EPISODE 8 · THE SUPERINTELLIGENT LEADER

Leadership Gate 8 · Constitution

> **Reference to Series 1: WP 7 · The Superintelligent Organization** — membership instead of control after Yamakawa and Taniguchi, and the de facto constitution following Selznick (1957). The evidence, with references, is there. This episode converts it to the leader and closes the path.

For personnel data and third-party names the rule still holds: the anonymized version goes into the AI system, roles instead of names.

ABSTRACT

The last gate. It looks for what has survived every restructuring of the last five years — the de facto constitution, written nowhere and governing more strongly than any mission statement. Added to that is the second finding from WP 7: membership is structurally stronger than control. And at the end stands the question that hung over the whole path: how an outsider recognizes that this organization has stayed capable of judgement. Gate 8 opens when at least one surviving rule you would not agree to today is explicitly put to decision.

Suggested citation: Huesch, G. (2026). The Superintelligent Leader. Series 2 · The Superintelligent Leader, Episode 8. Working Paper Series 2026, Global Leadership Consultancy.

THE GATE

The lock	What was never decided governs most strongly
The key	A constitution list, a succession test
It opens when	at least one surviving rule you would not agree to today is explicitly put to decision

PART 1 · THE FINDING

WHERE IT COMES FROM

WP 7 · The Superintelligent Organization, Series 1 — the closing paper of the first series, and thus the counterpart to this final episode. Two findings from it carry this gate: the de facto constitution following Selznick (1957), and the sentence by Yamakawa and Taniguchi that ethics is architecture and not a knob — from which it follows that membership is structurally stronger than control.

Added to that, **WP 0 · The Second Leap**, for the floor plan of the old factory and the finding that AGI amplifies organizational maturity, including immaturity. The two papers thereby also bracket Series 2: WP 0 stood over Gate 5, WP 7 stands over this gate.

All evidence stands with references in Series 1. This episode introduces none.

THE FLOOR PLAN THAT SURVIVED EVERY CONVERSION

Series 1 begins with a floor plan, and Series 2 ends with one. That is not a device — it is the same object, seen once from outside and once from inside.

In the old factory the floor plan lay around the central shaft. When the shaft disappeared, the floor plan stayed. Thirty years. Nobody had decided it, nobody defended it, and nobody would have given an answer to the question of why the machines stand like that other than: they stand like that.

The floor plan is what survives every conversion — and that is why it is the only thing that really governs. A mission statement does not govern. A strategy governs for three years. The floor plan governs until somebody notices it.

WP 7 calls this the de facto constitution, following Selznick (1957): not the document, but what has proved untouchable across all restructurings. In almost every operation nobody knows that list. It decides more than any strategy paper, and it has never been put to a vote.

ETHICS IS ARCHITECTURE, NOT A KNOB

The second finding from WP 7 comes from Hiroshi Yamakawa and Tadahiro Taniguchi, and it is the reason this episode does not end at posture.

Ethics from outside is a penalty term with a weight. You add it to the objective, you give it a factor, and the factor can be changed. **If the weight goes to zero, the ethics has disappeared** — not been

violated, but gone, and without anything breaking in the process. That is why ethics as an appendix does not hold, in no system, not in a human one either.

Whoever instead co-constitutes an organization's shared variable is contained in everybody else's objective. Not as an additional term, but as part of the quantity all of them optimize.

Membership is structurally the stronger position than control. That is the sentence Series 1 arrives at, and for a leader it means something uncomfortable: control has to be expended — every day, in every meeting, with every follow-up question. Membership carries on working when nobody is looking. Whoever trades control for membership does not give up power. He stops expending it constantly.

THREE RULES THAT SURVIVED THREE REORGANIZATIONS

An area is recut for the third time in five years. New responsibilities, new reporting lines, new leadership twice.

After every cut, the following still holds:

- Nothing is decided on a Friday.
- Sales is not criticized.
- What the founder said on a subject is not reopened.

None of these three rules is written anywhere. All three survived three reorganizations. That is the constitution of this area, and nobody decided it.

And each of the three once had a good reason. Fridays were not decision days because ten years ago the figures only arrived on Mondays. Sales was not criticized because in an existential phase it carried the house. Founder topics stayed shut because the founder was right at the time.

The reasons are gone. The rules are there. That is exactly what makes them a constitution and not a policy: a policy gets justified, a constitution simply holds.

NOT THE CLEVEREST PERSON IN THE ROOM

And with that, the title this episode and this series carry.

The superintelligent leader is not the cleverest person in the room. He is the one whose organization stays capable of judgement without him.

That is not a confession of humility but a definition with a checkpoint. It can be established from outside, it cannot be claimed for oneself, and it has a price: whoever reaches it is less often the

one who takes the decision. Gate 1 showed that price in numbers, and whoever has come this far has paid it.

The path does not end at a better person. That is the point where Series 2 points back at Series 1: the answer to a systemic problem is not a better human being. Series 1 expressly refused to point at the person in its first paper, because that is exactly the widespread misdiagnosis.

And the AGI everything is heading towards does not weaken that sentence but sharpens it. WP 0 shows: **it amplifies what is there.** An organization capable of judgement becomes faster at judgement through AI. One that depends on one head becomes faster at depending — with better arguments and higher confidence. What a leader builds now decides what gets amplified.

WHAT THE LEADER RECOGNIZES HERE

1 · Membership is structurally stronger than control. Whoever co-constitutes the shared variable is contained in everybody else's objective. Control has to be expended; membership carries on working when nobody is looking.

2 · The constitution is not a document. It is what every restructuring has survived. Whoever does not know it leads against it — sometimes for years, always unsuccessfully, and always with the explanation that it is a question of culture.

3 · The path does not end at a better person. The superintelligent leader is recognizable in his organization, not in himself. And because AI amplifies what is there, the question is not whether one is ready, but what it will get hold of.

PART 2 · THE WORK

THE OBSERVATION TASK

One week, archaeology.

Take the last five years of your area — reorganizations, changes of leadership, changes of strategy, changes of ownership — and look for what each of these changes **survived unchanged**. Rules, habits, taboo zones.

That is harder than it sounds, because you are looking for something you carry yourself. Two auxiliary questions that reliably expose something:

- Which sentence has nobody spoken in the last five years, although everybody thinks it?
- Which decision is never taken here on a Friday, never in the first quarter, never without a particular person — and why not, actually?

And then the part that carries the episode: ask the longest-serving person in your area: "What has always been like this here?"

Take notes without objecting. Not even when you hear something you consider outdated or wrong. **That answer is your most important material of the whole path, and it does not come from your own perception** — you have been inside too long to have it.

THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK

Monday, one thing. One rule, explicitly put to decision.

Take from your constitution list the one rule you **would not agree to today if it were proposed to you for the first time** — and put it explicitly to decision.

Three steps, in this order:

1. **Name it.** Verbatim, as it holds, not as it was meant.
2. **Say that it was never decided.** That is the actual act — not the abolition, but the statement that something holds here that nobody decided.
3. **Set a date** on which it is decided or abolished.

You may also decide to keep it. That is not a retreat and not a lesser outcome. The difference is that it is then decided, has an author and carries a date — and can therefore be reopened next time. An undecided rule cannot be changed, because it cannot be grasped.

Expect some disquiet. Speaking a constitutional rule aloud is the only operation in this series that does something to the room immediately.

THE PROMPTS

Prompt 8.1 · The de facto constitution

``` Below I list what was restructured in my area in the last five years: reorganizations, changes of leadership, changes of strategy, changes of ownership — with the year and what was changed in each case.

Work out what each of these changes survived: 1. Which rule, which habit, which taboo zone remained unchanged across all versions? 2. Which of them is written down somewhere — and which is not? 3. Which of these surviving rules would I reject if it were proposed to me today for the first time?

The technical term for point 1 is the de facto constitution: not the mission statement, but what has proved untouchable.

Format: table rule | surviving since | written yes/no | would I agree today. Enter only what follows from my list.

The restructurings: [insert here] ```

**Prompt 8.2 · The succession test**

This is the last prompt of this series, and it asks the question Gate 1 began with — only from the other side.

``` Below I describe my role: what I am responsible for, which decisions rest with me, what I know that is not documented, and which external relationships hang on me.

Write the induction note for my successor — but not as a handover list, as a diagnosis: 1. What could this person not do in week one, although it lies within their responsibility? And why not? 2. Which decision would they take differently because they do not know a backstory — and where would that backstory have to be written for that not to happen? 3. Which of these dependencies is a legitimate part of the role and which a fault in the organization? Separate the two explicitly.

At the end, one sentence: how would an outsider recognize, after three months, that the organization has stayed capable of judgement?

Invent nothing I have not described.

My role: [insert here] ```

**Point 3 is the open account from Gate 1.** There the dependency was counted without asking how much of it belongs to a role. Here it gets separated: a personnel decision one level down, a

commitment made externally, a departure from a rule you set yourself — that is the role. Everything that hangs on something being written nowhere is a fault in the organization. The second list is the one you take with you.

# PART 3 · ABOUT GERALD HUESCH

**Anyone claiming that an organization must stay capable of judgement without its leader has to be measured against that claim himself.**

**Systems shape behaviour.** Through the selection of the right instruments, mechanics and leadership codes — derived from values and leadership guidelines — the behaviour of everyone involved is synchronized and aligned. Not through motivation, but through a system that produces the right behaviour when applied.

Sales has Salesforce. Finance has SAP. Leadership has LEAD21.

**About the author.** Gerald Huesch is the creator of the leadership operating system category – "one of the most professional and creative minds in the domain of leadership and difficult change projects" (Boston Business School). With LEAD21 he built the first operating system for leadership – 21 evidence-based methods, the comprehensive solution and the missing link for complete transformation, extreme growth and high-volume post-merger integration: a unique leadership system for human coordination at scale, in which alignment and culture emerge as a by-product. He has trained more than 30,000 executives in over 30 countries (NASA, Rolls-Royce, Airbus, Omnicom and others) and delivers executive leadership training, leadership development and executive mentoring for executives in Germany, the Americas, Asia Pacific and the UAE. Participants from 300+ companies report +87% clarity, +58% efficiency, +50% performance, +46% alignment and −50% negative stress after LEAD21 (participant-reported); a one-year study with 567 leaders (Prof. Beate Hanson & Prof. Mohit Bhandari, McMaster University) showed improvement in 8 of 9 climate dimensions. Dr. Charles Pellerin (NASA) on LEAD21: "Unique in the world, and a capability that nobody else has." **gerald-huesch.com/about-en**

# PART 4 · THE GATE AND THE PATH

## THE CHECKPOINT — GATE 8 OPENS WHEN

**The de facto constitution exists as a list** — and at least one surviving rule you would not agree to today is explicitly put to decision.

Explicitly means: named, with the note that it was never decided, and with a date. Not: abolished. Abolition is a possible outcome, not the criterion.

**And if you find none you would not agree to?** Then check one thing: did you ask the longest-serving person, or did you make the list alone? A constitution list drawn up alone reliably contains only the rules one has already noticed — and those are by definition not the effective ones.

## STATUS OF THE GATES

| GATE | TITLE | YOUR KEY | STATUS |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The Sole Decider | Dependency list, 3 decision frames | passed |
| 2 | The Toolbox | Inventory of the last three years | passed |
| 3 | Why Good Methods Evaporate | Fallback path, one mandatory question | passed |
| 4 | The Bottleneck Is Not Information | Checking budget, extension, abstention | passed |
| 5 | What an Operating System Must Do | Assessment of the four functions | passed |
| 6 | LEAD21 — and What Is Still Missing | Gap map, requirements specification | passed |
| 7 | The Sentient Organization | Codebook, three target bands | passed |
| **▶ 8** | **The Superintelligent Leader** | **Constitution list, succession test** | **you are here** |

## WHAT YOU HAVE IN HAND

Eight gates, eight documents, eight changes in an operation. They rest with you, scattered across your files — and that is intended. This series built no portal and no account.

| | YOUR DOCUMENT |
|---|---|
| **Gate 1** | Dependency list, 20 decisions in four classes |
| **Gate 2** | Inventory of the last three years, with reference column |
| **Gate 3** | Fallback path, plus one mandatory question that stood for twelve weeks |
| **Gate 4** | Checking budget, extension lines, reasoned abstentions |
| **Gate 5** | Assessment of the four functions on your own calendar |
| **Gate 6** | Gap map, one metric, one requirements specification |
| **Gate 7** | Codebook with five terms, three target bands |
| **Gate 8** | Constitution list, succession test |

That is more than most transformation programmes leave behind, and it is in your handwriting.

## HOW AN OUTSIDER RECOGNIZES IT

The question that hung over the whole path deserves an answer that does not depend on your assessment. Four observations, all verifiable from outside:

1. **A decision is taken while you are unreachable** — and nobody apologizes for it.
2. **Somebody contradicts you in a meeting by referring to a definition**, not with an opinion.
3. **A submission from another specialist area is judged by a non-specialist**, not waved through.
4. **A rule that has existed for years is cited with a date and an author** — because by now it has been decided.

None of these four can be claimed. All four can be seen.

## HOW IT CONTINUES

**Series 3 · The Superintelligent Leadership System** shows the individual methods — one episode per instrument, with procedure, metric and the evidenced effect, each with its method of measurement. Whoever wants to know how an instrument works will find it there.

And if you want to bring together what stayed scattered here: that happens in the **7×7 — seven instruments over seven weeks, virtual, or as a three-day live format.** There all three series converge. Whoever comes from Series 2 brings eight of their own documents and does not need the first week to find out where they stand.

Whoever walked the eight gates alone has more from it than from any webinar. That was the purpose.

## OPEN QUESTIONS FROM THIS EPISODE

- The de facto constitution is a reconstruction, not a survey. It is as good as the honesty of the people you asked, and you are the person people answer least honestly.
- That membership is structurally stronger than control is a formal argument from AGI research. **For human organizations it is not evidenced.** WP 7 formulates it as a falsifiable prediction, and this episode adopts it as an argument, not as a finding.
- The four external observations above are proposals for a checkpoint, not validated indicators. They have the merit of being observable — they do not have the merit of being tested.
- Whether eight gates in this order are the most effective path is open. The order follows a mechanic — each gate needs the key of the previous one — and not a measurement.

## REFERENCES

**Series 1, Working Paper Series 2026** WP 7 · The Superintelligent Organization. Ethics as architecture and not as a knob; membership against control; the de facto constitution. WP 0 · The Second Leap. AGI amplifies organizational maturity including immaturity; the floor plan of the old factory.

**Named in this episode** Yamakawa, H. & Taniguchi, T. (Kyoto University; Intelligence Symbiosis / AI Alignment Network): AGI-26, conference poster. The two sentences on ethics as architecture and on membership appear there; they are reproduced with references in WP 7. Selznick, P. (1957): *Leadership in Administration.* Origin of the concept of the de facto constitution, introduced in WP 7.

All further primary sources used in WP 7 and WP 0 from the 19th Conference on Artificial General Intelligence (AGI-26), San Francisco, 27–30 July 2026, are identified there with volume and page numbers.