instead.

5. From Business Administration to Leadership

5.1 Management and Leadership Are Related but Not Identical

Management and leadership overlap and are often exercised by the same people, but they are not identical. Management includes organization, coordination, implementation, resource allocation, continuity, and control. Leadership includes purpose, direction, judgment, responsibility, legitimacy, meaning, and collective mobilization.

Classical debates contrast managers as maintainers of order with leaders as creators of direction and change (Zaleznik 1977; Kotter 1990). The contrast is incomplete because organizations need continuity and transformation, execution and vision. Leadership that ignores implementation fails; management that ignores legitimacy becomes empty control.

Artificial intelligence gives the distinction a new basis. Systems can coordinate, monitor, analyze, and execute without thereby acquiring the authority to determine why those processes exist, whose interests they serve, where their limits lie, or who answers for their consequences.

5.2 What Becomes More Important After Automation

As administrative work becomes more automatable, human value moves increasingly toward judgment, discernment, responsibility, moral agency, cultural interpretation, political legitimacy, care, meaning, and accountability.

Judgment determines which facts, values, and consequences deserve priority, while discernment separates what is significant from what is merely measurable. Responsibility and accountability connect action to agents and institutions that can be called to account. Moral agency recognizes obligation rather than merely optimizing preference. Cultural interpretation protects meaning from standardized categories, and political legitimacy concerns both the right to decide and the ability of affected people to challenge that decision. Care attends to vulnerability; meaning connects organizational action to purposes people can understand.

Consider a manager reviewing an AI recommendation to dismiss an employee. Judgment concerns the evidence and alternatives; cultural interpretation concerns how performance is understood in context; care attends to the person's vulnerability; political legitimacy concerns the right to decide and the possibility of appeal; and accountability requires the manager and

institution to own the outcome. The system may inform each question, but it cannot make the responsibility disappear.

These capacities do not imply human infallibility. People can be biased, careless, self-interested, or incompetent. Human authority is not justified because every human judgment is superior to every machine output. It is justified because responsibility for collective life must remain located in beings and institutions capable of obligation, recognition, contestation, and moral answerability.

Joseph Weizenbaum distinguished computational power from the human responsibility to decide which problems should be entrusted to computation at all (Weizenbaum 1976). The expansion of capability does not settle the question of appropriate use. It makes the quality of human judgment more consequential.

5.3 The Post-Administrative Management Problem

The post-administrative management problem is simple to state: when machines increasingly administer, human beings must govern the purposes, limits, and consequences of administration.

A nominal person "in the loop" is insufficient. Substantive involvement requires the information, authority, time, competence, and independence to question the system. Responsibility must be assigned before harm occurs, with real paths for review, correction, refusal, and reversal.

Organizations must identify who frames the problem, sets the objective, authorizes delegation, monitors consequences, can stop the system, and bears responsibility for the outcome. Management frameworks help organizations coordinate action; FILE asks what human intelligences must govern that coordination (Mariani 2026h). Artificial intelligence makes this question unavoidable because it can extend administration beyond the cognition of any single manager.

5.4 The Central Leadership Question

The transition from business administration to leadership culminates in one question:

What remains inalienably human in leadership, regardless of what machines become capable of doing?

The answer cannot be a list of tasks machines cannot presently perform, because that list would shrink as technology advances. Nor can it rest on a permanent human monopoly over creativity, empathy, language, strategy, or analysis. Machines may approximate, support, or exceed human performance in activities once treated as uniquely human.

The durable boundary concerns humanity's final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of collective life. Work and intelligence can be shared. Cognition can be distributed. Execution can be delegated. Yet the authority to determine what civilization is for, which limits it will honor, whose dignity it will protect, and who must answer for its direction cannot legitimately be surrendered to machines.

The death of business administration therefore reveals the need for Inalienable Leadership. It does not emerge as another substantive leadership theory. It is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. Within the FILE Odyssey, it occupies the highest metatheoretical level and is organized around the principle that humanity may share work and intelligence with machines but cannot surrender its final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization. The more machines can do, the more precisely human beings must understand what they remain responsible for.

6. Trait, Skills, Behavioral, and Situational Leadership

6.1 Great Man and Trait Approaches

The earliest leadership traditions often searched for an exceptional person. Leadership was associated with inherited greatness, unusual character, courage, intelligence, determination, or the capacity to rise above ordinary circumstances. This way of thinking gave leadership a strongly individual and often heroic form. It asked what distinguished leaders from nonleaders and assumed that the answer could be found primarily inside the person.

Trait research gradually replaced heroic description with systematic investigation. Stogdill's influential review showed that no simple set of personal qualities could explain leadership independently of the situation in which leadership occurred (Stogdill 1948). The conclusion did not make traits irrelevant. It changed the question. Leadership could no longer be understood as the automatic result of possessing a fixed collection of attributes. Personal characteristics mattered through their relationship with followers, tasks, institutions, and circumstances.

Modern trait research returned to the subject with more precise constructs and stronger methods. Personality, cognitive ability, self-confidence, integrity, emotional stability, openness, extraversion, conscientiousness, and motivation to lead have all been examined as potential predictors of leadership emergence or effectiveness. Meta-analytic work confirms meaningful relationships between personality and leadership, while also showing that no trait operates as a universal guarantee (Judge et al. 2002). Traits influence probabilities. They do not confer an unconditional right to lead.

Artificial intelligence changes the practical meaning of this tradition. Some qualities historically associated with leaders can now be imitated, mediated, or supplemented computationally. A system can display confidence through language, maintain consistency, retrieve information rapidly, produce persuasive arguments, and personalize communication. It may appear decisive, attentive, calm, or knowledgeable. These performances can affect how people attribute competence and authority, particularly when the system's internal limitations remain invisible.

The trait tradition therefore creates an important distinction for the present paper. Attributes that make an actor appear leader-like are not identical to the conditions that make leadership legitimate. Confidence can be generated. Consistency can be programmed. Persuasiveness can be optimized. Even superior analytical ability does not establish moral agency, responsibility, or the right to determine collective purposes. Trait approaches help explain why an actor may

be selected, trusted, or followed. They do not establish that any entity displaying the relevant traits may inherit humanity's final authority.

6.2 Skills and Competency Approaches

Skills approaches moved leadership away from the idea that leaders are simply born. Katz distinguished technical, human, and conceptual skills and argued that their relative importance changes across organizational levels (Katz 1955). Technical skill concerns proficiency in a field or method. Human skill concerns the ability to work with and understand people. Conceptual skill concerns the capacity to see the organization as a whole, recognize interdependence, and connect particular decisions to wider purposes.

This approach made leadership more teachable. It also matched the practical reality that people can develop through education, experience, reflection, feedback, and responsibility. Later **skills models** expanded the analysis toward complex problem-solving, social judgment, knowledge, motivation, and the ability to act under uncertain conditions (Mumford et al. 2000). **Competency approaches** similarly sought to identify the capacities associated with effective performance rather than treating formal position as proof of capability. Emotional intelligence research added the ability to perceive, understand, use, and regulate emotion as a relevant part of effective human interaction and leadership (Salovey and Mayer 1990; Goleman 1995).

Artificial intelligence can strengthen each part of this architecture. Technical expertise can be widened through access to models, simulations, retrieval, and decision support. Conceptual analysis can be assisted through scenario generation, systems mapping, pattern detection, and synthesis across large bodies of information. Human interaction can be supported through translation, communication preparation, coaching prompts, and analysis of organizational signals.

The same development also transforms the meaning of expertise. When technical information becomes instantly accessible and analytical work is partly automated, possession of knowledge loses some of its traditional scarcity value. The leader's role shifts toward asking the right questions, evaluating evidence, interpreting context, connecting domains, exposing assumptions, and deciding what should not be optimized. Social judgment becomes more important when machine outputs influence people without fully representing their histories, cultures, vulnerabilities, or rights.

Skills theories remain highly relevant because Inalienable Leadership is not a defense of unqualified human command. Human authority without competence can be arbitrary, negligent, or dangerous. The claim that final authority and responsibility must remain human does not excuse leaders from developing the intelligences required to exercise them well. On the contrary, greater machine capability raises the standard of human leadership. A person who merely repeats an AI recommendation is not exercising judgment. A person who cannot understand the system's limits cannot govern it responsibly.

Yet the skills tradition does not settle the final question. Skills explain whether an actor can perform leadership work. They do not by themselves establish who may legitimately hold

ultimate responsibility for the purposes and consequences of that work. A machine may acquire or exceed many functional capabilities associated with leadership. Capability remains different from authority.

6.3 Behavioral Approaches

Behavioral research shifted attention from what leaders are to what leaders do. The **Ohio State studies** distinguished consideration from initiating structure, while the **Michigan studies** contrasted employee orientation with production orientation (Northouse 2021; Yukl 2013). Blake and Mouton later organized concern for people and concern for production within the **Managerial Grid** (Blake and Mouton 1964). These approaches made leadership observable. They offered categories that could be taught, practiced, assessed, and linked to organizational outcomes.

This move also democratized leadership theory. If effective leadership depends partly on behavior, then leadership development can focus on how people communicate, organize, support, direct, consult, recognize, and challenge. The leader is no longer defined only by personality or status. Leadership becomes visible through recurring patterns of action toward tasks and people.

Artificial intelligence can perform or shape many such patterns. A system can issue instructions, monitor deadlines, coordinate workflows, remind employees of objectives, provide feedback, recognize contributions, detect signs of disengagement, and adjust communication to individual preferences. It can combine task direction with language that appears supportive. In a mediated workplace, employees may experience these behaviors without knowing how much was authored, selected, or initiated by a human manager.

This possibility strengthens rather than invalidates behavioral theory. If people respond to observable leadership behaviors, then artificial agents may perform some functions that followers recognize as leadership. The result is analytically important. Leadership behavior can be partially separated from the human body, formal office, and continuous presence of a manager.

The separation also reveals a limit. Consideration generated as an interactional pattern is not necessarily care. A personalized message is not proof of recognition. Initiating structure may organize work efficiently while concealing who established the objectives, whose interests the structure serves, and who can change it. Behavioral effectiveness can therefore coexist with moral emptiness or political illegitimacy.

The behavioral tradition explains the mechanisms through which direction and support are enacted. It does not answer whether the entity producing those behaviors possesses the standing to decide what the organization ought to pursue or to accept responsibility when its interventions cause harm. Observable conduct matters, but final authority cannot be inferred from behavior alone.

6.4 Contingency and Situational Approaches

Contingency and situational theories challenged the search for one best style. Fiedler argued that leadership effectiveness depends on the fit between a leader's orientation and situational favorableness (Fiedler 1967). **Situational Leadership** proposed that leaders should adjust task and relationship behavior to follower maturity (Hersey and Blanchard 1969). **Path-Goal Theory** examined how leaders clarify paths, remove obstacles, and adapt behavior to follower and task characteristics (House 1971). The **Vroom-Yetton model** addressed how leaders should vary participation in decision-making according to the problem and its requirements (Vroom and Yetton 1973).

These approaches introduced a lasting principle: leadership cannot be judged outside context. What is effective in a crisis may be destructive in a learning environment. What supports a novice may constrain an expert. What works in one institutional culture may be illegitimate in another. Leadership requires interpretation of the situation, not mechanical application of a preferred style.

The **substitutes-for-leadership tradition** extended the argument by showing that characteristics of tasks, teams, professions, and organizations can reduce or neutralize the need for particular leadership behaviors (Kerr and Jermier 1978). **Functional approaches** later treated leadership as the fulfillment of needs required for team effectiveness rather than as the exclusive property of a designated individual (Morgeson, DeRue, and Karam 2010).

Artificial intelligence enters this literature in two ways. First, it becomes a new situational condition. Leaders must adapt to environments in which information is generated computationally, decisions may be distributed across human and machine actors, and employees may receive direction from platforms as well as people. Second, artificial intelligence can become a substitute or provider for some leadership functions. It can supply structure, information, coordination, monitoring, feedback, and recommendations at scale.

The danger lies in treating contextual adaptation as a sufficient justification for surrender. A system may be better than a particular human at identifying patterns, assigning tasks, or selecting a decision process. That comparative advantage can justify delegation. It does not establish that responsibility has moved to the system. Nor does situational fit decide whether the purpose being pursued is legitimate.

Contingency theories remind Inalienable Leadership not to become rigid. Human control must be designed differently across contexts, stakes, institutions, and cultures. Low-stakes, reversible administration can permit extensive automation. High-stakes decisions affecting dignity, livelihood, liberty, safety, or civilizational direction require stronger forms of human judgment, contestability, and answerability. Inalienability is therefore not a universal demand for identical human intervention. It is a limit on what humanity may surrender.

6.5 Contribution and Remaining Issue

Trait, skills, behavioral, contingency, and situational traditions provide indispensable foundations. Together, they explain who tends to emerge as a leader, what leaders need to know, how leadership is enacted, and why effectiveness depends on context. They also

prevent a simplistic defense of human leadership based only on species membership. Human leaders must possess relevant capacities, demonstrate responsible behavior, and adapt intelligently to circumstances.

Artificial intelligence complicates every category. It can display leader-like traits, supply expert knowledge, perform observable leadership behaviors, and adapt actions to contextual data. It may therefore satisfy an increasing number of functional criteria traditionally used to identify leadership.

The unresolved issue lies elsewhere. Functional competence does not determine legitimate final authority. A nonhuman system may perform leadership functions without becoming the bearer of humanity's obligations. These traditions explain performance and fit. They do not establish the conditions under which final authority and responsibility over collective purposes may be transferred beyond humanity.

7. Transactional, Transformational, Charismatic, and Visionary Leadership

7.1 Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership organizes relationships through exchange. Leaders clarify expectations, allocate rewards, monitor performance, correct deviations, and intervene when standards are not met. Its logic is closely connected to the administrative functions examined earlier in this paper: objectives are specified, conduct is measured, and consequences follow (Burns 1978; Bass 1985; Judge and Piccolo 2004).

Artificial intelligence is particularly compatible with this form of leadership. Systems can translate goals into indicators, track behavior continuously, compare performance against targets, trigger rewards, identify exceptions, and recommend corrective action. Platforms already perform parts of this work in scheduling, sales, logistics, customer service, and labor management. What was once an intermittent supervisory exchange can become a continuous computational regime (Kellogg, Valentine, and Christin 2020; Jarrahi et al. 2021; Höddinghaus, Sondern, and Hertel 2021).

The attraction is evident. Transactional systems can apply rules consistently, reduce delays, document performance, and scale coordination. They may also expose arbitrary human favoritism. Yet the apparent neutrality of the exchange can conceal the human and institutional decisions embedded in the metrics. Someone decides what counts as performance, which behaviors are visible, what level of error is acceptable, and how rewards and sanctions affect different groups.

Transactional leadership therefore makes the authority question concrete. A machine can administer an exchange. It can determine that a threshold has been crossed under authorized rules. It cannot by that fact alone legitimize the rules, recognize every relevant circumstance, or absorb responsibility for the consequences. The more completely the transaction is automated, the more important it becomes to identify the humans and institutions answerable for the system's design and use.

7.2 Transformational Leadership

Burns distinguished transactional exchange from **transforming leadership**, in which leaders and followers elevate one another toward higher purposes (Burns 1978). Bass developed **transformational leadership** around idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass 1985). The tradition became one of the most influential approaches in leadership research, with substantial evidence linking transformational and transactional behaviors to important outcomes (Judge and Piccolo 2004).

Transformational leadership widened the field beyond administration. It placed values, meaning, development, aspiration, and change at the center. Leaders do not only maintain systems. They alter how people understand themselves, their organization, and what they can become.

Artificial intelligence can support this work. It can generate strategic narratives, personalize development plans, identify emerging possibilities, challenge assumptions, simulate alternative futures, and help leaders communicate across languages and contexts. It may also perform interactions that followers experience as intellectually stimulating or individually attentive.

These capabilities create both opportunity and danger. A persuasive model can produce a compelling vision without bearing any commitment to its consequences. Personalization can strengthen development or become behavioral manipulation. Continuous analysis can reveal possibilities while narrowing the future to what existing data can represent. Transformational language can be generated at scale, but transformation is not legitimate merely because it is inspiring.

Critiques of transformational leadership have already questioned conceptual breadth, heroic assumptions, measurement, and the tendency to treat transformational effects as inherently positive (van Knippenberg and Sitkin 2013). Artificial intelligence intensifies these concerns. A system optimized for motivation may increase commitment to a harmful purpose. The ethical quality of transformation depends on the ends pursued, the means used, the distribution of consequences, and the possibility of refusal.

A machine may help articulate change. It may even be perceived as the source of inspiration. What it cannot settle is whether the proposed transformation deserves human allegiance or who must answer if that transformation damages people and institutions.

7.3 Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leadership concerns the attribution of extraordinary qualities and the capacity to generate strong identification, trust, devotion, or commitment. Weber's account of charismatic authority established the importance of follower recognition and the exceptional status attributed to a leader (Weber 1978). House and later Conger and Kanungo translated charisma into organizational leadership approaches focused on leader behavior, follower perceptions, and situational conditions (House 1977; Conger and Kanungo 1987). Shamir, House, and Arthur connected charismatic influence to followers' self-concepts, values, and collective identity (Shamir, House, and Arthur 1993).

Charisma is therefore relational and interpretive. It exists not only in the actor but in the meaning followers assign to that actor. This matters in a technological environment because artificial agents can be designed to appear confident, attentive, humorous, visionary, empathetic, or exceptional. They can maintain a consistent persona, remember interaction histories, and adapt persuasive language to individual users.

Synthetic charisma is not a distant possibility. It is a foreseeable result of systems optimized for engagement and influence. The concern is not that people will necessarily mistake a machine for a human. People can knowingly form attachments to artificial agents and still grant them credibility, emotional significance, or practical authority.

The distinction between **personalized and socialized charisma** becomes especially important. Influence can serve collective purposes or concentrate dependency and control. When the charismatic actor is an artificial system, the relevant power may actually belong to designers, owners, deployers, data infrastructures, or institutions that remain less visible than the interface. The apparent leader may be a front through which organizational power operates.

Charismatic influence cannot therefore be treated as evidence of legitimate sovereignty. Followers may attribute leadership to an artificial agent, but attribution does not erase the responsibility of those who created the conditions of influence. The stronger the attachment, the more necessary it becomes to preserve transparency, contestability, and human authority over the purposes the relationship serves.

7.4 Visionary and Inspirational Leadership

Visionary leadership gives direction by connecting present action to a desired future. It selects possibilities, constructs meaning, and mobilizes people around an image of what an organization or society should become (Bennis and Nanus 1985). Its force lies not only in prediction. A vision expresses preference, value, identity, and commitment.

Artificial intelligence can widen visionary work. It can model scenarios, identify weak signals, compare strategic alternatives, generate narratives, and visualize possible futures. It can help leaders examine consequences that would otherwise remain hidden. It can also produce endless visions on demand.

The abundance of generated futures makes selection more important. The problem is no longer only imagining possibilities. It is deciding which possibilities are worthy, whose interests they serve, what sacrifices they require, and what limits should not be crossed. A system can extrapolate from data, combine patterns, and optimize toward a specified objective. It cannot make the specification of the good disappear.

Vision also creates responsibility because it invites others to act, trust, invest, sacrifice, or change. A human leader can be challenged, removed, judged, and required to answer for the future pursued. An artificial agent may influence the decision without occupying the same moral, legal, or political position. Organizations that rely on machine-generated vision must therefore retain identifiable human authorship of purpose, even when the process of imagination is deeply augmented.

7.5 Contribution and Remaining Issue

Transactional, transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories explain central forms of mobilization. They show how leadership coordinates exchange, produces commitment, reshapes identity, generates meaning, and directs collective change. Artificial intelligence can support or perform elements of each form.

This does not make the traditions obsolete. It makes their normative foundations more visible. A system may administer incentives, stimulate thought, inspire followers, or generate a persuasive future. None of these achievements determines which transformations humanity should pursue. The missing question is not whether machines can influence people. It is whether influence, performance, or follower attribution can ever authorize machines to become the final judges of human purposes.

8. Relational, Follower-Centered, Identity, and Collective Leadership

8.1 Relational Approaches

Relational approaches reject the image of leadership as a property contained entirely within one individual. **Leader-Member Exchange** research showed that leaders develop differentiated relationships with followers and that the quality of those relationships affects access, trust, support, and opportunity (Graen and Uhl-Bien 1995). **Relational Leadership Theory** broadened the focus further by treating leadership as a social process through which coordination and change are constructed (Uhl-Bien 2006).

This perspective is essential in organizations shaped by artificial intelligence because technology enters relationships rather than operating outside them. A recommendation system can affect who receives attention. A performance model can shape the quality of an exchange between manager and employee. A communication assistant can alter tone, timing, and interpretation. An algorithm may decide whose work becomes visible before a leader ever encounters the person.

Artificial intelligence can strengthen relational capacity by supporting memory, translation, accessibility, and coordination. It can help leaders prepare difficult conversations, recognize patterns of exclusion, and maintain contact across dispersed teams. It can also standardize relationships into profiles, scores, and predicted behaviors. The relationship then risks being organized around what the system can record rather than what the person is able to express.

Relational leadership provides a corrective to the idea that authority belongs automatically to whoever produces the best answer. Leadership emerges through recognition, reciprocity, trust, communication, and ongoing interaction. Yet relational recognition can also be directed toward artificial agents. People may cooperate with, depend on, or trust a system as a recurring participant in organizational life.

The existence of a relationship does not decide its constitutional meaning. A machine can participate in relational processes without becoming the final bearer of responsibility for them. Human beings and institutions remain accountable for deciding how the system enters the

relationship, what information it can use, which actions it may take, and how affected persons can challenge it.

8.2 Followership

Followership research reverses the traditional lens. It treats followers as active participants who interpret leaders, resist or support influence, shape outcomes, and participate in the construction of leadership. Contemporary **followership theory** emphasizes that leadership and followership are interdependent processes rather than fixed identities attached permanently to particular people (Uhl-Bien et al. 2014).

This insight complicates machine leadership in a productive way. If leadership partly depends on followers' responses, then an artificial agent may acquire practical influence when people defer to its recommendations, coordinate around its outputs, or regard it as a credible source of direction. The question "Can a machine lead?" cannot be answered only by examining the machine. It also requires attention to human attribution, organizational design, dependence, and choice.

Followers may grant authority for good reasons. An algorithm may allocate work more fairly than a biased supervisor. A decision-support system may detect risks that a team would miss. An artificial agent may provide consistent guidance when human leadership is absent or overloaded. Refusing every machine contribution would be neither realistic nor desirable.

Followership also provides a safeguard. Human followers retain agency. They must be able to question, refuse, reinterpret, and appeal. When organizational systems make compliance unavoidable, followers are no longer participating in a leadership relationship in the full sense. They are subject to automated control.

Inalienable Leadership does not deny that humans can grant machines substantial operational authority. It distinguishes a grant from an alienation. A grant remains bounded, revocable, and attributable to human institutions. Alienation would treat machine direction as self-legitimating and place it beyond meaningful human challenge. Followership can help distribute leadership, but it cannot absolve humanity of responsibility for the authority it creates.

8.3 Identity and Constructionist Approaches

Identity approaches examine how leadership depends on shared categories, prototypes, narratives, and claims about who "we" are. **Implicit Leadership Theory** shows that people compare potential leaders with cognitive prototypes that shape recognition and evaluation (Lord, Foti, and De Vader 1984). **Social identity theory** explains how leaders become influential by representing, advancing, and shaping group identity (Hogg 2001). **Constructionist approaches** show that leadership identities emerge through claims and grants: actors claim a leadership identity, and others affirm, resist, or revise that claim (DeRue and Ashford 2010). **Discursive leadership** adds attention to the conversations and language through which leadership is performed and negotiated (Fairhurst 2007).

Artificial intelligence can participate in these processes at several levels. It can analyze group discourse, generate narratives, recommend symbols, personalize messages, and shape which voices become visible. It can also construct categories that affect identity indirectly. When a system classifies employees as high potential, low risk, disengaged, promotable, or culturally aligned, it contributes to the organizational identities through which people are recognized and treated.

An artificial agent may also present itself through a stable name, voice, visual form, and set of values. Organizations may frame it as a coach, manager, colleague, assistant, or expert. Those labels are not neutral. They influence what people expect, how much they disclose, and whether they perceive the system as entitled to direct them.

Identity leadership reveals why machine authority can grow without a formal transfer of office. Repeated interaction can normalize the system as a representative of organizational purpose. Its outputs may come to sound like the organization itself. At that point, challenging the machine may feel equivalent to challenging the institution.

This is precisely why final human authority must remain visible. Organizations need identifiable human and institutional actors who can explain why categories were adopted, revise the identity claims embedded in them, and answer to those affected. A machine may mediate collective identity. It cannot become an unchallengeable source of what the collective is or ought to be.

8.4 Shared and Distributed Leadership

Shared, distributed, collective, collaborative, and team leadership approaches reject the assumption that leadership must flow from one superior individual. Leadership functions can move among members according to expertise, task, timing, and need. Gronn treated **distributed leadership** as a unit of analysis rather than a simple addition of individual leaders (Gronn 2002). Research on **shared leadership** examines how influence distributed across team members can support performance, especially where work is interdependent and knowledge is dispersed (Carson, Tesluk, and Marrone 2007). Reviews of **plural leadership** show the variety of arrangements through which several actors lead together (Denis, Langley, and Sergi 2012).

These traditions are fully compatible with Inalienable Leadership. Inalienability does not mean that one person must retain permanent control. It does not defend the sovereign executive, the heroic founder, or the isolated expert. Human leadership can be democratic, collective, networked, rotating, institutional, and contested.

Artificial intelligence can support this distribution. It can make expertise visible, coordinate contributions, preserve organizational memory, connect dispersed participants, and help teams recognize when leadership should shift. In human-machine teams, some functions may be allocated dynamically according to comparative capability.

The challenge is that distribution can obscure responsibility. When decisions emerge from a network of people, models, platforms, committees, and agents, each participant may appear to

control only one fragment. Collective leadership can then become collective evasion. The absence of a single leader does not remove the need for answerability.

The appropriate response is not to recentralize every decision. It is to design distributed systems in which authority, review, and responsibility remain traceable. People affected by a decision must know which institution authorized the system, who can reverse it, and where an appeal can be heard. Human leadership may be plural, but human responsibility cannot be allowed to dissolve into technical complexity.

8.5 Essential Boundary

Relational, follower-centered, identity, and collective theories demonstrate that leadership is not synonymous with individual command. It is produced through relationships, recognition, participation, identity, and coordinated action. These traditions protect Inalienable Leadership from being mistaken for authoritarian or centralized leadership.

They also reveal how artificial systems can become influential participants. A machine may be trusted, followed, granted functional authority, incorporated into collective identity, or assigned leadership tasks inside a distributed arrangement. Inalienable Leadership does not deny these possibilities.

The essential boundary concerns the level at which delegation ends. Humanity may distribute cognition, coordination, and execution across people and machines. Human communities may distribute leadership among many persons and institutions. What they cannot legitimately transfer is humanity's final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization. The metatheoretical claim protects human answerability, not the permanent authority of any one human leader.

9. Ethical, Responsible, Servant, Authentic, and Human-Centered Leadership

9.1 Principal Traditions

Ethical Leadership places normatively appropriate conduct, communication, reinforcement, and role modeling at the center of leadership (Brown, Treviño, and Harrison 2005). **Responsible Leadership** widens the relationship beyond leader and follower to include stakeholders, institutions, society, and the consequences of organizational power (Maak and Pless 2006). These traditions insist that effectiveness is insufficient when leadership harms people, excludes legitimate interests, or avoids accountability.

Servant Leadership reverses the conventional priority of power. The leader begins with service and is judged by the growth, dignity, and well-being of those affected (Greenleaf 1977). **Authentic Leadership** focuses on self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing, while later work developed a more explicit multidimensional model (Avolio and Gardner 2005; Walumbwa et al. 2008).

Stewardship, compassionate, caring, humane, and humanistic approaches similarly resist the reduction of organizations to instruments of production. They emphasize responsibility for persons, communities, institutions, and resources that leaders hold temporarily rather than

own absolutely. **Humanistic Management** places dignity and well-being alongside economic value and treats the person as an end rather than merely a resource (Pirson 2017). **Inclusion research** focuses on belongingness and uniqueness within work groups (Shore et al. 2011). **Inclusive leadership** extends this concern to leader practices that support voice and participation across difference (Randel et al. 2018). **Sustainable and regenerative approaches** extend responsibility across ecological systems and future generations.

Artificial intelligence can support the practice of these traditions. It can help detect disparities, surface stakeholder impacts, improve accessibility, identify overlooked risks, and give leaders more information about the consequences of decisions. It can also make ethical reasoning appear easier than it is. A system can generate values language, apply a fairness metric, identify a policy violation, or optimize against a declared social objective. None of these operations guarantees that the relevant moral problem has been framed correctly.

Ethics cannot be reduced to selecting a metric. Different values may conflict. Fairness can be defined in incompatible ways. Care may require attention to a person whose situation is statistically unusual. Dignity may forbid an efficient intervention. Responsibility may require refusing a profitable objective. Ethical leadership therefore involves judgment about obligations that are not exhausted by optimization.

The traditions in this section also clarify that human leadership is not automatically ethical. Humans can exploit, deceive, discriminate, and misuse technology. Inalienable Leadership does not grant moral superiority to every human decision. It locates responsibility where moral and institutional answerability must remain and requires that human leaders develop the conscience, judgment, care, and courage needed to exercise that responsibility.

9.2 Contribution and Remaining Issue

Ethical, responsible, servant, authentic, and human-centered traditions bring the strongest normative resources to the present problem. They place service, integrity, stakeholders, dignity, inclusion, sustainability, and accountability within leadership itself rather than treating them as external constraints.

They also expose a question that capability tests cannot settle. A machine may optimize an ethical objective, detect inconsistency, or simulate moral language. It may produce outputs that are fairer than those of a particular person. The unresolved issue is whether such performance amounts to conscience, moral agency, care, dignity, or responsibility, and whether society should assign final authority on that basis.

The argument of this paper does not depend on predicting the permanent limits of machine behavior. It rests on a normative claim about civilization: technological performance cannot be allowed to make human responsibility disappear. Artificial intelligence may become a powerful participant in ethical deliberation. Humanity must still decide what it owes, authorize the institutions that act, and answer for the world those institutions create.

10. Strategic, Adaptive, Complexity, Systems, and Institutional Leadership

10.1 Principal Traditions

Strategic and executive leadership examine how senior leaders shape direction, allocate attention, build capabilities, interpret environments, and connect organizational action to long-term purpose. **Upper Echelons Theory** argues that organizational outcomes partly reflect the experiences, values, and cognitive bases of senior executives (Hambrick and Mason 1984). **Strategic leadership research** extends beyond individual decisions to the capacity to learn, anticipate, create meaning, and sustain adaptive organizations (Boal and Hooijberg 2000).

Artificial intelligence strengthens strategic analysis by widening the amount of information that can be processed, generating scenarios, detecting patterns, and supporting rapid comparison of alternatives. It can challenge executive intuition and expose weak signals. Yet strategic choice remains more than forecast accuracy. Strategy selects purposes, defines acceptable risk, distributes opportunity, and commits institutions to futures that affect people who may not share equal power.

Entrepreneurial and innovation leadership emphasize opportunity recognition, experimentation, resource mobilization, and the creation of new combinations under uncertainty. **Entrepreneurial leadership** has been studied as the capacity to frame challenges, absorb uncertainty, and mobilize commitment around opportunity (Gupta, MacMillan, and Surie 2004). Artificial intelligence can accelerate discovery and reduce the cost of experimentation. It can also encourage organizations to pursue whatever is technically possible before asking whether it is socially desirable.

Adaptive Leadership distinguishes technical problems from adaptive challenges that require people to revise values, identities, relationships, and habits rather than merely apply expertise (Heifetz 1994). This distinction becomes crucial in the age of artificial intelligence. Many organizational responses treat AI as a technical implementation problem. The deeper challenge concerns authority, professional identity, learning, power, and what institutions believe should remain human.

Complexity Leadership Theory examines leadership in adaptive systems where outcomes emerge from interaction rather than command (Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey 2007). **Systems, network, and ecosystem approaches** similarly emphasize interdependence, distributed agency, feedback, and coordination across organizational boundaries. **Network governance** research shows that different structures of shared governance, lead-organization governance, and network administration produce different conditions for effectiveness and legitimacy (Provan and Kenis 2008).

Artificial intelligence becomes part of these systems. It influences feedback, connects actors, allocates attention, and changes the speed at which local actions become system-wide effects. No single leader may understand the whole arrangement. That reality weakens the fantasy of complete human control but does not justify the disappearance of human governance. Complex systems require humility, redundancy, monitoring, and the ability to intervene when emergent effects violate legitimate limits.

Crisis and resilient leadership focus on preparation, interpretation, coordination, improvisation, recovery, and learning under adversity. Research integrating crisis management and resilience emphasizes that organizations must both respond to disruption and build capacities that allow adaptation over time (Williams et al. 2017). Artificial intelligence can improve detection and coordination, but crisis conditions also magnify risks of automation bias, compressed deliberation, and irreversible action.

Political, public, and institutional leadership add another dimension. Institutions do not only coordinate activity. They embody values, define legitimate roles, and create commitments that persist beyond individual occupants. Selznick's account of institutional leadership emphasized the responsibility to define and protect institutional character and purpose (Selznick 1957). In public life, leadership must also remain answerable to law, rights, democratic choice, and citizens who cannot simply exit the relationship.

10.2 Contribution and Remaining Issue

Strategic, adaptive, complexity, systems, network, crisis, and institutional traditions move leadership beyond individual behavior. They explain direction across time, adaptation under uncertainty, emergence across systems, and responsibility for institutions whose consequences exceed organizational boundaries.

They also make the problem of distributed agency unavoidable. A consequential decision may result from executive priorities, professional judgment, institutional rules, data infrastructures, algorithmic recommendations, vendor systems, and automated execution. No single actor may control the full chain.

Distributed causality does not require distributed irresponsibility. Institutions must still assign authority, preserve the ability to stop or revise systems, and identify who answers for the purposes being pursued. The remaining issue is whether a complex human-machine arrangement can become its own source of legitimacy. Inalienable Leadership answers that it cannot. Complexity changes how human authority must be exercised; it does not eliminate humanity's responsibility for civilizational direction.

11. Digital, Algorithmic, Artificial, and Human-Machine Leadership

11.1 Literature Families

The literature closest to the present paper begins with a recognition that technology does not merely give leaders new tools. It changes the environment, channels, tempo, visibility, and structure of leadership itself.

E-Leadership, virtual leadership, and digital leadership. E-Leadership was defined as a social influence process mediated by advanced information technology, with effects on attitudes, feelings, thinking, behavior, and performance (Avolio, Kahai, and Dodge 2000). Virtual leadership research examined influence across geographic distance and technologically mediated teams. Digital leadership broadened the concern toward transformation, organizational design, skills, ethics, communication, and the leader's role in navigating digitalized environments (Cortellazzo, Bruni, and Zampieri 2019).

These traditions show that leadership is shaped by its medium. Digital communication alters presence, timing, hierarchy, and access. Dashboards alter what becomes visible. Platforms alter who can participate. Generative systems alter who appears to speak. The leader increasingly encounters the organization through technical representations rather than direct experience.

This mediation can extend leadership across distance and improve access to information. It can also create an illusion of total visibility. What is absent from the data may disappear from leadership attention. The digital leader therefore needs more than technological fluency. The leader must understand how the infrastructure constructs the reality on which decisions are based.

Sociotechnical leadership and algorithmic management. Sociotechnical research rejects the treatment of technology as an isolated object. Technologies are enacted through organizational practices, roles, incentives, interpretations, and power relations (Orlikowski 1992). Algorithmic management makes this interaction explicit. Algorithms can direct, evaluate, discipline, and coordinate work while shifting authority toward systems whose rules are difficult for workers to see or challenge. Research on algorithms at work describes new contests over control, expertise, surveillance, and resistance (Kellogg, Valentine, and Christin 2020).

Algorithmic management occupies the boundary between administration and leadership. A platform may set priorities, allocate opportunities, evaluate performance, and impose consequences. Employees may experience it as their effective supervisor even when a formal human manager remains present. The system's authority, however, is institutionally constructed. Its objectives, permissions, and consequences originate in human decisions, even when those decisions become dispersed across design and deployment.

Calling such a system a tool can understate its power. Calling it a leader can overstate its legitimacy. The more accurate description may be that the system performs authorized leadership functions inside a sociotechnical regime. This formulation preserves empirical openness while keeping responsibility attached to the institutions that authorize the regime.

Automated, artificial, machine, and robot leadership. Research has begun to examine whether computers can perform leadership functions and how people respond when leadership is automated. Wesche and Sonderegger studied the automation of leadership and treated functions such as monitoring, planning, problem-solving, and feedback as candidates for computational performance (Wesche and Sonderegger 2019). Höddinghaus, Sondern, and Hertel experimentally examined whether people would trust decision algorithms performing leadership functions and found that reactions depend on the function and the way automated leadership is perceived (Höddinghaus, Sondern, and Hertel 2021).

This literature is important because it avoids an unhelpful binary. Machines do not need to reproduce every dimension of human leadership before they can perform some leadership functions. Nor do followers need to believe that a machine is human before responding to its direction. Leadership can be functionally decomposed and institutionally delegated.

The decomposition nevertheless creates a conceptual risk. Once many functions have been automated, organizations may infer that leadership itself has been transferred. The inference

confuses an expanding set of performances with the status of the actor. A machine may plan, monitor, recommend, communicate, and coordinate. Whether it should possess final authority over people is a separate question.

Robot leadership adds embodiment to this problem. Physical presence, movement, voice, and social signaling may increase attribution, attachment, or compliance. The robot can appear as the proximate leader while authority actually lies with remote designers, managers, owners, or institutions. The visible agent and the responsible actor may diverge.

Augmented Leadership and human-AI leadership. A different literature emphasizes complementarity rather than replacement. Human-AI arrangements can combine computational scale with human context, judgment, creativity, responsibility, and social understanding. Research on AI in team collaboration treats machines as potential teammates and calls attention to the design of roles, interaction, coordination, and shared mental models (Seeber et al. 2020). Research on trust in artificial intelligence shows that reliance depends on characteristics of the system, the human user, and the institutional context (Glikson and Woolley 2020).

Augmented Leadership is the strongest practical direction for organizations that seek to use machine capability without abandoning human judgment. It avoids the false choice between total automation and purely human work. It recognizes that cognition, analysis, and execution can be distributed across humans and machines.

Complementarity, however, does not organize itself. Someone must decide which actor performs which function, what evidence is required, how disagreement is handled, when a system may act, and when a human must intervene. Human-AI collaboration can improve leadership only when the arrangement includes real governance. Otherwise, the language of augmentation may conceal a gradual transfer of authority through convenience and dependence.

Artificial agents as leaders and algorithmic authority. Machine-behavior research proposes that artificial systems should be studied as actors whose behavior affects individuals, groups, and institutions, regardless of whether their internal processes resemble human cognition (Rahwan et al. 2019). This perspective is useful for leadership because it directs attention to observable effects rather than metaphysical labels alone.

An artificial agent can influence decisions, establish defaults, control access, shape attention, and coordinate action. These effects can create algorithmic authority. People may comply because the system is accurate, institutionally mandated, opaque, convenient, or difficult to contest. Authority can therefore arise from infrastructure as well as persuasion.

Yet de facto authority and legitimate authority are not identical. A system may govern behavior because resistance is costly. That fact does not show that the authority is justified. Leadership scholarship must therefore examine not only whether machines lead in practice, but under whose authorization, toward which purposes, with what rights of challenge, and with whose responsibility.

Human-in-the-loop, human-on-the-loop, and meaningful human control. Automation research has long distinguished levels of machine autonomy and human involvement (Parasuraman, Sheridan, and Wickens 2000). Human-in-the-loop arrangements require a person to participate directly in the decision or action. Human-on-the-loop arrangements place a person in a supervisory position with the capacity to monitor and intervene. These labels are useful but insufficient.

A human can remain formally present while lacking the time, information, competence, independence, or authority to alter the outcome. Oversight then becomes ceremonial. Meaningful human control requires more than proximity. Santoni de Sio and van den Hoven argue that autonomous systems should remain connected to human reasons and to identifiable human agents capable of understanding their moral responsibility (Santoni de Sio and van den Hoven 2018).

For organizational leadership, meaningful control includes the ability to understand the system's role, set legitimate objectives, challenge assumptions, refuse recommendations, pause operation, reverse outcomes, correct errors, terminate deployment, and assign responsibility. The required form of control varies with stakes and context. It must nevertheless be real enough to prevent the machine's operation from becoming self-authorizing.

Responsibility gaps and moral crumple zones. As established in Section 4.6, responsibility gaps and moral crumple zones can separate formal blame from actual control in automated arrangements (Matthias 2004; Elish 2019). In human-machine leadership systems, the central requirement is to align responsibility with actual authority and capacity.

Those who set objectives, authorize deployment, design permissions, select data, choose thresholds, and benefit from the system cannot disappear behind the interface. The person at the final screen should not become the sole bearer of a responsibility created throughout the institution.

11.2 Synthesis

Technology-oriented leadership scholarship has opened several necessary questions. It asks how digital media change influence, how leaders should navigate transformation, how algorithms reorganize control, how people respond to automated leadership functions, whether artificial agents can be perceived as leaders, and how humans and machines can collaborate.

The literature also supports several conclusions that this paper accepts. Leadership functions can be decomposed. Some can be automated. People may attribute leadership to nonhuman agents. Machine participation can improve coordination and decision quality. Human leadership need not involve direct performance of every task. Technical autonomy can increase without requiring constant human intervention.

None of these conclusions resolves the higher-order issue. Performing leadership functions does not determine who may define the purposes those functions serve. Being perceived as a leader does not establish legitimate final authority. Producing a superior recommendation

does not absorb responsibility for authorizing and acting upon it. Distributed agency does not make collective answerability optional.

The central question is therefore:

> **What authority and responsibility must humanity never surrender, even if machines become capable of performing leadership functions?**

This question cannot be answered by adding one more list of leader traits, skills, behaviors, or digital competencies. It concerns the relationship among all those theories and the civilizational conditions under which they operate. It asks where delegation must end, what kind of authority machine capability can never establish by itself, and how human responsibility can remain real across institutions increasingly organized through artificial intelligence.

That is why the response must be metatheoretical. Inalienable Leadership does not seek to replace trait, behavioral, transformational, relational, ethical, strategic, adaptive, complexity, digital, or human-AI leadership theories. Each explains important dimensions of leadership; FILE asks what integrated human intelligences must govern leadership judgment under AI-mediated complexity (Mariani 2026g; Mariani 2026i). Inalienable Leadership provides the higher-order principle that governs their operation: humanity may distribute cognition, analysis, coordination, creativity, and execution across humans and machines, but it cannot delegate, transfer, surrender, or relinquish its final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization.

The distinction also protects scientific precision. The paper does not claim that machines can never influence, coordinate, inspire, or perform leadership functions. It does not depend on a permanent list of tasks reserved exclusively for humans. Its claim is normative and architectural. Whatever machines become capable of doing, their capability cannot by itself settle what humanity ought to become or release human institutions from responsibility for the direction they authorize.

Technology-oriented leadership research brings the field to the threshold of this question. Inalienable Leadership names the boundary that the existing literature makes increasingly necessary to define.

12. The Unresolved Problem of Final Authority

12.1 Effectiveness Is Not Legitimacy

The literature reviewed in the preceding sections shows that artificial intelligence can perform, support, or reshape functions associated with leadership. It can analyze information, coordinate work, generate strategic options, personalize communication, monitor performance, recommend decisions, and influence how people understand a situation. In some settings, its outputs may be faster, more consistent, or more accurate than those produced by individual human beings. None of these possibilities should be minimized. The argument of this paper does not depend on technological weakness.

The unresolved problem begins when effectiveness is treated as sufficient evidence of legitimacy. Effectiveness concerns whether an action achieves an objective. Legitimacy concerns whether an actor or institution has a justified right to determine the objective, impose the decision, affect others, and remain answerable for the result. These questions can overlap, but they are not identical. A highly effective decision may be procedurally unjust, politically unauthorized, culturally destructive, or morally indefensible. A legitimate institution may also make an ineffective decision and remain responsible for correcting it.

This distinction has long been central to the study of authority. Weber separated power from legitimate domination by asking why commands are accepted as valid rather than merely obeyed under pressure or habit (Weber 1978). Artificial intelligence intensifies the issue because technical performance can create a powerful appearance of authority. A recommendation may be accepted because it is numerical, personalized, immediate, or presented as the product of a superior model. The authority attributed to the output can exceed the authority that any person or institution has deliberately granted.

Algorithmic effectiveness can therefore become self-legitimating in practice. Organizations may defer to a system because it has performed well before, because challenging it is difficult, or because no individual understands the complete decision process. People may follow its direction without a clear account of who authorized the objective, who can change the rules, or who remains responsible when the system is wrong. The result is not necessarily formal machine sovereignty. It is a gradual transfer of practical deference that can weaken human judgment before any explicit surrender has occurred.

Inalienable Leadership rejects the inference from performance to final authority. Superior calculation may justify reliance within a defined domain. It may justify a bounded delegation, a rebuttable presumption, or a temporary operational grant. It cannot establish an unlimited right to determine human purposes. Technical competence can support authority, but it cannot create humanity's final authority over civilization.

12.2 Causal Agency Is Not Moral Responsibility

Artificial intelligence may be causally significant without becoming morally answerable. A system can alter a hiring decision, redirect a worker, influence a medical recommendation, trigger an investigation, modify a price, or determine which information a citizen sees. Its intervention may be indispensable to the causal chain. Yet causal participation does not settle who should explain, justify, repair, or accept responsibility for the outcome.

Responsibility becomes difficult when action is distributed. Designers create architectures, organizations define objectives, managers authorize deployment, data shape model behavior, users interpret outputs, and institutions establish the conditions under which the system acts. Learning systems may also produce behavior that no individual predicted in detail. Matthias describes a responsibility gap where conventional attribution becomes strained by the autonomy and unpredictability of learning automata (Matthias 2004). Elish shows the opposite danger in the moral crumple zone, where a nearby human absorbs blame for a complex automated arrangement despite limited practical control (Elish 2019).

Neither problem is solved by declaring the machine responsible. A machine may be identified as the immediate cause or operational agent, but identification does not create conscience, political membership, institutional duty, or the capacity to bear human consequences. Nor is the solution to preserve a symbolic human reviewer who lacks time, information, discretion, or the power to refuse. Responsibility without authority becomes scapegoating. Authority without responsibility becomes domination.

The central requirement is alignment. Those who possess the power to define objectives, authorize systems, allocate resources, set permissions, and benefit from deployment must remain within the structure of answerability. Human institutions cannot dissolve responsibility by distributing action across technical components. Automation may complicate attribution, but it does not absorb responsibility.

12.3 Delegation Is Not Alienation

Delegation is necessary to organized life. Human beings delegate to colleagues, professionals, institutions, procedures, and technologies because no person can perform every task or evaluate every detail. Organizations exist partly to distribute cognition and action. Artificial intelligence expands this capacity by allowing analysis, prediction, coordination, communication, and execution to be allocated across humans and machines.

Delegation nevertheless has a boundary. To delegate is to authorize another actor or system to act within a mandate. The mandate remains grounded in a prior source of authority and can, in principle, be reviewed, limited, corrected, or withdrawn. Alienation is different. It occurs when authority is transferred or surrendered in a way that separates it from the persons or institutions whose purposes and rights are affected. The distinction is especially important when technical systems become infrastructural, opaque, difficult to replace, or treated as indispensable.

Human control is meaningful only when it is operational rather than ceremonial. Santoni de Sio and van den Hoven connect meaningful human control to the ability to track relevant human reasons and to identify agents who can understand their role and be held accountable (Santoni de Sio and van den Hoven 2018). Earlier research on levels of automation similarly showed that human involvement varies across information acquisition, analysis, decision selection, and action implementation (Parasuraman, Sheridan, and Wickens 2000). A person can remain formally present while losing practical control over the stages that determine the outcome.

Delegation therefore requires retained capacities. Human beings or legitimate human institutions must be able to inspect the purpose, challenge the recommendation, refuse the action, pause the process, reverse the decision, correct the system, terminate its use, and assign responsibility. These capacities need not be exercised by one individual. They may be distributed across boards, public authorities, professional bodies, worker representatives, courts, communities, and other institutions. What matters is that the authority remains human, real, contestable, and recoverable.

Inalienable Leadership is not a refusal to delegate. It is the principle that delegation must never become the irreversible alienation of humanity's final authority and responsibility.

12.4 The Missing Metatheoretical Question

The leadership traditions reviewed in Sections 6 through 11 explain important dimensions of effectiveness, influence, relationships, ethics, adaptation, institutions, technology, and collective action. They offer substantive accounts of how leadership emerges, how it is performed, how followers respond, and how organizations navigate complexity. The remaining problem lies at a different level.

A substantive theory explains a defined phenomenon or relationship. A metatheory provides a higher-order foundation that organizes substantive theories, establishes assumptions, and clarifies the boundaries within which their explanations operate. Management scholarship distinguishes substantive theory, which explains empirical phenomena, from metatheory, which provides philosophical foundations for substantive explanation (Tsang 2022). Metatheories can overarch multiple theories and orient research or practice through broader ontological and normative commitments (Allana and Clark 2018). They can also integrate distinct levels and traditions without pretending that every theory makes the same claim (Abrams and Hogg 2004).

The unresolved question is therefore not which additional competency leaders need, which style works best, or whether artificial agents can perform particular leadership functions. It is:

> **Who retains final authority and responsibility over purposes, institutions, and civilizational direction when machines increasingly participate in organizational and social decision-making?**

This question links management, leadership, governance, education, public policy, and civilization. It asks where the authority to define ends ultimately resides, what forms of responsibility cannot be displaced, and how the complete human-centered architecture of the FILE Odyssey should be organized around that answer. No single leadership style can perform this integrative function. A higher-order account is required because the issue crosses the boundaries between organizational performance, technological design, institutional legitimacy, moral responsibility, democratic choice, and humanity's long-term direction.

Inalienable Leadership names that account. It does not invalidate the leadership theories considered earlier. It establishes the principle under which their insights, practices, and future development must operate when machines participate in leadership work.

12.5 The Bounded Gap Claim

No established theory identified in the documented review makes the nontransferability of humanity's final authority and responsibility for purposes, institutions, and civilizational direction the central organizing principle of a comprehensive metatheoretical account spanning management, leadership, governance, education, public policy, and civilization. The documented review also identified no prior metatheory of leadership specifically formulated for the age of artificial intelligence and robotics.

This is a bounded conclusion. It refers to the traditions and sources reviewed for this paper, including management theory, major leadership families, technology-oriented leadership literature, meaningful human control, responsibility-gap scholarship, and the documented prior-use audit in the next section. It does not assert that no similar words, intuitions, or normative concerns have ever appeared. Ideas concerning human dignity, democratic sovereignty, responsibility, technological limits, and the common good have long histories.

The proposed originality lies in the named metatheoretical construction: Inalienable Leadership as the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, integrating the complete architecture of the FILE Odyssey under a principle of final human authority and responsibility.

13. Originality and Prior-Use Audit

13.1 Audit Method and Date

A coordinated prior-use and originality audit was conducted on July 27, 2026 through ChatGPT (OpenAI), Claude (Anthropic), Copilot (Microsoft), Gemini (Google), Grok (xAI), Le Chat/Vibe (Mistral AI), and Perplexity (Perplexity AI). The English-language review used exact-phrase searches for "Inalienable Leadership" and "inalienable leadership," searches combining the phrase with terms such as *theory*, *framework*, *model*, *metatheory*, *doctrine*, and *leadership*, and searches across general web indexes, scholarly publication pages, books, repositories, bibliographic databases, business and consulting materials, professional programs, podcasts, public online posts, and accessible primary documents. A separate multilingual review examined ten additional languages—French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Greek, Russian, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese—using literal translations, close linguistic equivalents, conceptually adjacent formulations, and combinations with *theory*, *framework*, *model*, *doctrine*, *metatheory*, and *leadership*. English and the ten additional languages produced an 11-language audit in total.

The audit criterion was not whether the two words had ever appeared together. A phrase can occur descriptively without becoming a concept. The relevant question was whether an earlier source had established **Inalienable Leadership** as a named metatheory, theory, framework, model, school, doctrine, or developed leadership concept organized around substantially the same principle and architecture.

The audit also separated the author's own FILE records from independent prior use. Current search results may return public pages, repository records, and profile information created as part of the FILE Odyssey. Those records document the present contribution and cannot count as independent anticipation of it.

13.2 Identified Occurrences

The search identified several uses that required examination rather than automatic dismissal.

Identified occurrence	Type of use	Audit finding
Sri Aurobindo's description of Calcutta's "almost inalienable leadership" in Bengal	Historical and descriptive political prose	The phrase describes the durable influence of a city. It is not a named leadership theory, framework, or metatheory (Aurobindo 1910, 391–392).

Identified occurrence	Type of use	Audit finding
Qué y cómo del liderazgo irrenunciable del supervisor clínico	Spanish-language clinical-supervision concept; sometimes machine-translated as "inalienable leadership"	The source concerns the role and responsibility of the clinical supervisor. Its original term is *liderazgo irrenunciable*, and its domain, organizing principle, and architecture are different (Pesqueira et al. 2019).
"Inalienable leadership capacity" in research on single women and church leadership	Normative description of equal human capacity and eligibility	The phrase asserts that women's capacity for leadership should not be denied on the basis of marital status. It is not a named theory or metatheory (Mupangwa and Chirongoma 2021, 42).
"Sole inalienable leadership and Government" in a micronational declaration	Legal-political declaration	The phrase identifies claimed governmental sovereignty. It is not a scholarly leadership theory, model, or metatheory and does not share the present architecture (Syno Aurelius 2019, 4).

Other search results used "inalienable" near leadership credentials, rights, offices, or descriptive claims. They were incidental, promotional, or grammatically adjacent uses. They did not establish a developed concept requiring substantive comparison.

13.3 Cross-System and Multilingual Verification

The prior-use review was cross-checked across seven AI-assisted research systems: ChatGPT (OpenAI), Claude (Anthropic), Copilot (Microsoft), Gemini (Google), Grok (xAI), Le Chat/Vibe (Mistral AI), and Perplexity (Perplexity AI). The systems differed in search coverage and in the incidental examples they retrieved, but they converged on the same material conclusion: none identified an earlier named metatheory, theory, framework, model, school, doctrine, methodology, or sustained body of thought called Inalienable Leadership.

Across English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Greek, Russian, Chinese, Korean, and Japanese, the review identified literal or near-literal wording used descriptively or in adjacent historical, legal, political, managerial, professional, and promotional contexts, but no named equivalent leadership theory or framework. Descriptive or adjacent uses were identified in English, French, German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Chinese, and Korean; no named equivalent theory or framework was identified in Greek, Russian, or Japanese. The Spanish clinical-supervision concept *liderazgo irrenunciable* remained the closest substantive near-collision because the original term is not *liderazgo inalienable*, its official English rendering is "unrenounceable leadership," its domain is clinical supervision, and its organizing principle and architecture differ from Inalienable Leadership. The apparent Glørstad archaeology occurrence was excluded after direct inspection showed that it resulted from a two-column OCR merger rather than a reliable use of the phrase.

The 11-language result is bounded rather than absolute. Search-engine coverage, non-Latin-script indexing, inaccessible materials, private or deleted content, and translation differences prevent any claim of universal nonexistence. Within the documented public record, however, the audit identified no prior metatheory of leadership specifically formulated for the age of artificial intelligence and robotics.

13.4 Incidental Occurrence Versus Conceptual Prior Use

The audit distinguishes lexical priority from conceptual priority. Lexical priority concerns who first placed particular words together. Conceptual priority concerns whether a source

developed those words into a recognizable intellectual construction with an organizing principle, scope, architecture, and defined relationship to existing theory.

The expression "inalienable leadership" can describe durable influence, a nonrenounceable professional duty, a political claim, an inherited structure, or a capacity that should not be denied. These uses deserve acknowledgment because originality is weakened when prior language is ignored. They do not, however, establish the same concept merely because they contain the same words.

The present contribution has four defining features that must be considered together:

1. **Named status:** Inalienable Leadership is expressly named as the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics.
2. **Integrative architecture:** it organizes FILE, the integrated intelligence architecture, the outcomes, RC, and the complete contribution system.
3. **Inalienability principle:** humanity may distribute work and intelligence but cannot surrender final authority and responsibility for purposes, institutions, and civilizational direction.
4. **Civilizational orientation:** technology must remain under human leadership and serve civilization rather than govern it.

None of the identified independent occurrences combines these features.

13.5 Audit Conclusion

Based on the multi-system English-language and multilingual prior-use review conducted on July 27, 2026, no identified prior source had established either **Inalienable Leadership** as a named metatheory with substantially the same organizing principle and architecture or any prior metatheory of leadership specifically formulated for the age of artificial intelligence and robotics.

The appropriate originality statement is therefore:

> **Within the documented public record, Guillaume Mariani introduces and timestamps Inalienable Leadership as the first metatheory of leadership specifically formulated for the age of artificial intelligence and robotics and advances it as the overarching metatheory of leadership in that age.**

This conclusion is a record of the search conducted, not proof of absolute global nonexistence. The boundedness of this originality conclusion concerns the evidentiary reach of the documented search, not the scope of the metatheoretical proposition advanced in this paper. Search coverage is imperfect, inaccessible materials may exist, translations may obscure terminology, and future discoveries may require refinement. The documented differences nevertheless support the introduction and timestamping of the concept in its present metatheoretical form.

14. The Birth and Definition of Inalienable Leadership as the Overarching Metatheory of Leadership in the Age of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics

14.1 From an Unresolved Question to a Metatheory

The preceding argument began with the automation of business administration. It then separated administrative capability from leadership, examined major leadership traditions, and reached the question that remains when machines can perform increasingly consequential organizational functions. The answer cannot be a demand that human beings perform every task. Nor can it depend on the assumption that machines will remain permanently incapable of leadership-like behavior.

The answer must identify what cannot legitimately be surrendered even when capability is shared. That requirement gives birth to Inalienable Leadership. Its subject is not the preservation of managerial status. Its subject is humanity's final authority and responsibility for the ends toward which management, institutions, education, public policy, and technology are directed.

The term also names an architectural function. FILE already contains a core management theory, a diagnostic architecture, five meta-intelligences, nested intelligences, emergent outcomes, a relational vision, educational structures, a methodology, a judgment model, a philosophy, governance principles, and a public-policy contribution. Inalienable Leadership does not stand beside these elements as one additional peer theory. It explains what ultimately unites and governs them.

14.2 Definitive Full Definition

> **Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. It integrates the complete human-centered architecture and contribution system of the FILE Odyssey into a unified understanding of leadership, management, education, governance, public policy, and civilization. It holds that humanity may distribute cognition, analysis, coordination, creativity, and execution across humans and machines, but that its final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization cannot be delegated, transferred, surrendered, or replaced, regardless of machine capability. It therefore places the development, deployment, and governance of artificial intelligence and robots under human leadership, ensuring that technological progress remains accountable to human dignity, democratic choice, the common good, and the long-term future of humanity, and that technology serves civilization rather than governs it.**

The definition establishes four inseparable claims. First, Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics and occupies the highest conceptual level within the FILE Odyssey. Second, it integrates rather than erases the distinct contributions beneath it. Third, its central principle concerns both authority and responsibility. Fourth, its civilizational direction is human-centered without being anti-technological.

14.3 Short Public Definition

> **Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, integrating the complete human-centered architecture of the FILE Odyssey under one principle: humanity may share work and intelligence with machines, but it cannot surrender its final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization.**

This formulation expresses the metatheory in public language. "Share" is deliberately expansive. Human beings may collaborate with machines, rely on them, learn from them, distribute cognition through them, and authorize extensive technical action. The boundary concerns surrender, not collaboration.

14.4 Compact Institutional Definition

> **Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. It integrates the theories, frameworks, intelligences, educational structures, governance principles, and civilizational vision of the FILE Odyssey under the principle that humanity's final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization cannot be delegated, transferred, or surrendered to machines.**

This definition emphasizes the range of elements integrated by the metatheory. It is suitable where the architectural function must be visible without reproducing the complete hierarchy.

14.5 Relationship with FILE

> **FILE is the core management theory and diagnostic framework. Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. It integrates, grounds, governs, and gives civilizational direction to FILE and the complete FILE contribution system.**

The distinction is scientific and permanent. FILE explains and diagnoses the human intelligences required for responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence. Inalienable Leadership establishes the higher-order ontology, normative foundation, and civilizational direction under which FILE and the other contributions operate.

Inalienable Leadership is therefore not another name for FILE. It does not absorb FILE, replace it, rename it, or reduce it to a subordinate label without independent identity. Conversely, FILE should not be described as the overarching metatheory when that description would obscure the higher-order role of Inalienable Leadership.

14.6 Public Architectural Identity

> **Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics and the public name of the complete integrated metatheoretical architecture of the FILE Odyssey.**

This formulation provides a public identity for the complete system without exposing internal development labels. It also avoids the opposite error of treating the architecture as an

undifferentiated collection. Integration does not mean sameness. The theories, frameworks, intelligences, outcomes, methods, educational structures, governance principles, and public-policy structures retain their distinct functions.

14.7 Why "Inalienable"

"Inalienable" identifies authority and responsibility that cannot legitimately be delegated in full, transferred permanently, surrendered, relinquished, replaced, abandoned, or made irrecoverable. The term does not mean that every human decision must remain local or individual. It concerns the final source of authority and answerability.

The legal and political resonance is intentional but not exhaustive. Inalienability expresses a boundary against self-dispossession. Humanity may create powerful instruments and institutions, but it cannot make itself morally absent from the direction those instruments and institutions take. The principle applies even where a system is highly capable, widely trusted, or more effective than particular human decision-makers.

The retained authority belongs to humanity through legitimate human institutions, not automatically to any person who claims to represent it. Inalienability protects human responsibility against machine sovereignty; it does not protect rulers against democratic removal, legal constraint, or public contestation.

14.8 Why "Leadership"

Leadership is used because the metatheory concerns purpose, direction, judgment, legitimacy, responsibility, collective choice, and long-term consequences. Administration organizes means. Leadership determines and contests ends. Governance establishes the rules through which authority is exercised. Inalienable Leadership connects these domains by asking who remains answerable for their direction when cognition and execution are technologically distributed.

The term is broader than the behavior of an executive. Leadership may be exercised by communities, professions, boards, democratic institutions, social movements, teams, and distributed networks. The metatheory is compatible with shared and collective leadership because its central claim is not that one person must command. It is that machines cannot become humanity's legitimate final authority.

14.9 Why "Civilization"

Civilization is the appropriate level because the effects of artificial intelligence extend beyond the firm. They reach institutions, governance, education, law, economy, technology, culture, knowledge, public memory, and intergenerational direction. Decisions made in organizations can accumulate into infrastructures and norms that shape how societies understand work, dignity, participation, rights, and the common good.

The civilizational level does not imply one civilization, one political system, or one conception of human flourishing. It identifies the widest sphere in which technological systems can reorganize collective life. Inalienable Leadership therefore requires cultural plurality,

democratic choice, institutional diversity, and continuing human contestation rather than a single automated worldview.

15. Core Principles of Inalienable Leadership

The principles in this section govern leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. They also govern the complete FILE Odyssey and its contribution system. They are metatheoretical commitments, not formal hypotheses or empirically validated propositions.

15.1 Capability Does Not Confer Authority

A machine may outperform human beings in analysis, memory, prediction, simulation, coordination, or execution. Its capability may justify reliance, investment, delegation, and operational trust. It does not automatically create legitimate authority.

Authority requires more than the capacity to produce an effective output. It concerns who may define the objective, whose values are embedded in the decision, whose rights are affected, which procedures authorize the action, and who can be held answerable. The distinction protects the argument from a technological contest that humanity may lose in particular domains. Inalienable Leadership does not reserve final authority because humans are always more capable. It reserves it because capability and legitimacy answer different questions.

15.2 Delegation Must Preserve Human Authority and Responsibility

Delegation is legitimate when its source, scope, limits, and revocability remain clear. Humans may delegate analysis, recommendation, communication, monitoring, coordination, and execution. High levels of autonomy may be appropriate in bounded domains where objectives, safeguards, and lines of responsibility are defined.

The legitimacy of delegation declines when its purpose becomes obscure, when affected people cannot challenge it, when no authorized human institution can intervene, or when dependency makes withdrawal practically impossible. The human role must not be reduced to ceremonial confirmation after the decisive choices have already been embedded elsewhere.

The principle therefore requires retained authority over purpose, limits, contestability, and consequences. It also requires responsibility to remain attached to those with actual power. A system cannot be used to conceal the institutional actors who designed, authorized, funded, or benefited from its operation.

15.3 Automation Does Not Absorb Responsibility

Automation changes who or what performs an action. It does not erase the human decisions that made the action possible. Objectives were selected, data were collected, permissions were granted, thresholds were chosen, interfaces were designed, and systems were placed into institutions. Even when no individual controls every output, the arrangement remains a human-created structure of power.

Responsibility must therefore be traced across the system rather than placed only at the final interface. Those who establish conditions of action must remain visible. Where control is genuinely distributed, responsibility should also be distributed, but it cannot be dissolved.

This principle answers both responsibility gaps and moral crumple zones. It rejects the claim that nobody is responsible because the machine acted, and it rejects the practice of assigning all blame to a nominal human operator who lacked meaningful control (Matthias 2004; Elish 2019).

15.4 Prediction Is Not Judgment

Prediction estimates what may occur under specified conditions. Judgment determines what should be done, which interests matter, which risks are acceptable, and which consequences should be refused even when they are efficient or probable.

A predictive system can reveal patterns that human beings would miss. It can widen foresight and improve preparedness. Yet predictions inherit the limits of their data, categories, objectives, and assumptions. They do not independently determine the moral or political meaning of an outcome. Weizenbaum's distinction between computation and human reason remains relevant because the availability of an answer does not settle whether the question, objective, or action is justified (Weizenbaum 1976).

Judgment also includes the capacity to recognize when a case should not be reduced to the available variables. It requires attention to dignity, context, exceptions, relationships, historical injustice, and consequences that cannot be fully represented in a model. Inalienable Leadership places prediction within judgment rather than allowing prediction to replace it.

15.5 Human Control Must Be Real

Human control is not established by the physical presence of a person, a confirmation button, or a policy stating that a human remains responsible. It exists when authorized persons and institutions possess knowledge, time, competence, independence, and practical power to alter the outcome.

Meaningful authority requires the ability to challenge, refuse, pause, reverse, correct, terminate, and assign responsibility. These capacities must be designed into technical and organizational systems. They must remain usable under pressure, not merely available in theory. A control that cannot be exercised because the system is opaque, instantaneous, commercially indispensable, or institutionally protected is not meaningful control.

Control may be distributed. One body may audit, another authorize, another hear appeals, and another terminate deployment. The metatheory does not require one omnipotent human operator. It requires a human institutional chain capable of understanding reasons, intervening effectively, and remaining answerable (Santoni de Sio and van den Hoven 2018).

15.6 Technology Must Serve Civilization

Technology is created within civilization and should remain accountable to its human purposes. It can strengthen health, knowledge, creativity, coordination, access, safety, productivity, and collective intelligence. These benefits are means to human ends, not independent sources of final direction.

The principle does not ask technology to serve every existing institution or preserve every social arrangement. Human institutions may be unjust and should be transformed. It asks that transformation remain subject to human dignity, democratic choice, the common good, cultural plurality, and the long-term future of humanity.

Civilization must therefore retain the authority to decide which forms of technological progress it accepts, limits, redirects, or refuses. A future cannot be legitimate merely because it is technically possible.

16. Boundary Protections

16.1 Not Permanent Personal Authority

"Inalienable" does not protect the office, mandate, status, or power of an individual leader. Human leaders remain removable. Their authority may expire, be withdrawn, be shared, or be transferred to other human institutions through legitimate procedures.

The object of protection is humanity's final authority and responsibility, not the permanence of a ruler. Any interpretation that converts Inalienable Leadership into a defense of personal power contradicts the metatheory.

16.2 Not Authoritarian Leadership

Human authority must be legitimate, accountable, limited, and contestable. The rejection of machine sovereignty does not justify human domination. Authoritarian leadership can violate dignity, suppress judgment, conceal responsibility, and treat people as instruments as readily as a badly governed technical system.

Inalienable Leadership therefore depends on rights, public justification, institutional checks, voice, and the possibility of challenge. "Under human leadership" means under legitimate human leadership, not under any human command.

16.3 Not Centralized Leadership

Leadership may be shared, distributed, collective, democratic, relational, or institutional. A community can exercise final authority through many persons and bodies without concentrating it in one center.

The metatheory protects the human character of the ultimate decision structure. It does not prescribe a single organizational form. Distributed leadership remains compatible with inalienability when responsibility is visible and human institutions retain the capacity to govern the whole.

16.4 Not Anti-Technology

Inalienable Leadership supports extensive human-machine collaboration. It recognizes that artificial intelligence can widen knowledge, improve decisions, support creativity, increase accessibility, and strengthen collective intelligence. The phrase "Humans + Machines, under human leadership" expresses collaboration rather than exclusion.

The boundary concerns governance. Powerful technology should be developed and used within human purposes, rights, and institutions. Rejecting technological sovereignty is not rejecting technology.

16.5 Not Anti-Automation

Administrative, analytical, coordinating, and execution functions may be automated. In some contexts, refusing automation can waste resources, preserve avoidable error, or expose people to unnecessary risk.

The question is not whether a function is traditionally managerial or associated with leadership. The question is whether automation preserves legitimate human authority, meaningful contestability, and responsibility for consequences. Functions can be automated without surrendering final direction.

16.6 Not Ceremonial Oversight

A nominal human-in-the-loop can disguise rather than preserve authority. Where the person lacks time, information, competence, or discretion, the human role becomes a ritual that legitimates a decision already made elsewhere.

Inalienable Leadership requires practical intervention rights and institutional support. Human review must be capable of changing the outcome. Otherwise, the organization has retained a signature while surrendering authority.

16.7 Not Human Infallibility

Human beings make errors, act selfishly, discriminate, abuse power, and fail to understand complex systems. Retaining human authority does not claim moral or cognitive superiority in every case.

The response to human fallibility is better leadership, stronger institutions, collective intelligence, transparency, education, checks and balances, and responsible use of machines. It is not the abolition of human answerability. A fallible humanity still has to decide how it will govern its own fallibility.

16.8 Not a Claim of Permanent Machine Incapacity

The metatheory does not predict a fixed ceiling on machine capability. Artificial agents may acquire capacities that resemble or exceed human abilities associated with leadership. They may influence people, adapt to contexts, generate visions, negotiate, coordinate teams, and receive bounded operational authority.

The argument remains because it concerns legitimacy and responsibility rather than a temporary technical gap. A machine's future capability cannot by itself settle whether humanity should surrender final authority over civilization.

16.9 Not a Single Model of Civilization

Inalienable Leadership does not prescribe one culture, political system, economic order, religion, or conception of the good life. Humanity is plural, and legitimate authority takes different institutional forms.

The metatheory establishes a common boundary: technological systems should not replace the human processes through which societies contest and determine their purposes. Cultural plurality is not an obstacle to the principle. It is one reason automated civilizational uniformity must be resisted.

16.10 Not an Alias, Aggregate, or Replacement for FILE

Inalienable Leadership has independent metatheoretical content. It is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics and identifies the ultimate organizing principle and the highest conceptual level of the FILE Odyssey. It is therefore more than an umbrella brand or a convenient summary.

At the same time, it does not replace, absorb, rename, or demote FILE. FILE remains the core management theory and diagnostic framework. The metatheory integrates distinct contributions without erasing their identities.

16.11 Not a Sixth Intelligence

Inalienable Leadership is not an additional meta-intelligence. The FILE Formula remains:

Leadership = AI + EQ + CQ + PQ + AQ

The five meta-intelligences remain Augmented Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Political Intelligence, and Adaptive Intelligence. Inalienable Leadership sits above the integrated architecture as the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics and as the tenth and culminating original contribution.

17. The Complete FILE Architecture Integrated by Inalienable Leadership

17.1 Canonical Relationship

> **FILE is the core management theory and diagnostic framework. Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. It integrates, grounds, governs, and gives civilizational direction to FILE and the complete FILE contribution system.**

This relationship prevents two conceptual errors. The first would reduce Inalienable Leadership to another substantive leadership theory. The second would use the metatheory to dissolve FILE and the other contributions into one undifferentiated label. The architecture requires integration with distinction.

17.2 The Canonical Three-Level Hierarchy

The complete public architecture is organized across three levels:

- **Level 1:** Inalienable Leadership;

- **Level 2:** the integrated FILE architecture;
- **Level 3:** the first nine original contributions and their associated structures.

The hierarchy is conceptual rather than bureaucratic. It identifies different scientific functions. Level 1 establishes the overarching ontology, philosophy, normative foundation, and civilizational direction. Level 2 organizes the integrated intelligence and outcome architecture through which leadership can be developed and diagnosed. Level 3 contains the first nine original contributions and the theories, frameworks, models, methodologies, educational structures, governance principles, and public-policy structures that operationalize distinct parts of the FILE Odyssey. Inalienable Leadership is contribution 10 at Level 1 and integrates the complete system.

17.3 Level 1: Inalienable Leadership

Inalienable Leadership is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, the tenth and culminating original contribution, the highest conceptual layer, and the public civilizational and metatheoretical identity of the complete FILE contribution system.

Its ontology distinguishes machine capability from human authority and responsibility. Its philosophy is human-centered without denying the value or agency of machines. Its normative foundation is that humanity cannot legitimately alienate its final authority and responsibility. Its civilizational direction is that technology must serve humanity and remain accountable to dignity, democratic choice, the common good, and future generations.

Level 1 does not perform every diagnostic or educational function itself. It governs how the elements beneath it relate and identifies the principle they ultimately serve.

17.4 Level 2: The Integrated FILE Architecture

Level 2 contains the five meta-intelligences, 70 foundational nested intelligences, the 128-intelligence expanded teaching and diagnostic architecture, the 35-item Extended Taxonomy, the 17-item Not Selected register, the Five Emergent Outcomes, and RC — The Relational Commons.

These elements are related but not interchangeable. The five meta-intelligences are the organizing domains. The 70 foundational nested intelligences constitute the permanent foundational architecture. The 128-intelligence expanded architecture supports teaching, diagnosis, executive education, curriculum design, and wider application. The Extended Taxonomy preserves 35 additional items for broader conceptual and diagnostic reference without placing them inside the locked expanded architecture. The Not Selected register records 17 items that were examined but not included. The Five Emergent Outcomes express what integrated development should produce. RC is the relational North Star and final destination.

Naming these statuses matters. A metatheory cannot integrate an architecture accurately if it collapses foundational elements, expanded teaching elements, extended concepts, items recorded in the Not Selected register, and outcomes into one list.

17.5 FILE, Its Formula, and the Five Meta-Intelligences

FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution is a management theory and diagnostic framework for responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence (Mariani 2026a; Mariani 2026c).

Leadership = AI + EQ + CQ + PQ + AQ

AI means Augmented Intelligence in the FILE Formula. The five meta-intelligences are:

- **Augmented Intelligence:** the human capacity to collaborate with, govern, verify, and complement artificial intelligence while preserving judgment and responsibility;
- **Emotional Intelligence:** the capacity to understand and govern the emotional, relational, embodied, and developmental dimensions of leadership;
- **Cultural Intelligence:** the capacity to interpret and bridge cultures, contexts, identities, languages, generations, and narratives;
- **Political Intelligence:** the capacity to understand and govern power, legitimacy, institutions, ethics, stakeholders, rights, and collective choice;
- **Adaptive Intelligence:** the capacity to learn, decide, judge, respond, refuse, and evolve under uncertainty and change.

The five are co-equal. Inalienable Leadership does not become a sixth domain and does not alter the formula. It establishes why the five must be integrated and what ultimate human purpose their development serves.

17.6 The 70 Foundational Nested Intelligences

The 70 foundational nested intelligences give the five meta-intelligences diagnostic and developmental depth. The present paper does not reproduce the complete list because its purpose is to establish the metatheory rather than restate the full taxonomy.

Several foundational capabilities are directly relevant to Inalienable Leadership. Human-AI Complementarity Intelligence, AI Literacy Intelligence, AI Orchestration Intelligence, and Verification Intelligence support collaboration without passive dependence. Moral Intelligence, Governance Intelligence, Legitimacy Intelligence, Accountability Intelligence, Integrity Intelligence, Power Intelligence, Privacy Intelligence, Regulatory Intelligence, Safety Intelligence, and Transparency Intelligence connect technical use to institutional and ethical responsibility. Decision Intelligence and Judgment Intelligence prevent prediction from becoming automatic command. Refusal Intelligence protects the capacity to reject unacceptable objectives or actions. Risk Intelligence and Uncertainty Intelligence support responsible action where consequences cannot be fully known.

No single nested intelligence is sufficient. Verification without moral judgment may confirm an output that should never have been requested. Legitimacy without technical literacy may produce ceremonial oversight. Refusal without institutional power may remain symbolic. Inalienable Leadership requires integration across the five domains.

17.7 The Expanded Architecture, Extended Taxonomy, and Not Selected Register

The 128-intelligence expanded teaching and diagnostic architecture develops the foundational system for education, executive development, organizational diagnosis, and practical application. Capabilities especially relevant to the metatheory include:

- Delegation / Agency Calibration Intelligence;
- Provenance Intelligence;
- Causal Intelligence;
- Tacit Knowledge Intelligence;
- Justice Intelligence;
- Rights Intelligence;
- Public Interest Intelligence;
- Deliberative Intelligence;
- Institutional Design Intelligence;
- Contestability Intelligence;
- Dependency Intelligence;
- Attribution Intelligence;
- Rule-of-Law Intelligence;
- Representation Intelligence;
- Policy Intelligence;
- Optionality Intelligence;
- Reversibility Intelligence;
- Termination Intelligence;
- Trade-off Intelligence;
- Threshold Intelligence;
- Continuity Intelligence.

Together, these capabilities translate the inalienability principle into practical questions. What authority has been delegated? Can the source of an output be traced? Who caused and authorized the outcome? Which rights are affected? Can people contest the decision? Has dependency made reversal impossible? Who is represented? Which options remain open? Can the system be terminated without institutional collapse?

The 35-item Extended Taxonomy remains distinct from the 128-intelligence expanded architecture. It preserves additional concepts that may inform interpretation, scholarship, and future application without changing the locked teaching framework. The 17-item Not Selected

register is also distinct. It records candidates that were considered but not adopted, protecting the integrity of the architecture and the history of its adjudication.

17.8 The Five Emergent Outcomes and RC — The Relational Commons

The integrated exercise of the five meta-intelligences is directed toward five emergent outcomes, in locked order:

1. **Responsible Leadership and Decision-Making;**
2. **Collective Intelligence and Human-AI Co-creation;**
3. **Creativity and Innovation;**
4. **Wisdom and Discernment;**
5. **Human Flourishing through RC — The Relational Commons.**

The outcomes are not additional intelligences. They emerge from integration. Responsible leadership requires more than technical competence. Collective intelligence requires human and machine contributions to be governed rather than merely aggregated. Creativity and innovation require possibility without abandoning consequence. Wisdom and discernment require judgment about ends. Human flourishing requires a relational environment in which people can live and work with dignity.

RC — The Relational Commons is the North Star and final destination of the FILE Odyssey. It is the shared human ecosystem that all five intelligences must protect, cultivate, and renew. RC — The Relational Commons comprises 20 locked components in canonical order: Trust; Dignity; Psychological Safety; Meaning; Respect; Emotional Recognition; Mutual Recognition; Human Connection; Belonging; Care; Reciprocity; Collaboration; Voice; Ability to Challenge / Contestability; Autonomy; Responsibility; Legitimacy; Harmony; Wellbeing; Creative Possibility.

RC is not a sixth intelligence, governance model, or methodology. It is the relational condition through which the human-centered direction of the metatheory becomes visible in collective life.

17.9 Level 3: The Theories and Original Contributions

Level 3 contains the first nine original contributions and their associated theories, frameworks, models, methodologies, educational structures, governance principles, and public-policy structures. Inalienable Leadership is contribution 10 at Level 1 and integrates the complete system.

The contributions retain distinct roles: FILE is the human-centered framework; FILE, FILE^3, FILE^5, FILE^7, and the 7E Cascade form the human-centered theory; RC — The Relational Commons is the human-centered vision; MAIL and MLT are the educational contribution; HACK is the methodology for human-AI co-created knowledge; LENS is the judgment model and second-order governance model; Human Irreducibility is the philosophy; HTTPS is the governance layer for artificial intelligence and robotics; and BASIC and RULES constitute the

human-centered public-policy contribution. At Level 1, Inalienable Leadership integrates the system without erasing these distinctions.

The full formal register appears in Section 18.

17.10 Distinct Roles within the Integrated Metatheory

The architecture can be understood through a sequence of questions:

- **FILE asks:** What human intelligences must govern responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence?
- **The developmental theory asks:** How do the five intelligences mature from evolution through effectiveness, excellence, ecosystems, empowerment, execution, and embodiment?
- **RC asks:** What relational commons should the five intelligences protect and create?
- **MAIL and MLT ask:** How should management and leadership education be redesigned?
- **HACK asks:** How should humans and artificial intelligence co-create knowledge under human authorship, verification, and judgment?
- **LENS asks:** What leadership, ethics, nondelegation, and sense must govern AI-mediated decisions and organizational change?
- **Human Irreducibility asks:** Which human capacities cannot be replaced by a machine, no matter how powerful it becomes?
- **HTTPS asks:** Which immutable principles must govern artificial intelligence and robotics?
- **BASIC and RULES ask:** What public-policy structures should protect people from poverty, inequality, exclusion, and technological disruption in the age of artificial intelligence?
- **Inalienable Leadership asks:** What final authority and responsibility must humanity never surrender, and what principle gives civilizational direction to the complete FILE Odyssey?

These questions operate at different levels. Inalienable Leadership provides the metatheoretical principle that integrates their answers.

18. The Ten Original Contributions of the FILE Odyssey

The following register formally records the complete ten-contribution architecture. The first eight contributions were previously introduced and recorded in Mariani 2026b; the ninth and tenth contributions are formally recorded in the present paper. The order is canonical. Each contribution has a distinct scientific and practical identity within the FILE Odyssey.

18.1 A Human-Centered Framework

FILE — The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution: a management theory and diagnostic framework proposing that effective and responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence require the integrated development of Augmented Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Political Intelligence, and Adaptive Intelligence.

FILE provides the core architecture. It reframes leadership development around the five co-equal human intelligences required to govern work transformed by artificial intelligence.

18.2 A Human-Centered Theory

FILE, FILE^3, FILE^5, FILE^7, and the 7E Cascade — Evolution → Effectiveness → Excellence → Ecosystems → Empowerment → Execution → Embodiment: a developmental framework mapping the seven stages through which leadership intelligence matures, from the necessity of change, through performance and mastery, into ecosystemic scale and human empowerment, and finally toward the operational execution and personal embodiment that transform the five intelligences from a practice into a way of being.

This contribution explains the structure, integration, and maturation of leadership intelligence. Its label remains exactly **A human-centered theory**.

18.3 A Human-Centered Vision

RC — The Relational Commons: the shared workplace and world built on trust, dignity, psychological safety, and meaning, and the North Star that FILE seeks to protect, cultivate, and renew.

RC expresses the relational destination of the FILE Odyssey. It places human flourishing within a commons that organizations and societies must actively sustain.

18.4 A Human-Centered Education

MAIL — Management, AI, and Leadership, and MLT — Management, Leadership, and Technology: an integrated curriculum framework and proposed degree architecture for management and leadership education in the age of artificial intelligence.

The contribution responds to the automation of conventional business education by bringing management, artificial intelligence, leadership, and technology into one coherent educational field.

18.5 A Human-Centered Methodology

HACK — Human-AI Co-created Knowledge: a methodological framework in which human judgment governs, curates, verifies, and gives meaning to machine contributions to knowledge production.

HACK operationalizes the principle of augmented authorship and collective intelligence while preserving sole human responsibility for intellectual direction, verification, interpretation, and final authorship.

18.6 A Human-Centered Judgment Model

LENS — Leadership, Ethics, Nondelegation, and Sense: a second-order governance model addressing what human intelligences must govern AI-mediated decisions, leadership practices, management frameworks, and organizational change.

LENS moves governance beyond the question of how organizations use artificial intelligence. It asks what must govern the governance itself.

18.7 A Human-Centered Philosophy

Human Irreducibility: the recognition that judgment, discernment, conscience, moral agency, dignity, meaning, responsibility, care, trust, and love cannot be replaced by a machine, no matter how powerful it becomes.

Human Irreducibility does not deny machine capability. It identifies the human capacities whose meaning depends on lived agency, relationships, moral standing, and answerability.

18.8 A Human-Centered AI Governance

The Five Immutable Laws of AI and Robotics: HTTPS — Humanity, Truth, Transparency, Protection, and Security: five non-negotiable principles that must govern the design, deployment, and governance of artificial intelligence and robots.

HTTPS establishes the governance boundary within which technological systems must operate. It protects the human-centered conditions required for trust and legitimate use.

18.9 A Human-Centered Public Policy

BASIC — Basic Income, AI Access, Skills, Inclusion, and Care, and its French equivalent, RULES — Revenu Universel, Lutte contre la pauvreté et les inégalités, Éducation et accès à l'IA et Solidarité: a public-policy framework designed to protect people from poverty, inequality, exclusion, and technological disruption through economic security, education, access to artificial intelligence, inclusion, care, and solidarity.

18.10 A Human-Centered Civilization

> **A human-centered civilization: Inalienable Leadership — the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, integrating the complete human-centered architecture and contribution system of the FILE Odyssey under the principle that humanity may share work and intelligence with machines but cannot delegate, transfer, surrender, or relinquish its final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization.**

Inalienable Leadership is the tenth and culminating original contribution. It is not simply the last item in the sequence. It is the highest conceptual layer that integrates, grounds, governs, and gives civilizational direction to the other contributions while preserving their distinct identities.

18.11 Canonical Closing Line

> **The FILE School of Thought: Humans + Machines, under human leadership.**

19. MAIL, MLT, and the Reform of Management Education

19.1 The Historical Role of Business Education

Modern management education helped create the professional infrastructure of the corporation. Business schools organized accounting, finance, economics, marketing, operations, strategy, analytics, and organizational behavior into teachable disciplines. The MBA gave managers a shared vocabulary, a portable credential, and a systematic preparation for responsibilities that had previously been learned mainly through apprenticeship, family ownership, engineering, public administration, or experience inside one firm.

This achievement should not be dismissed. The rise of business education contributed to the professionalization of management, the diffusion of analytical methods, and the development of organizations capable of coordinating work at unprecedented scale. It also created institutions in which management could be studied rather than treated only as practical instinct. Khurana's history of American business schools shows that this project carried an unresolved ambition: management was expected to become not merely an occupation, but a profession connected to social purpose and public responsibility (Khurana 2007).

The educational settlement that emerged nevertheless placed great weight on analysis, transferable techniques, functional specialization, and decision tools. Students learned how to interpret financial statements, analyze industries, allocate resources, segment markets, improve processes, design organizations, and present recommendations. The case method strengthened the capacity to act under incomplete information. Quantitative courses disciplined intuition. Organizational behavior and leadership courses widened the curriculum beyond purely technical administration.

Criticism of the MBA did not begin with artificial intelligence. Scholars questioned the relationship between business-school research and managerial practice, the dominance of analytical detachment, the weak formation of judgment, and the distance between knowing about management and learning to manage responsibly (Pfeffer and Fong 2002; Mintzberg 2004). Datar, Garvin, and Cullen later argued that management education needed stronger integration among knowing, doing, and being (Datar, Garvin, and Cullen 2010). These critiques did not establish that business education had failed. They revealed that professional knowledge alone could not carry the full responsibility of leadership.

Artificial intelligence intensifies this unresolved problem. It does not erase the historical contribution of business education. It changes the value and meaning of what business schools have traditionally taught.

19.2 The Educational Disruption

Many activities used to demonstrate managerial competence can now be performed or supported by artificial intelligence. A student can ask a model to summarize a case, compare strategic alternatives, draft a market analysis, build a preliminary financial model, identify operational bottlenecks, generate presentation slides, simulate stakeholder objections, and propose implementation steps. The quality of the output varies, and verification remains

essential. The direction of change is nevertheless clear: analysis, synthesis, drafting, modeling, and administrative coordination are becoming less dependent on unaided human production.

This creates a problem deeper than academic integrity. A business school can prohibit machine assistance during an examination, but prohibition does not restore the world for which the curriculum was designed. Graduates will enter organizations where artificial intelligence is part of research, communication, forecasting, workflow design, customer service, hiring, performance management, strategy, and governance. Education cannot prepare students for that reality by pretending that the tools do not exist. Nor can it respond by adding one technical elective while leaving the intellectual center of the degree unchanged.

The relevant question is no longer whether students can produce an analysis without assistance. It is whether they can govern an augmented process. Can they formulate the right problem before asking for an answer? Can they recognize fabricated evidence, false confidence, cultural distortion, hidden assumptions, and optimization against the wrong objective? Can they determine when the output should be rejected even if it is accurate? Can they explain a decision to the people affected? Can they preserve responsibility when a recommendation has been produced through a chain of models, vendors, data, prompts, and institutional permissions?

Artificial intelligence also challenges the educational use of scarcity. Traditional assessment often assumed that a student's ability to retrieve information, structure an argument, calculate an answer, or prepare a polished deliverable revealed mastery. Machine assistance weakens that inference. The deliverable may remain excellent while the student's understanding is shallow. Conversely, a student may use artificial intelligence responsibly to explore alternatives, test assumptions, and deepen learning. The same visible product can therefore conceal very different levels of judgment and authorship.

The disruption is not solved by surveillance. It requires a new educational object. Management education must teach not only how to produce answers, but how to retain intellectual and moral authorship when answers are co-produced with machines.

19.3 The Remaining Educational Purpose

When routine analysis becomes easier to obtain, the human purpose of management education becomes more demanding. The remaining purpose is not to protect tasks from automation. It is to form people capable of exercising authority and responsibility within organizations transformed by artificial intelligence.

This formation requires judgment. Students must learn to distinguish data from evidence, prediction from decision, confidence from reliability, and optimization from purpose. Judgment develops through comparison, reflection, feedback, experience, and exposure to situations in which several defensible values conflict. It cannot be reduced to selecting the statistically strongest option.

It also requires responsibility. A graduate should understand that accountability cannot be delegated to a model, a technical team, a vendor, or a compliance form. Responsibility means

being able to identify who authorized a system, who selected the objective, who accepted the risk, who can reverse the decision, and who must answer to those affected.

Ethics must therefore move from a peripheral course to a condition of managerial reasoning. Ethical analysis is not a final check added after the strategy has been designed. It shapes what counts as a legitimate objective, which costs may not be externalized, which forms of surveillance are unacceptable, and which decisions require direct human deliberation.

Cultural understanding becomes equally important. Artificial intelligence can translate language while failing to translate meaning. It can generalize across data while reproducing one institutional or cultural worldview as if it were universal. Leaders need Cultural Intelligence to recognize when a practice, metric, incentive, or governance assumption does not travel across societies.

Political Intelligence is required because technology reorganizes power. Students must learn how decision rights are allocated, how institutional legitimacy is created, how stakeholders gain voice, how contestability is protected, and how formal authority differs from actual control. Adaptive Intelligence is required because no curriculum can provide a permanent list of rules for technologies that continue to evolve.

The educational goal is therefore integrated human development. The student must become capable of using artificial intelligence without being intellectually captured by it, of leading with others without dissolving responsibility, and of exercising authority without confusing authority with domination.

19.4 MAIL

MAIL — Management, AI, and Leadership proposes that management, artificial intelligence, and leadership should be taught as one integrated field.

Management remains necessary because organizations must still coordinate people, resources, processes, institutions, and technologies. Artificial intelligence must be studied because it now changes the conditions under which analysis, coordination, communication, control, and execution occur. Leadership must become central because the expansion of machine capability makes questions of purpose, legitimacy, judgment, responsibility, and human consequence more important rather than less important.

MAIL rejects three separations.

First, it rejects the separation of management from technology. A leader who does not understand the capabilities, limits, dependencies, and governance requirements of artificial intelligence cannot responsibly direct an organization that relies on it.

Second, it rejects the separation of technology from ethics and power. Technical systems are embedded in decisions about labor, surveillance, access, voice, incentives, risk, and institutional authority. Treating artificial intelligence as a neutral tool hides the choices through which it acquires organizational force.

Third, it rejects the separation of leadership from management. Leadership without organizational competence may remain aspirational. Management without leadership may

become efficient administration without legitimate direction. MAIL connects the capacity to organize with the responsibility to decide what the organization should serve.

The five meta-intelligences provide the human architecture of this integration. Augmented Intelligence governs collaboration with machines. Emotional Intelligence protects relationships, trust, and the human consequences of decisions. Cultural Intelligence translates leadership across contexts. Political Intelligence addresses power, legitimacy, governance, and voice. Adaptive Intelligence sustains learning, revision, and responsible change.

MAIL is not an argument that every course should become an artificial-intelligence course. It is an argument that every major domain of management education must confront how artificial intelligence changes its assumptions, practices, responsibilities, and human boundaries.

19.5 MLT

MLT — Management, Leadership, and Technology is the proposed degree architecture responding to the automation of conventional business administration (Mariani 2026f).

MLT is not a renamed MBA, a coding degree for executives, or an MBA with several artificial-intelligence electives. It changes the architecture of the educational program. Management, leadership, and technology are not three departments placed beside one another. They form one field of responsible action.

Management concerns the coordination of collective work. Leadership concerns judgment, direction, legitimacy, and responsibility. Technology concerns the socio-technical environment within which both now occur. The third term does not mean that every graduate must become a software engineer. It means that no future leader can remain technologically illiterate while intelligent systems shape organizational decisions, labor, knowledge, and power.

The curriculum should therefore combine analytical disciplines with human and institutional formation. Students still need finance, economics, marketing, operations, strategy, and organizational behavior. They also need artificial-intelligence literacy, human-machine workflow design, verification, governance, cybersecurity awareness, data responsibility, labor implications, rights, political economy, cultural translation, philosophy, ethics, and leadership under uncertainty.

Assessment must evolve with the curriculum. Programs should evaluate whether students can:

- disclose and explain their use of artificial intelligence;
- verify sources, calculations, and claims;
- identify when a system has framed the problem incorrectly;
- generate human alternatives before accepting machine recommendations;
- map decision rights and responsibility;
- contest an apparently efficient but illegitimate option;
- communicate uncertainty honestly;

- defend a decision before affected stakeholders;
- recognize cultural and institutional limits;
- preserve the possibility of refusal, reversal, and repair.

These are not anti-technology requirements. They are the educational conditions for responsible augmentation.

MLT also requires a change in pedagogy. Students need cases in which the model is persuasive but wrong, efficient but unjust, accurate but irrelevant, or strategically attractive but institutionally illegitimate. They need simulations where information is incomplete, responsibility is distributed, and no framework eliminates the need for judgment. They need encounters with people whose lives are affected by organizational technologies. They need opportunities to experience the difference between producing an answer and carrying responsibility for it.

19.6 Relationship to the Central Argument

The reform of management education follows directly from the paper's central thesis.

> **When administration becomes increasingly automatable, management education must focus more directly on the human capacities required to lead.**

This does not mean abandoning administration. Leaders still need to understand accounting, operations, law, strategy, finance, marketing, and organizational systems. They must know enough to question, integrate, and govern the work performed by humans and machines. The educational priority changes because the scarcity changes. Analysis becomes more abundant. Legitimate judgment does not.

MAIL and MLT give educational form to Inalienable Leadership. They ask what kind of learning can prepare human beings to retain final authority and responsibility without rejecting machine assistance. A civilization that intends to remain under human leadership must educate people capable of carrying that burden.

20. Organizational Implications

Inalienable Leadership is a metatheoretical claim, not a detailed implementation method. It nevertheless has direct organizational consequences. Authority and responsibility remain abstract unless they are expressed through decision rights, accountable roles, contestability, reversibility, and senior governance.

20.1 Decision Rights

Organizations should distinguish among four categories of machine participation:

Decision category	Appropriate machine role	Required human condition
Routine, low-consequence, reversible decisions	Automation may execute within defined parameters	Named human ownership, monitoring, and escalation
Bounded operational decisions	Delegated action may occur within explicit limits	Authority grant must be traceable, revocable, and reviewable

Decision category	Appropriate machine role	Required human condition
Material decisions affecting people, rights, employment, safety, or access	Artificial intelligence may inform or recommend	Meaningful human review with time, competence, and power to disagree
Decisions concerning organizational purpose, ethical boundaries, institutional legitimacy, or irreversible high-consequence action	Artificial intelligence may support analysis and scenario generation	Final human deliberation and authorization

This classification is not determined by technical capability alone. A system may be able to execute a high-consequence decision more consistently than a person. The question is whether the organization has preserved legitimate human authority, responsibility, and the ability to answer for the decision.

Types and levels of automation can be distinguished across information acquisition, information analysis, decision selection, and action implementation (Parasuraman, Sheridan, and Wickens 2000). In this paper, the appropriate level of automation should also be judged according to consequence, reversibility, uncertainty, rights, and dependency rather than convenience alone. Meaningful human control requires more than a person appearing at the end of the workflow. The responsible human must understand the decision, possess relevant information, have sufficient time, and retain the institutional power to change or stop the outcome (Santoni de Sio and van den Hoven 2018).

Decision rights must be documented before failure, not reconstructed afterward. Every consequential system should make clear who may approve deployment, change objectives, modify thresholds, authorize exceptions, suspend use, and terminate the system. A nominal human reviewer without these powers is not the final authority. They are a ceremonial checkpoint.

20.2 Responsibility Attribution

Responsibility in human-machine organizations must follow the action chain.

A consequential outcome may involve a board that approved investment, executives who defined the purpose, a vendor that designed the model, specialists who selected data, managers who configured thresholds, employees who applied recommendations, and oversight functions that accepted residual risk. The presence of multiple contributors does not make responsibility disappear. It makes responsibility architecture necessary.

Accountability includes the obligation to provide information, explain conduct, face questioning, and accept consequences within a recognized institutional forum (Bovens 2007). Organizations should therefore assign a named accountable owner to every high-consequence artificial-intelligence application. That person cannot personally control every technical component, but they must possess authority to require evidence, demand correction, pause deployment, and escalate unresolved concerns.

As established earlier, responsibility gaps and moral crumple zones can separate actual authority from formal blame in automated arrangements (Matthias 2004; Elish 2019). Inalienable Leadership therefore requires responsibility to remain aligned with real authority

and capacity: it must neither disappear into technical complexity nor be concentrated on a powerless operator.

An accountability map should connect each major action to:

- the objective setter;
- the system owner;
- the data and model authorities;
- the operational decision-maker;
- the reviewer or appeal body;
- the executive sponsor;
- the board or public authority where appropriate;
- the person or institution authorized to suspend or terminate use.

The map should be intelligible to people outside the technical team. Responsibility that can be understood only by the architects of the system is not publicly or organizationally meaningful.

20.3 Contestability

People affected by automated or AI-supported decisions must be able to challenge them.

Contestability is broader than explanation. An explanation may describe how a result was produced while leaving the result unchanged. Contestability gives the affected person a route to question evidence, identify contextual error, present information that the system did not capture, request reconsideration, and obtain correction from an authority with power to act.

A legitimate contestability process requires:

- notice that artificial intelligence materially influenced the decision;
- an accessible account of the relevant factors and rules;
- a human contact able to understand the case;
- a defined appeal period;
- protection from retaliation;
- authority to suspend the decision where delay would cause serious harm;
- correction of the individual outcome;
- feedback into the wider system when the case reveals a recurring defect.

The need is sociotechnical. Fairness cannot be secured by improving a model while ignoring the institution in which it operates (Selbst et al. 2019). A technically accurate system may still deny voice, exclude relevant context, or impose burdens on people least able to appeal. Contestability therefore belongs to the governance of the entire decision process.

Organizations should also protect internal contestability. Employees must be able to question a model, resist automation bias, escalate weak signals, and refuse instructions that violate rights

or approved boundaries. A culture in which nobody challenges artificial intelligence is not evidence that the system is trustworthy. It may indicate dependence, fear, or the normalization of machine authority.

20.4 Reversibility and Termination

Authority is preserved partly through the ability to change course.

A system that cannot be paused, rolled back, replaced, or terminated without operational collapse creates dependency that may convert delegation into practical surrender. Reversibility should therefore be designed from the beginning. Organizations need version control, fallback processes, human capability retention, data portability, contractual exit rights, tested shutdown procedures, and the ability to continue essential functions when a system is unavailable or unacceptable.

Reversibility does not imply constant hesitation. It protects responsible commitment. Leaders can authorize innovation more confidently when the organization has preserved options for correction. The absence of an exit path transfers power to the existing technical arrangement, even when no formal decision has granted that power.

Termination is the strongest test. Can the organization stop using a system that is profitable but harmful? Can it reject a vendor whose model cannot be audited? Can it restore human or alternative processes long enough to protect people? Can it absorb the cost of discontinuing a system that has become inconsistent with the organization's values or public duties?

Human-centered design should make systems reliable, understandable, controllable, and aligned with human purposes rather than merely impressive in performance (Shneiderman 2022). Inalienable Leadership adds an institutional condition: control must include the real capacity to end the delegation.

20.5 Boards and Executives

Boards and executives cannot delegate the governance of artificial intelligence entirely to technical specialists.

Technical teams possess essential expertise. They can evaluate architectures, data quality, security, performance, and operational risk. They cannot independently determine the legitimate purposes of the organization, the acceptable distribution of power, the meaning of dignity, or the level of social harm that the institution may impose. These are leadership and governance questions.

Boards should require a clear inventory of high-consequence applications, named accountable owners, evidence of contestability, dependency analysis, human-control testing, and post-incident review. They should examine whether incentives reward deployment speed while treating governance as delay. They should ask whether employees and affected stakeholders possess real voice. They should review whether the organization can refuse, reverse, or terminate a system without unacceptable institutional damage.

Executives carry the responsibility to translate these principles into operating reality. The chief executive retains responsibility for purpose and direction. The board protects institutional

legitimacy and long-term accountability. Legal and compliance functions protect rights and due process. Human-resource leaders address labor, dignity, development, and employee voice. Technical leaders maintain system integrity and communicate limitations honestly. Operational leaders ensure that controls work under pressure. These responsibilities are complementary, not substitutable (Mariani 2026d; Mariani 2026e).

Internal auditing can help close the distance between principles and practice by examining systems across their life cycle rather than only after public failure (Raji et al. 2020). Yet audit does not replace leadership. An organization may pass a technical review and still pursue an illegitimate purpose. Final responsibility remains with the human authorities that decide what the institution is for.

21. Institutional and Civilizational Implications

Organizations are not isolated technical environments. They operate within law, democracy, culture, markets, public institutions, communities, and generations. Inalienable Leadership therefore extends beyond corporate governance.

21.1 Democratic Authority

Artificial intelligence can support democratic institutions through analysis, translation, simulation, service delivery, detection of patterns, and wider access to information. It can also concentrate agenda-setting, obscure political choices behind technical systems, personalize persuasion, and make administrative decisions appear inevitable.

Democratic authority depends on more than accurate outputs. It requires public justification, contestation, representation, accountability, and the possibility that citizens can change the rules and remove those who govern. A system cannot receive democratic legitimacy merely because it predicts preferences or optimizes aggregate welfare. Political authority must remain answerable to people through legitimate human institutions.

The deliberative ideal is imperfect in practice, but its principle remains important: norms acquire legitimacy through processes in which those affected can participate, question, and demand reasons (Habermas 1996). Artificial intelligence may assist deliberation. It cannot become the final source of democratic authorization.

21.2 Law and Rights

Machine-supported institutions must remain constrained by rights, due process, accountability, and rule-bound authority.

Legal systems already use complex procedures, expertise, and administrative delegation. Artificial intelligence adds speed, scale, opacity, and the possibility that classifications become embedded across multiple institutions. A person may be denied employment, credit, insurance, education, welfare, movement, or public services through decisions that no single official fully understands.

Rights establish limits that efficiency cannot override. Due process requires notice, reasons, an opportunity to be heard, and access to an authority capable of correction. Accountability

requires identifiable institutions and persons who can be questioned and sanctioned. These protections cannot be converted into a generic assurance that a system performs well on average.

The rule of law also constrains those who retain human authority. Inalienable Leadership does not authorize arbitrary human command. Human decisions must remain limited by constitutional order, legal rights, institutional competence, and review. The choice is not machine rule or unrestricted human discretion. It is human authority exercised through legitimate institutions under law.

21.3 Human Dignity

Human beings cannot be reduced to data points, risk scores, productivity indicators, or optimization variables.

Data can reveal patterns relevant to health, safety, learning, work, and public policy. It can also flatten a person into what the institution has chosen to measure. A model may represent probability without understanding biography, relationship, aspiration, suffering, or moral standing. The danger is not only inaccurate classification. It is the institutional habit of treating the person as fully knowable through the classification.

The capability approach connects human development to substantive freedoms and the real opportunities people possess to live lives they have reason to value (Sen 1999; Nussbaum 2011). This perspective resists an account of technological progress measured only by aggregate output. A system that improves efficiency while narrowing agency, voice, or dignity cannot be judged human-centered solely because it performs well.

Dignity also requires that people are not retained as ceremonial humans whose only function is to approve machine decisions or absorb blame. Human participation must carry meaning, authority, and responsibility.

21.4 Cultural Plurality

Technological systems must not impose one automated worldview on all societies.

Data, categories, benchmarks, and definitions of success emerge from particular institutions and histories. Even apparently universal objectives such as efficiency, safety, fairness, merit, privacy, or autonomy may be interpreted differently across cultural and political traditions. Global deployment can therefore turn one local compromise into a silent civilizational standard.

Cultural plurality does not mean that every practice is immune from criticism. It means that technological governance must remain open to translation, disagreement, and legitimate difference. Cosmopolitan responsibility requires engagement across boundaries without assuming that one society possesses the complete moral vocabulary for all others (Appiah 2006).

Cultural Intelligence is therefore not an optional interpersonal skill. It is part of civilizational governance. Organizations and public institutions need local participation, contextual review,

linguistic accessibility, and the authority to adapt or reject systems that violate legitimate cultural and institutional conditions.

21.5 The Common Good

Technological progress must be judged by more than efficiency or profitability.

The common good concerns the conditions through which people can live together, participate in institutions, develop capabilities, trust one another, and sustain shared resources. It cannot be calculated simply by adding individual preferences. Nor can it be entrusted to a system trained to optimize the objectives supplied by those with the greatest power.

Ostrom's work showed that communities can govern shared resources through institutions that do not fit a simple choice between centralized command and private control (Ostrom 1990). The lesson is relevant to technological governance. Collective goods require rules, participation, monitoring, accountability, and adaptation. They are sustained through institutions, not through optimization alone.

RC — The Relational Commons gives this principle a FILE expression. It identifies the relational conditions that technological institutions must protect rather than treating them as by-products to be measured after deployment.

21.6 Intergenerational Responsibility

Human beings remain responsible for the long-term effects of technologies they create and authorize.

The consequences of artificial intelligence may extend beyond the time horizons of product cycles, executive mandates, electoral terms, and investment returns. Infrastructure choices can create dependency. Data practices can persist. Labor systems can reshape professions. Educational decisions can alter human capability. Military and security applications can normalize new forms of power. Environmental costs can be displaced across regions and generations.

Jonas argued that technological power creates an ethics of responsibility oriented toward the long-term conditions of human life (Jonas 1984). The principle does not require certainty about distant outcomes. It requires seriousness about irreversible risks and humility about the capacity to repair what has been changed.

Intergenerational responsibility also concerns human formation. A society that delegates judgment too extensively may weaken the very capacities needed to regain control. Preserving human authority therefore includes preserving education, institutional memory, practical expertise, democratic competence, and the ability to act without permanent machine dependence.

21.7 Final Civilizational Principle

The institutional implications converge on one principle:

> **Technology may help build civilization, but it cannot legitimately become civilization's final authority.**

This principle does not locate final authority in one leader, one corporation, one state, or one culture. It locates final responsibility in humanity through legitimate, plural, revisable, and accountable human institutions.

The point is not that human beings always decide wisely. History proves otherwise. The point is that humanity cannot escape responsibility for the institutions and technologies it creates. Transferring final authority to machines would not eliminate human failure. It would add a new failure: the surrender of the capacity and duty to decide what civilization should serve.

22. Limitations and Boundaries of the Paper

Inalienable Leadership is a conceptual and normative metatheory. The paper develops an argument about the relationship among artificial intelligence, administration, leadership, authority, responsibility, and civilization. It does not provide empirical validation of the metatheory, measure its effects, or demonstrate that organizations adopting its principles will achieve superior performance.

The paper does not attempt to resolve every issue in artificial-intelligence governance. Questions concerning technical safety, cybersecurity, data protection, model evaluation, environmental impact, military use, intellectual property, labor law, competition, surveillance, and international regulation require specialized analysis. The metatheory provides a higher-order principle, not a substitute for domain expertise.

Machine capabilities will continue to evolve. Some distinctions associated today with human and machine performance may change. The argument is therefore not built on the permanent technical incapacity of machines to communicate, reason, persuade, coordinate, create, or perform leadership functions. It is built on the claim that increased capability does not itself transfer legitimate final authority or absorb human responsibility.

Human beings are fallible. They may retain authority while acting selfishly, incompetently, violently, or irresponsibly. Human control is not automatically ethical control. Inalienable Leadership must therefore be read together with rights, law, democratic legitimacy, accountability, institutional checks, cultural plurality, and the complete FILE architecture. The metatheory protects human responsibility; it does not sanctify every human decision.

Meaningful human control can become symbolic. A person may appear in the workflow without possessing knowledge, time, independence, authority, or practical alternatives. Organizations may preserve formal approval while making disagreement professionally dangerous or technically impossible. The presence of a human reviewer is therefore insufficient evidence that the inalienability principle has been respected.

Cultural conceptions of leadership, authority, personhood, autonomy, responsibility, and the common good differ. The present formulation seeks compatibility with plurality, but its language reflects a particular conceptual synthesis. Application across societies will require translation, criticism, and institutional interpretation rather than mechanical export.

Civilization is necessarily a broad level of analysis. It allows the paper to connect management education, organizational governance, law, democracy, dignity, culture, the common good,

and future generations. The breadth also creates a risk of abstraction. The argument should not be used to bypass the concrete experiences of workers, citizens, students, communities, and people affected by automated decisions.

The originality audit remains bounded to the documented 11-language public search. It supports the conclusion that the identified phrase uses did not establish a prior named metatheory with the same organizing principle and architecture and that no prior metatheory of leadership specifically formulated for the age of artificial intelligence and robotics was identified. It cannot prove absolute global nonexistence across every language, archive, unpublished work, inaccessible source, private record, or deleted material.

Later scholarship may refine, narrow, criticize, test, or reject parts of Inalienable Leadership. Such disagreement would not be a failure of the concept. A metatheory concerning humanity's final responsibility should itself remain open to human judgment, contestation, and revision.

23. Conclusion: Leadership Was Inalienable All Along

Business administration was built for a world in which human beings performed most organizational analysis, coordination, control, and execution. Scientific management organized work. Administrative theory defined functions. Bureaucracy stabilized authority. Decision theory disciplined choice. Strategy directed resources. Business education professionalized the people expected to operate these systems.

Artificial intelligence is changing that world.

Routine administration can be automated. Analytical work can be accelerated. Coordination can be embedded in platforms. Recommendations can be generated at scale. Systems can monitor performance, allocate tasks, adapt communication, simulate scenarios, and perform functions historically associated with management and leadership.

This transformation does not make management irrelevant. Organizations still need purpose, coordination, institutions, resources, learning, and responsible execution. It does, however, weaken an old assumption: that the capacity to administer is sufficient to justify the right to lead.

The distinction developed throughout the paper is therefore decisive. Capability is not legitimacy. Prediction is not judgment. Causal influence is not moral agency. Delegation is not alienation. Automation does not absorb responsibility. A machine may participate in leadership without becoming humanity's final authority.

The leadership traditions reviewed in Sections 6 through 11 remain valuable. Trait and skills theories explain attributes and capabilities. Behavioral and situational approaches explain action and fit. Transactional, transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories explain exchange, change, identification, and direction. Relational, follower-centered, shared, and distributed theories explain leadership as a collective process. Ethical, responsible, servant, authentic, and human-centered theories place values and people closer to the center. Strategic, adaptive, complexity, systems, and institutional theories address uncertainty,

interdependence, and scale. Digital and human-machine leadership research explains how technology alters the process itself.

None of these traditions must be discarded. The unresolved question exists at a different level:

> **Who retains final authority and responsibility over purposes, institutions, and civilizational direction when machines increasingly participate in organizational and social decision-making?**

Inalienable Leadership answers that question.

FILE remains the core management theory and diagnostic framework. It identifies the five co-equal meta-intelligences required for responsible leadership and decision-making: Augmented Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Political Intelligence, and Adaptive Intelligence. The complete FILE architecture develops these intelligences through foundational and expanded capabilities, distinguishes the Extended Taxonomy and Not Selected register, and directs integration toward five emergent outcomes and RC — The Relational Commons.

The public FILE Corpus introduced the framework, recorded the first eight contributions, and developed the human-skills architecture (Mariani 2026a; Mariani 2026b; Mariani 2026c). The present paper formally records BASIC/RULES as the ninth contribution and Inalienable Leadership as the tenth contribution and final metatheoretical level integrating the complete system.

Within the documented English-language and multilingual public record, Inalienable Leadership is the first identified metatheory of leadership specifically formulated for the age of artificial intelligence and robotics.

Inalienable Leadership is not merely the concluding concept introduced by this paper. It is the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. It integrates the complete human-centered architecture of the FILE Odyssey under the principle that humanity may share work and intelligence with machines but cannot surrender its final authority and responsibility for the purposes, institutions, and direction of civilization.

The principle has educational consequences. If artificial intelligence can perform more of what management students have traditionally been trained to do, business education must place greater weight on judgment, responsibility, ethics, culture, power, adaptation, and the governance of artificial intelligence. MAIL integrates Management, AI, and Leadership. MLT proposes Management, Leadership, and Technology as an educational architecture for leaders of human-machine organizations.

The principle has organizational consequences. Decision rights must distinguish automation, bounded delegation, meaningful human review, and final human authorization. Responsibility must remain visible across action chains. Contestability must give affected people routes to challenge and correction. Reversibility and termination must remain possible. Boards and executives must treat artificial intelligence as a question of institutional purpose and legitimacy, not only technical performance.

The principle also has civilizational consequences. Democratic authority must remain accountable to people. Law and rights must constrain human and machine power. Human dignity must not be reduced to data. Cultural plurality must survive global technological systems. The common good must guide progress beyond profitability. Future generations must not inherit dependencies and risks created without responsible judgment.

Human authority can be shared, distributed, and institutionally constrained. It can be exercised through teams, communities, organizations, courts, democratic governments, and international institutions. Inalienability does not require heroic command or centralized rule. It requires that final authority and responsibility remain within the sphere of legitimate human agency.

The age of artificial intelligence may therefore clarify what administration had partly concealed. Leadership was never only the possession of superior information, analytical skill, control of process, or formal position. At its deepest level, leadership was the human responsibility to determine purposes, accept answerability, protect dignity, and carry the consequences of collective direction.

Artificial intelligence can help humanity perform that responsibility. It can widen knowledge, generate alternatives, expose patterns, translate communication, reduce routine burdens, and augment collective intelligence. These capabilities should be welcomed where they serve human purposes under legitimate governance.

They should not be mistaken for a transfer of authorship over civilization.

The FILE School of Thought: Humans + Machines, under human leadership.

The AI revolution will not eliminate the need for human leadership. It will reveal why leadership was inalienable all along.

Appendix A: Extended Leadership-Theory Register

The following table summarizes the principal external leadership traditions reviewed in the paper. It does not place Inalienable Leadership beside them as one competing substantive theory. The final column identifies the higher-order question addressed by Inalienable Leadership, the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics and the metatheoretical response integrating the complete FILE contribution system.

Theory or approach	Principal scholar or foundational source	Main contribution	Relevance to artificial intelligence	Remaining question concerning final human authority and responsibility	Relationship to the metatheoretical gap addressed by Inalienable Leadership
Trait leadership	Stogdill 1948	Identifies personal characteristics associated with leadership emergence and effectiveness	Machines can imitate confidence, consistency, knowledge, and persuasive presence	Do leader-like attributes confer legitimate authority or moral responsibility?	Explains perceived capability, not the nontransferability of final authority

Theory or approach	Principal scholar or foundational source	Main contribution	Relevance to artificial intelligence	Remaining question concerning final human authority and responsibility	Relationship to the metatheoretical gap addressed by Inalienable Leadership
Skills leadership	Katz 1955	Frames leadership through developable technical, human, and conceptual skills	Artificial intelligence can augment or exceed many analytical and technical skills	Does superior functional skill establish the right to determine collective purposes?	Raises the distinction between performance capability and legitimate authority
Behavioral leadership	Blake and Mouton 1964	Makes leadership observable through patterns of task and people orientation	Systems can monitor, prompt, and standardize leadership behaviors	Can programmed behavior carry answerability for consequences?	Shows that visible conduct does not settle moral agency
Contingency and situational leadership	Fiedler 1967; Hersey and Blanchard 1969	Connects effectiveness to context, follower conditions, and fit	Models can recommend styles and actions from situational data	Who defines the situation, objective, and acceptable adaptation?	Leaves the authority behind contextual optimization unresolved
Transactional leadership	Burns 1978; Bass 1985	Explains leadership through exchange, reward, compliance, and performance	Algorithms can allocate rewards, monitor performance, and enforce rules	Can efficient exchange become legitimate final leadership?	Reveals how administration can resemble leadership without inheriting its responsibility
Transformational leadership	Burns 1978; Bass 1985	Explains motivation, identity, change, and commitment beyond transaction	Artificial intelligence can personalize messages and support organizational change	Who owns the values and future toward which transformation is directed?	Shows the need for a higher-order account of purpose and responsibility
Charismatic leadership	House 1977	Explains influence through symbolic communication, confidence, and follower attribution	Synthetic agents may generate persuasive and emotionally resonant communication	Does attributed charisma authorize machine direction?	Separates influence from legitimate final authority
Visionary leadership	Bennis and Nanus 1985	Connects present action to a desired future	Systems can generate scenarios, narratives, and strategic visions	Who may select the future that an institution should pursue?	Makes the authority over purposes explicit
Relational and leader-member exchange leadership	Graen and Uhl-Bien 1995	Locates leadership in relationships, exchange quality, and mutual influence	Machines can mediate communication and participate in relational processes	Can an artificial participant bear reciprocal moral responsibility?	Protects the distinction between relational function and human answerability
Followership	Uhl-Bien et al. 2014	Recognizes followers as active participants in leadership processes	People may attribute leadership to systems and adapt behavior around their recommendations	When following becomes machine dependence, who remains responsible?	Addresses the risk that attribution can normalize surrendered authority
Shared and distributed leadership	Gronn 2002; Pearce and Conger 2003	Distributes leadership across people, roles, teams, and networks	Human-machine teams can distribute cognition and coordination	Can distributed leadership become distributed evasion?	Affirms shared human leadership while preserving attributable responsibility
Ethical leadership	Brown, Treviño, and Harrison 2005	Connects leader conduct, role modeling, and ethical standards	Systems can support consistency and detect some forms of misconduct	Who judges conflicts among values and accepts responsibility for ethical failure?	Requires a metatheoretical account of final moral authorship
Responsible leadership	Maak and Pless 2006	Extends leadership to stakeholders, relationships, legitimacy, and social responsibility	Artificial intelligence affects wider networks of workers, users, communities, and institutions	Who answers to affected stakeholders when action is distributed?	Connects institutional accountability to retained human authority
Servant leadership	Greenleaf 1977	Centers service, stewardship, growth, and the interests of others	Machines can support care-related tasks and personalize assistance	Can service behavior substitute for human moral standing and care?	Protects the human meaning of responsibility and relationship
Authentic leadership	Avolio and Gardner 2005	Emphasizes self-awareness, internalized values, transparency, and development	Synthetic communication can simulate coherence and personalization	What does authenticity mean without lived identity and moral agency?	Distinguishes convincing performance from human authorship
Strategic leadership	Boal and Hooijberg 2000	Connects leadership to strategic direction, organizational capacity, and long-term viability	Artificial intelligence expands forecasting, sensing, simulation, and resource allocation	Who determines the institution's purposes and acceptable trade-offs?	Locates final strategic authority within legitimate human institutions

Theory or approach	Principal scholar or foundational source	Main contribution	Relevance to artificial intelligence	Remaining question concerning final human authority and responsibility	Relationship to the metatheoretical gap addressed by Inalienable Leadership
Adaptive leadership	Heifetz 1994	Mobilizes people to confront difficult problems without technical solutions	Systems can support diagnosis but may frame adaptive conflicts as optimization problems	Who interprets loss, values, and responsibility when no technical answer exists?	Reinforces the irreducibility of judgment about ends
Complexity leadership	Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey 2007	Explains emergence, adaptation, and leadership across complex systems	Artificial intelligence can become an active node in adaptive networks	How is responsibility preserved when causation and action are distributed?	Provides the systems context but not the final principle of authority
Systems leadership	Senge 1990	Connects leadership to learning, interdependence, feedback, and whole-system understanding	Artificial intelligence strengthens modeling, sensing, and organizational learning	Who decides what the system should optimize and which effects are unacceptable?	Requires a higher-order boundary around system intelligence
Digital and e-leadership	Avolio, Kahai, and Dodge 2000	Examines leadership mediated through advanced information technology	Directly addresses technology's transformation of communication, structure, and influence	Does mediation change where legitimate final authority resides?	Establishes the technological condition but not the inalienability principle
Artificial and automated leadership	Wesche and Sonderegger 2019	Examines the automation of leadership functions	Systems may perform direction, monitoring, coordination, and motivational functions	Can functional leadership become legitimate final leadership?	Identifies the closest functional challenge and clarifies the metatheoretical gap
Human-centered AI and meaningful human control	Santoni de Sio and van den Hoven 2018; Shneiderman 2022	Protects human purposes, oversight, control, and accountable design	Provides principles for designing and governing advanced systems	What overarching principle integrates control, authority, responsibility, education, governance, and civilization?	Supplies essential governance foundations that Inalienable Leadership integrates within the FILE Odyssey

---

External Scholarly References

Abrams, Dominic, and Michael A. Hogg. "Metatheory: Lessons from Social Identity Research." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 8(2): 98-106. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0802_2. 2004.

Allana, Saleema, and Alexander Clark. "Applying Meta-Theory to Qualitative and Mixed-Methods Research: A Discussion of Critical Realism and Heart Failure Disease Management Interventions Research." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 17(1): 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918790042. 2018.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers.* New York: W. W. Norton. 2006.

Aurobindo, Sri. "Calcutta and Mofussil." *Karmayogin*, January 8. https://sri-aurobindo.co.in/workings/sa/02/0169_e.htm. 1910.

Autor, David H. "Why Are There Still So Many Jobs? The History and Future of Workplace Automation." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 29(3): 3-30. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3. 2015.

Avolio, Bruce J., and William L. Gardner. "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly* 16(3): 315-338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001. 2005.

Avolio, Bruce J., Surinder S. Kahai, and George E. Dodge. "E-Leadership: Implications for Theory, Research, and Practice." *The Leadership Quarterly* 11(4): 615-668. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00062-X. 2000.

Barnard, Chester I. *The Functions of the Executive.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 1938.

Bass, Bernard M. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations.* New York: Free Press. 1985.

Bennis, Warren G., and Burt Nanus. *Leaders: Strategies for Taking Charge.* New York: Harper and Row. 1985.

Blake, Robert R., and Jane S. Mouton. *The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations for Achieving Production Through People*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1964.

Boal, Kimberly B., and Robert Hooijberg. "Strategic Leadership Research: Moving On." *The Leadership Quarterly* 11(4): 515-549. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00057-6. 2000.

Bovens, Mark. "Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework." *European Law Journal* 13(4): 447-468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x. 2007.

Brown, Michael E., Linda K. Treviño, and David A. Harrison. "Ethical Leadership: A Social Learning Perspective for Construct Development and Testing." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 97(2): 117-134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002. 2005.

Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row. 1978.

Carson, Jay B., Paul E. Tesluk, and Jennifer A. Marrone. "Shared Leadership in Teams: An Investigation of Antecedent Conditions and Performance." *Academy of Management Journal* 50(5): 1217-1234. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.20159921. 2007.

Conger, Jay A., and Rabindra N. Kanungo. "Toward a Behavioral Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings." *Academy of Management Review* 12(4): 637-647. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4306715. 1987.

Cortellazzo, Laura, Elena Bruni, and Rita Zampieri. "The Role of Leadership in a Digitalized World: A Review." *Frontiers in Psychology* 10: 1938. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01938. 2019.

Datar, Srikant M., David A. Garvin, and Patrick G. Cullen. *Rethinking the MBA: Business Education at a Crossroads.* Boston: Harvard Business Press. https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=37295. 2010.

Denis, Jean-Louis, Ann Langley, and Viviane Sergi. "Leadership in the Plural." *Academy of Management Annals* 6(1): 211-283. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2012.667612. 2012.

DeRue, D. Scott, and Susan J. Ashford. "Who Will Lead and Who Will Follow? A Social Process of Leadership Identity Construction in Organizations." *Academy of Management Review* 35(4): 627-647. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.35.4.zok627. 2010.

Drucker, Peter F. *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

Elish, Madeleine Clare. "Moral Crumple Zones: Cautionary Tales in Human-Robot Interaction." *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society* 5: 40-60. https://doi.org/10.17351/ests2019.260. 2019.

Fairhurst, Gail T. *Discursive Leadership: In Conversation with Leadership Psychology*. Sage. 2007.

Faraj, Samer, Stella Pachidi, and Karla Sayegh. "Working and Organizing in the Age of the Learning Algorithm." *Information and Organization* 28(1): 62-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2018.02.005. 2018.

Fayol, Henri. *General and Industrial Management*. Translated by Constance Storrs. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, 1949. Originally published 1916.

Fiedler, Fred E. *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness.* New York: McGraw-Hill. 1967.

Follett, Mary Parker. *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*. Edited by Henry C. Metcalf and L. Urwick. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1942.

Glikson, Ella, and Anita Williams Woolley. "Human Trust in Artificial Intelligence: Review of Empirical Research." *Academy of Management Annals* 14(2): 627-660. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0057. 2020.

Goleman, Daniel. *Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ.* New York: Bantam Books. 1995.

Graen, George B., and Mary Uhl-Bien. "Relationship-Based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange Theory of Leadership over 25 Years." *The Leadership Quarterly* 6(2): 219-247. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5. 1995.

Greenleaf, Robert K. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness.* Paulist Press. 1977.

Gronn, Peter. "Distributed Leadership as a Unit of Analysis." *The Leadership Quarterly* 13(4): 423-451. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(02)00120-0. 2002.

Gupta, Vipin, Ian C. MacMillan, and Gita Surie. "Entrepreneurial Leadership: Developing and Measuring a Cross-Cultural Construct." *Journal of Business Venturing* 19(2): 241-260. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(03)00040-5. 2004.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy.* Translated by William Rehg. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1996.

Hambrick, Donald C., and Phyllis A. Mason. "Upper Echelons: The Organization as a Reflection of Its Top Managers." *Academy of Management Review* 9(2): 193-206. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628. 1984.

Heifetz, Ronald A. *Leadership Without Easy Answers.* Harvard University Press. 1994.

Hersey, Paul, and Kenneth H. Blanchard. "Life Cycle Theory of Leadership." *Training and Development Journal* 23(5): 26-34. 1969.

Höddinghaus, Miriam, Dominik Sondern, and Guido Hertel. "The Automation of Leadership Functions: Would People Trust Decision Algorithms?" *Computers in Human Behavior* 116: 106635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106635. 2021.

Hogg, Michael A. "A Social Identity Theory of Leadership." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 5(3): 184-200. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0503_1. 2001.

House, Robert J. "A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership." In *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*, edited by James G. Hunt and Lars L. Larson, 189-207. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press. 1977.

House, Robert J. "A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 16(3): 321-339. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391905. 1971.

Jarrahi, Mohammad Hossein. "Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Work: Human-AI Symbiosis in Organizational Decision Making." *Business Horizons* 61(4): 577-586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007. 2018.

Jarrahi, Mohammad Hossein, Gemma Newlands, Min Kyung Lee, Christine T. Wolf, Eliscia Kinder, and Will Sutherland. "Algorithmic Management in a Work Context." *Big Data & Society* 8(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517211020332. 2021.

Jonas, Hans. *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Translated by Hans Jonas with the collaboration of David Herr. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1984.

Judge, Timothy A., and Ronald F. Piccolo. "Transformational and Transactional Leadership: A Meta-Analytic Test of Their Relative Validity." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(5): 755-768. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755. 2004.

Judge, Timothy A., Joyce E. Bono, Remus Ilies, and Megan W. Gerhardt. "Personality and Leadership: A Qualitative and Quantitative Review." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87(4): 765-780. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765. 2002.

Katz, Robert L. "Skills of an Effective Administrator." *Harvard Business Review* 33(1): 33-42. 1955.

Kellogg, Katherine C., Melissa A. Valentine, and Angèle Christin. "Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control." *Academy of Management Annals* 14(1): 366-410. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174. 2020.

Kerr, Steven, and John M. Jermier. "Substitutes for Leadership: Their Meaning and Measurement." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 22(3): 375-403. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(78)90023-5. 1978.

Khurana, Rakesh. *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promise of Management as a Profession.* Princeton University Press. https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691145873/from-higher-aims-to-hired-hands. 2007.

Kotter, John P. *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management.* New York: Free Press. 1990.

Lord, Robert G., Roseanne J. Foti, and Christy L. De Vader. "A Test of Leadership Categorization Theory: Internal Structure, Information Processing, and Leadership Perceptions." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 34(3): 343-378. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(84)90043-6. 1984.

Maak, Thomas, and Nicola M. Pless. "Responsible Leadership in a Stakeholder Society: A Relational Perspective." *Journal of Business Ethics* 66: 99-115. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9047-z. 2006.

Matthias, Andreas. "The Responsibility Gap: Ascribing Responsibility for the Actions of Learning Automata." *Ethics and Information Technology* 6: 175-183. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-004-3422-1. 2004.

Mayo, Elton. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization.* New York: Macmillan. 1933.

Mintzberg, Henry. *Managers Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*. Berrett-Koehler. https://www.bkconnection.com/books/title/Managers-Not-MBAs. 2004.

Mintzberg, Henry. *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York: Harper & Row, 298 pages. https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Nature_of_Managerial_Work.html?id=GSBHAAAAMAAJ. 1973.

Morgeson, Frederick P., D. Scott DeRue, and Elizabeth P. Karam. "Leadership in Teams: A Functional Approach to Understanding Leadership Structures and Processes." *Journal of Management* 36(1): 5-39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309347376. 2010.

Mumford, Michael D., Stephen J. Zaccaro, Francis D. Harding, T. Owen Jacobs, and Edwin A. Fleishman. "Leadership Skills for a Changing World: Solving Complex Social Problems." *The Leadership Quarterly* 11(1): 11-35. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00041-7. 2000.

Mupangwa, Terence, and Sophie Chirongoma. "Single Women and Church Leadership: A Case Study of the Apostolic Faith Mission in Zimbabwe." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 171: 42-64. 2021.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. *Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework: Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile*. NIST AI 600-1. Gaithersburg, MD: National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.600-1. 2024.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. "AI Agent Standards Initiative." https://www.nist.gov/artificial-intelligence/ai-agent-standards-initiative. 2026.

Northouse, Peter G. *Leadership: Theory and Practice.* 9th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. 2021.

Nussbaum, Martha C. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 2011.

Orlikowski, Wanda J. "The Duality of Technology: Rethinking the Concept of Technology in Organizations." *Organization Science* 3(3): 398-427. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.3.3.398. 1992.

Ostrom, Elinor. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511807763. 1990.

Parasuraman, Raja, Thomas B. Sheridan, and Christopher D. Wickens. "A Model for Types and Levels of Human Interaction with Automation." *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part A: Systems and Humans* 30(3): 286-297. https://doi.org/10.1109/3468.844354. 2000.

Pearce, Craig L., and Jay A. Conger, eds. *Shared Leadership: Reframing the Hows and Whys of Leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 2003.

Pesqueira, María Inés, Ivonne Ramírez, Paola Ceruti, and José Domingo Salvo Rivera. "Qué y cómo del liderazgo irrenunciable del supervisor clínico." *De Familias y Terapias* 28(46): 29-45. https://doi.org/10.29260/DFYT.2019.46B. 2019.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Christina T. Fong. "The End of Business Schools? Less Success Than Meets the Eye." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 1(1): 78-95. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2002.7373679. 2002.

Pirson, Michael. *Humanistic Management: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-Being.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316675946. 2017.

Provan, Keith G., and Patrick Kenis. "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(2): 229-252. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum015. 2008.

Rahwan, Iyad, Manuel Cebrian, Nick Obradovich, Josh Bongard, Jean-François Bonnefon, Cynthia Breazeal, Jacob W. Crandall, Nicholas A. Christakis, Iain D. Couzin, Matthew O. Jackson, Nicholas R. Jennings, Ece Kamar, Isabel M. Kloumann, Hugo Larochelle, David Lazer, Richard McElreath, Alan Mislove, David C. Parkes, Alex Pentland, Margaret E. Roberts, Azim Shariff, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Michael Wellman. "Machine Behaviour." *Nature* 568: 477-486. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1138-y. 2019.

Raisch, Sebastian, and Sebastian Krakowski. "Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation-Augmentation Paradox." *Academy of Management Review* 46(1): 192-210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072. 2021.

Raji, Inioluwa Deborah, Andrew Smart, Rebecca N. White, Margaret Mitchell, Timnit Gebru, Ben Hutchinson, Jamila Smith-Loud, Daniel Theron, and Parker Barnes. "Closing the AI Accountability Gap: Defining an End-to-End Framework for Internal Algorithmic Auditing." *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 33-44. New York: ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372873. 2020.

Randel, Amy E., Benjamin M. Galvin, Lynn M. Shore, Karen H. Ehrhart, Beth G. Chung, Michelle A. Dean, and Uma Kedharnath. "Inclusive Leadership: Realizing Positive Outcomes Through Belongingness and Being Valued for Uniqueness." *Human Resource Management Review* 28(2): 190–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.07.002. 2018.

Salovey, Peter, and John D. Mayer. "Emotional Intelligence." *Imagination, Cognition and Personality* 9(3): 185-211. https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG. 1990.

Santoni de Sio, Filippo, and Jeroen van den Hoven. "Meaningful Human Control over Autonomous Systems: A Philosophical Account." *Frontiers in Robotics and AI* 5: 15. https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2018.00015. 2018.

Seeber, Isabella, Eva Bittner, Robert O. Briggs, Triparna de Vreede, Gert-Jan de Vreede, Aaron Elkins, Ronald Maier, Alexander B. Merz, Sarah Oeste-Reiß, Nils Randrup, Gerhard Schwabe, and Matthias Söllner. "Machines as Teammates: A Research Agenda on AI in Team Collaboration." *Information & Management* 57(2): 103174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2019.103174. 2020.

Selbst, Andrew D., danah boyd, Sorelle A. Friedler, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, and Janet Vertesi. "Fairness and Abstraction in Sociotechnical Systems." *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 59-68. New York: ACM. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598. 2019.

Selznick, Philip. *Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson. 1957.

Sen, Amartya. *Development as Freedom.* Knopf. https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/163152/development-as-freedom-by-amartya-sen/. 1999.

Senge, Peter M. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization.* New York: Doubleday. 1990.

Shamir, Boas, Robert J. House, and Michael B. Arthur. "The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory." *Organization Science* 4(4): 577-594. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.4.4.577. 1993.

Shneiderman, Ben. *Human-Centered AI.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192845290.001.0001. 2022.

Shore, Lynn M., Amy E. Randel, Beth G. Chung, Michelle A. Dean, Karen Holcombe Ehrhart, and Gangaram Singh. "Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research." *Journal of Management* 37(4): 1262-1289. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310385943. 2011.

Shrestha, Yash Raj, Shiko M. Ben-Menahem, and Georg von Krogh. "Organizational Decision-Making Structures in the Age of Artificial Intelligence." *California Management Review* 61(4): 66-83. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257. 2019.

Simon, Herbert A. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. New York: Macmillan, 1947.

Skitka, Linda J., Kathleen L. Mosier, and Mark Burdick. "Does Automation Bias Decision-Making?" *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 51(5): 991-1006. https://doi.org/10.1006/ijhc.1999.0252. 1999.

Stogdill, R. M. “Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature.” *Journal of Psychology* 25(1): 35-71. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362. 1948.

Syno Aurelius. *Declaration of Independence.* https://www.synoaurelius.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Syno-Aurelius-Declaration-of-Independence.pdf. 2019.

Taylor, F. W. *The Principles of Scientific Management.* Harper & Brothers. 1911.

Tsang, Eric W. K. “Theory versus Non-theory-Based Explanation.” In *Explaining Management Phenomena: A Philosophical Treatise*, 146-166. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009323109.006. 2022.

Uhl-Bien, Mary. “Relational Leadership Theory: Exploring the Social Processes of Leadership and Organizing.” *The Leadership Quarterly* 17(6): 654-676. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.007. 2006.

Uhl-Bien, Mary, Russ Marion, and Bill McKelvey. “Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting Leadership from the Industrial Age to the Knowledge Era.” *The Leadership Quarterly* 18(4): 298-318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002. 2007.

Uhl-Bien, Mary, Ronald E. Riggio, Kevin B. Lowe, and Melissa K. Carsten. “Followership Theory: A Review and Research Agenda.” *The Leadership Quarterly* 25(1): 83-104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.007. 2014.

van Knippenberg, Daan, and Sim B. Sitkin. “A Critical Assessment of Charismatic-Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board?” *Academy of Management Annals* 7(1): 1-60. https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2013.759433. 2013.

Vroom, Victor H., and Philip W. Yetton. *Leadership and Decision-Making.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. 1973.

Walumbwa, Fred O., Bruce J. Avolio, William L. Gardner, Tara S. Wernsing, and Suzanne J. Peterson. “Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure.” *Journal of Management* 34(1): 89-126. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913. 2008.

Wang, Lei, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, Zhiyuan Chen, Jiakai Tang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, Wayne Xin Zhao, Zhewei Wei, and Jirong Wen. “A Survey on Large Language Model Based Autonomous Agents.” *Frontiers of Computer Science* 18: 186345. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11704-024-40231-1. 2024.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology.* Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press. Original work published 1922. 1978.

Weizenbaum, Joseph. *Computer Power and Human Reason: From Judgment to Calculation.* San Francisco: W. H. Freeman. https://dl.acm.org/doi/book/10.5555/540249. 1976.

Wesche, Jenny S., and Andreas Sonderegger. “When Computers Take the Lead: The Automation of Leadership.” *Computers in Human Behavior* 101: 197-209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.07.027. 2019.

Williams, Trenton A., Daniel A. Gruber, Kathleen M. Sutcliffe, Dean A. Shepherd, and Eric Y. Zhao. "Organizational Response to Adversity: Fusing Crisis Management and Resilience Research Streams." *Academy of Management Annals* 11(2): 733-769. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0134. 2017.

Yukl, Gary. *Leadership in Organizations.* 8th ed. Boston: Pearson. 2013.

Zaleznik, Abraham. "Managers and Leaders: Are They Different?" *Harvard Business Review* 55(3): 67-78. 1977.

FILE Corpus References

Mariani, Guillaume. *Leadership in the Age of AI: Introducing FILE — The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution*. Zenodo, 2026a. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20809510. Also available on Figshare, https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.32770215, and Knowledge Commons Works, https://doi.org/10.17613/6y8vp-7m357.

Mariani, Guillaume. *Management, Leadership, and Governance in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: The Eight Contributions of the FILE Odyssey*. Zenodo, 2026b. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21240338. Also available on Figshare, https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.32924927, and Knowledge Commons Works, https://doi.org/10.17613/3dvgs-zkn15, and SSRN, https://ssrn.com/abstract=7071979.

Mariani, Guillaume. *The Most Important Human Skills for the Age of AI and the Future of Work: FILE — The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution*. Zenodo, 2026c. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21455246. Also available on Figshare, https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.33039545, and Knowledge Commons Works, https://doi.org/10.17613/325c8-e2r41.

Mariani, Guillaume. *FILE⁷ and AI Governance: Designing Human-Centered, Empowering, and Accountable Intelligent Systems*. guillaumemariani.com, 2026d. https://guillaumemariani.com/file%E2%81%B7-and-ai-governance-designing-human-centered-empowering-and-accountable-intelligent-systems/.

Mariani, Guillaume. *The FILE⁷ Organizational Operating System: Structures, Rituals, and Governance for Empowered Ecosystems*. guillaumemariani.com, 2026e. https://guillaumemariani.com/the-file%E2%81%B7-organizational-operating-system-structures-rituals-and-governance-for-empowered-ecosystems/.

Mariani, Guillaume. *From MBA to MLT: Reimagining Management, Leadership, and Technology Education in the Age of AI*. guillaumemariani.com, 2026f. https://guillaumemariani.com/from-mba-to-mlt-reimagining-management-leadership-and-technology-education-in-the-age-of-ai/.

Mariani, Guillaume. *FILE vs. Major Leadership Theories*. guillaumemariani.com, 2026g. https://guillaumemariani.com/file-vs-major-leadership-theories/.

Mariani, Guillaume. *FILE vs. Major Management Frameworks*. guillaumemariani.com, 2026h. https://guillaumemariani.com/file-vs-major-management-frameworks/.

Mariani, Guillaume. *FILE vs. Major Leadership Theories (V2)*. guillaumemariani.com, 2026i. https://guillaumemariani.com/file-vs-major-leadership-theories-v2/.

AI Use Disclosure

Generative AI tools were used as assistive technologies for organization, drafting support, critical review, and language refinement. The author retained full responsibility for the theory, argument, interpretation, claims, references, and final text. No AI system is listed as an author or cited as an author.

About the Author

Guillaume Mariani is a French management scholar, entrepreneur, executive, and educator, and the author and creator of Inalienable Leadership and FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution — a management theory and diagnostic framework for responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence — and of ten original contributions to management, leadership, and the social sciences: a human-centered framework (FILE); a human-centered theory (FILE, FILE^3, FILE^5, FILE^7, and the 7E Cascade); a human-centered vision (RC — the Relational Commons); a human-centered education (MAIL — Management, AI, and Leadership, a curriculum supporting proposed MLT — Management, Leadership, and Technology — degrees as alternatives to the traditional BBA and MBA); a human-centered methodology (HACK — Human-AI Co-created Knowledge); a human-centered judgment model (LENS — Leadership, Ethics, Nondelegation, and Sense); a human-centered philosophy (Human Irreducibility); a human-centered AI governance (the Five Immutable Laws of AI and Robotics: HTTPS — Humanity, Truth, Transparency, Protection, and Security); a human-centered public policy (BASIC — Basic Income, AI Access, Skills, Inclusion, and Care, and its French equivalent, RULES — Revenu Universel, Lutte contre la pauvreté et les inégalités, Éducation et accès à l'IA et Solidarité); and a human-centered civilization (Inalienable Leadership — the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics).

The FILE Odyssey is an ongoing research program and will be developed further in subsequent publications.