

AI AND THE NATURE OF ORGANIZATIONS

How AI Is Ending the Modern Organizational Structure

KRISH VASUDEVAN

Founder, TERAXYS

TERAXYS • SEPTEMBER 2026

© 2026 TERAXYS HOLDINGS LLC. All rights reserved.

I. The Return Hurdle

Artificial intelligence requires large and continuing commitments of capital, compute, infrastructure and physical resources. At the firm level, those costs eventually must be matched by sufficient increases in revenue, productivity or both. The optimization achieved by layering AI onto legacy organizational structures is unlikely to offset that burden, and it leaves largely unexplored the economic opportunities available through fundamental organizational redesign. If labor, managerial and coordination structures remain broadly unchanged, the firm carries the cost of the new machine layer alongside much of the existing cost base meant to be transformed. Therefore, redesign must address the organization itself: the number of layers, the division of functions, the positioning of human judgment and the coordination architecture when machine cognition can absorb a growing share of analysis and execution.

Revenue and the Economics of AI

The revenue case rests on the expectation that greater machine capability will create new products, expand existing markets and raise the output that firms can generate through the existing organizational structure. Some of that value may appear directly through higher sales, faster product development, broader service capacity or entry into activities that were previously uneconomic. The required return, however, must be measured against a cost structure that is also rising. Firms must absorb not only model access and compute expenditure, but the capital and physical-resource costs embedded in sustaining increasingly capable and powerful systems. Further, these systems are also demonstrating shorter technological half-lives and require significant ongoing reinvestment. The economic hurdle is therefore higher than demonstrating that AI improves a task or reduces the cost of an existing process. Deployment must generate enough incremental revenue and productivity to cover the machine layer, compensate for its supporting resource burden and earn an adequate return on the new capital committed to it.

II. Why the Corporate Pyramid must Contract

Across much of the modern economy, a significant share of organizational structure and cost arises from the need to divide complex cognitive work among people and then reconnect the resulting output through process, management and review. This structure supports activities as varied as finance, law, medicine, consulting, technology, administration and other knowledge-intensive services. Its economic purpose is to compensate for limited human bandwidth: no individual can continuously hold the full context, perform every analysis or coordinate every dependency required by a large institution. As machine systems assume more of that cognitive load across multiple stages of work, the requirement for some intermediate roles, handoffs and supervisory layers declines with it. The productivity effect therefore extends beyond faster task completion. It changes the amount of organizational structure required to produce the same—or greater—economic output. The current organizational structure globally must undergo the same changes that the manufacturing industry did with the rise of automation in the 70s. An argument that machines could coexist with human employees while leaving staffing levels and organizational structures substantially intact is as fallacious now as it was then.

Human Authority at the Point of Consequence

The modern corporate pyramid developed around the following assumptions: Human cognition is finite, information is fragmented and large organizations require structures that divide responsibility while at once maintaining enough coordination to act coherently. Machine cognition weakens part of that economic foundation by allowing broader context, faster synthesis and more dynamic coordination across activities that previously required multiple organizational layers. The remaining human role becomes concentrated in functions that are harder to compress or even replicate such as setting core objectives, framing consequential problems, exercising judgment under uncertainty and authorizing decisions with material multi-order effects. A conventional human-in-the-loop model becomes inadequate when the volume and speed of machine-generated judgment exceed the capacity of a person to reconstruct the underlying reasoning in real time. The resulting organization therefore requires both fewer intermediate layers and a different control architecture, with machine-speed verification supporting human judgment at defined points of consequence.

Structural Endogeneity

As AI cognition absorbs more of the informational and analytical burden previously carried by the organization, the required structure should contract with it. Conceptually, the organizational requirement can be expressed as:

$$S = f(H, I, C)$$

where S is the required structure for operation, H represents the organization's dependence on finite human cognitive bandwidth, I the fragmentation of information and C the cost of coordination. AI cognition reduces each constraint by allowing a larger share of context, analysis and coordination to remain within a continuous operating system rather than being divided across separate organizational units. That in turn changes the remaining human roles to those involving judgment, authority and relationships required by the undertaking.

III. The Objective-Oriented Firm

The resulting structure is organized less around permanent departments and more around specific objectives. Each undertaking draws only the people whose judgment, authority, relationships or physical capabilities are necessary to achieve it, together with the technological capacity and resources required for execution. These configurations can form, contract or dissolve as objectives change rather than remaining embedded in a fixed and expensive hierarchy. Organizational structure therefore becomes endogenous to the undertaking itself: its size, composition and duration are determined by what must exist between an objective and its intended outcome, rather than by the legacy architecture of the firm.

The Human Core

The result is a much smaller human core operating against a powerful technological base. Human participation becomes concentrated where the undertaking requires authority, accountability, legitimacy, relationships or judgment that cannot or should not be transferred. Even strategy and senior management are not necessarily exempt from this compression. Advanced systems can increasingly construct strategic

alternatives, test assumptions, allocate resources, identify contradictions in declared objectives and challenge whether an undertaking should exist at all. The role of the executive therefore shifts from being the principal generator of strategy toward governing, contesting and authorizing a wider AI-supported field of operations. Productive reach is consequently no longer closely tied to headcount or managerial depth. A relatively small group may command analytical, strategic and execution capacity previously associated with organizations several orders of magnitude larger, provided that the institutional judgments are controlled and the organization maintains objective authority.

The Redesign Loop

Greater AI adoption increases demand for capital and the physical resources required to sustain technological velocity, raising the return required from each additional deployment. That higher productivity hurdle impacts organizational form directly. Activities, roles and structures must be reconsidered according to whether they remain necessary to achieve the underlying objective. As machine capability, resource costs and objectives change, an undertaking can therefore be reconstituted around a different combination of people, machine capacity and physical resources. Successful redesign reduces the organizational burden required to generate economic value and can make further AI deployment viable; additional deployment then places new claims on the resource system and raises the hurdle again. The firm consequently evolves with the technological system: its structure is repeatedly determined by the shortest viable configuration between an objective and the outcome sought, rather than inherited legacy structures.

IV. Governing a Fluid Institution

A more fluid organization still requires a coherent institutional frame. Permanent departments and managerial hierarchies have historically carried organizational purpose, a shared conception of activity and continuity as projects changed. Once that structure is substantially reduced, those functions must be recreated in another form. An objective-oriented institution must retain a persistent understanding of its purpose, how separate undertakings relate to it, which activities belong within the institution and when the institution itself should be reconsidered. As AI capability expands, even parts of strategy and organizational framing can become dynamic rather than periodically determined by a small executive group. AI systems may increasingly challenge, refine and translate institutional purpose, but authority to determine the purposes an institution may pursue remains a human and governance responsibility. Legal compliance, fiduciary responsibility and accountability for organizational action nevertheless remain human obligations, even where much of the underlying analysis, coordination and execution is AI-mediated. The remaining problem is therefore to maintain a coherent conception of the institution while allowing its structure, undertakings and methods to change continuously around the objectives it chooses to pursue.

Objective-Driven Productivity

The evolved architecture also changes what a firm can be. If a hundred people can eventually direct productive capacity once associated with a hundred thousand, organizational scale becomes increasingly detached from headcount, and the range of economically feasible undertakings expands rapidly. A small institution could originate, build and operate activities that previously required separate companies, large functional staffs or extensive managerial hierarchies, reconstituting itself as

objectives and opportunities change. The central problem becomes coordinating an institution whose economic reach can outstrip the human organizational structure. The next generation of firms will therefore require an operating architecture capable of translating authorized objectives into undertakings, allocating the resources required and preserving control over the judgments through which that capacity is directed. AI may, paradoxically, be necessary to monitor and continuously adjust that architecture.