APPLIED NEUROSCIENCE ESSAY

The Biological Edge

Why the quality of hybrid intelligence depends on the state of the human nervous system arriving at the interface - and what leaders need to protect.

Etienne van der Walt, MD

Neurologist | Living Systems Thinker | Founder, Neurozone | Author of 'To Emerge'

1 October 2026

A companion piece to the framework essay Hybrid Intelligence in Organisations.

The Other Intelligence

The conversation about artificial intelligence is overwhelmingly a conversation about AI: what the technology can do, how quickly its capabilities are growing, which tasks it can perform and which processes it can automate. Far less attention is paid to the other intelligence in the emerging hybrid system. Biological intelligence. Us.

In the framework essay *Hybrid Intelligence in Organisations*, I described the architecture that is already forming in organisations. Agents automate the process layer below. Companions work alongside us as thinking partners. And humans transcend continuously above each newly automated layer, carrying with them everything that is irreducibly human. That essay asked what the transcended human layer requires in order to remain capable, coherent and wise.

This essay goes one level deeper. It asks what the human being actually brings to that architecture - biologically - and what must be optimised in the brain and body for the hybrid system to work. The answer is not a single cognitive trick that AI cannot perform. It is a set of biological conditions, and they can be cultivated, protected and measured.

> *The quality of hybrid intelligence does not depend only on the sophistication of the AI model. It depends on the state of the human nervous system arriving at the interface.*

Where the Two Intelligences Meet

Describing AI as a tool is no longer adequate. A calculator is a tool. A spreadsheet is a tool. Contemporary AI participates in the cognitive process itself. We converse with it to explore, challenge, deliberate and refine. And we use its generative and increasingly agentic capabilities to produce analyses, code, documents, designs and workflows.

The relationship is one with a form of bounded agency. The human contributes intention, context, values, judgement and meaning. AI contributes extraordinary access to knowledge, perspectives, alternatives and analysis. Together, the pair can explore, refine, decide and create in ways neither could alone. The opportunity is a synchronous dance between two very different forms of intelligence - not AI replacing human intelligence, and not humans competing with machines at the things machines increasingly do better.

That changes the question we should be asking. It is no longer simply: *what can AI do?* It becomes: *what does the human need to remain exceptionally good at for this hybrid system to work?*

Biological intelligence makes four particularly important contributions: embodied salience, divergence, skills and expertise, and context. AI brings formidable capabilities in knowledge, convergence, analysis and generation. These are not absolute divisions. Humans converge and hold knowledge; AI can generate divergent possibilities and increasingly works with context. The point is not to draw an impermeable line between human and machine. It is to identify where the distinctive value of biological intelligence lies - and therefore what we must be careful not to allow to atrophy.

The deepest of these contributions is embodied salience: the biological process through which an organism determines what matters. As the framework essay described, biological intelligence is a vertical architecture, running from interoceptive, survival-oriented processes at the base, through social cognition and emotional regulation, to symbolic reasoning at the apex. AI operates at that apex. Salience rises through the whole depth of it.

The nervous system is constantly assigning significance to signals from inside and outside the body. At its simplest, this is reflexive. Touch something dangerously hot and withdrawal begins before conscious deliberation. Sudden movement in the periphery and attention is already being allocated. At higher levels, the same fundamental problem becomes vastly more sophisticated. The brain must decide which problem deserves attention, how urgent it is, which capabilities to recruit, how much energy to allocate, and whether a course of action is meaningful and adaptive in the social world in which the person lives.

I call this continuum the salience axis: a gradient from reflexive to reflective. At the lower end, responses are rapid, stable and energetically inexpensive. At the higher end, cognition becomes fluid, adaptive and energetically expensive, recruiting stored knowledge, executive function, divergence, convergence and decision-making. Yet the entire axis is biological. It is the organism continuously determining what matters, and responding accordingly.

This is why the relationship between AI and humans cannot be understood as an exchange of information. Humans do not simply possess knowledge. We possess embodied meaning - shaped by experience, relationships, values, belonging, threat, safety and culture. Much of this

processing is unconscious. We often experience the conclusion before we can articulate the variables that produced it.

> *Humans do not simply bring knowledge to the interface. We bring embodied meaning. That may be the most important biological contribution to hybrid intelligence.*

Pristine Salience

The biological advantage should not be romanticised. Human salience can be extraordinarily sophisticated, but it can also be distorted. A current situation activates an old threat pattern. Emotion hijacks judgement. Attention is captured by something urgent but unimportant. Chronic stress changes the way threat is interpreted. Intrusive thoughts consume cognitive resources. We allocate enormous energy to the wrong problem while neglecting the one that actually matters.

The task is therefore not merely to preserve human salience, but to cultivate what I call pristine salience: the ability to meet the problem in front of us with the appropriate capability, energy and urgency.

That places self-leadership at the heart of hybrid intelligence. Purpose and clarity of direction matter because salience requires orientation toward what matters. Self-worth and mood matter because they shape the platform from which goal-directed behaviour emerges. Values matter because integrity, in practical terms, is the extent to which values become action rather than remaining abstract declarations. And goal-directedness matters because biological intelligence must not only recognise what matters, but mobilise energy toward it.

Mindfulness belongs here too - not as relaxation, but as a mechanism for decluttering salience: improving the capacity to notice what deserves attention, rather than allowing every internal and external signal to compete equally for cognitive resources.

In an AI-accelerated environment, this capacity becomes more important, not less. AI dramatically expands what can be generated, analysed, considered and acted upon. Human attention now operates inside an environment of ever-increasing possibility. As the framework essay warned, capability without salience is acceleration without direction.

> *The scarce resource may no longer be information. It may increasingly be the ability to determine what matters.*

Be Careful What We Outsource

AI provides extraordinary access to knowledge. But knowledge is not merely something humans retrieve. Certain forms of knowledge have always been acquired through doing -

through repetition, error, correction and experience. Over time, they become skill, then expertise, and eventually judgement.

If we outsource the entire developmental pathway because AI performs the early-stage task more efficiently, we may prevent people from developing the very expertise they need to supervise, contextualise and challenge AI later. This is the developmental form of the drift described in the framework essay, in which the human gradually moves from directing the companion to accepting its outputs, and quietly supervises their own cognitive atrophy.

The question is most acute for younger people entering the workforce. Many of the tasks traditionally performed by graduates and junior professionals are precisely those most amenable to automation. But those tasks were also the apprenticeship through which inexperienced people became experienced professionals.

Organisations will need to think far more deliberately about apprenticeship in the age of AI. Rather than asking only which junior tasks can be removed, they must ask which experiences must be retained because they build the skills, expertise and judgement required at higher levels. This is not an argument for keeping humans doing work machines can do, simply for the sake of tradition. It is an argument for understanding the developmental pathway through which human capability is created before removing parts of it.

> *The governing layer of tomorrow is being trained by the junior work of today. Automate that work without redesigning the apprenticeship, and we hollow out the expertise that hybrid intelligence depends on.*

The State of the Thinker Is Part of the Thinking

The human contribution to hybrid intelligence depends on the biological conditions under which sophisticated cognition becomes possible.

Divergence - generating possibilities, making lateral connections and imagining alternatives - and convergence - narrowing those possibilities into realistic courses of action - both require a nervous system capable of flexible, higher-order cognition. That capacity rests on prefrontal regulation, attenuation of the amygdala's threat response, growth factors that support neural plasticity, and healthy biological rhythms.

Chronic stress shifts the balance in the opposite direction. Threat-processing becomes more dominant, and the prefrontal regulation on which sophisticated thinking depends is compromised. The biological state of the thinker becomes part of the quality of the thinking.

The implication is practical. Sleep, recovery, physical activity, periods of reduced stimulation and mindfulness are not lifestyle accessories sitting outside the AI conversation. They are part of the infrastructure through which humans bring high-quality biological intelligence to the

hybrid system. In the language of the framework essay, they determine whether a person arrives at the apex with the full vertical depth of their intelligence intact - or whether convergence simply meets convergence.

> *We should be cautious about imagining that the quality of hybrid intelligence depends primarily on the sophistication of the AI model. It also depends on the state of the human nervous system arriving at the interface.*

The Danger of Doing More with More

AI gives us more capability. But more capability does not automatically create higher yield.

Humans are biological systems operating in environments of demands, threats and potential rewards, continually mobilising resources to meet them. AI reduces the effort required to perform individual tasks while simultaneously increasing the number of tasks we expect of ourselves and others. That creates a paradox. We become more capable, and because we are more capable, we fill the newly available capacity with more work. Output accelerates, and expectations accelerate with it.

The result is an escalating cycle of doing more with more, rather than using increased capability to create greater resilience, better judgement, deeper thinking or more sustainable performance. This is precisely the distinction the framework essay draws between output and yield. Output can rise while the living system producing it quietly depletes. Effective demand must therefore be actively managed, not left to expand into every unit of capacity AI creates.

> *The biological edge cannot survive indefinitely if every gain in technological capability is converted into additional demand.*

Coherence Becomes More Valuable as AI Becomes More Capable

People do not merely exchange information. We connect, synchronise, build trust, negotiate fairness, establish belonging and create shared meaning. At the team level, these relationships allow a collective to become something more than a collection of individually productive people. Coherence emerges through connectedness, integration and synchronisation - and, as the framework essay argued, it is what turns output into yield.

AI can clearly support human coordination. But as more interaction becomes mediated by companions and agents, organisations must deliberately protect the human-to-human interactions through which coherence emerges: integration and synchrony, trust and entrustment, fairness, social safety and belonging. These are not sentimental additions to the architecture of an AI-enabled organisation. They are properties of the living human system on which collective performance depends.

Consider a simple experiment. A leader works with an AI representation of a well-known human coach. The experience is useful - and noticeably predictable. It highlights something difficult to describe but deeply familiar: human-to-human interaction carries layers of meaning, context and embodied understanding that we recognise without being able to articulate fully. AI will participate ever more effectively in coaching, deliberation and decision-making. That does not make human encounter redundant. It makes it more distinctive.

> *The more human–AI interaction expands, the more deliberately we need to protect human–human interaction.*

Energy Remains Part of Intelligence

Biological intelligence is metabolically constrained. Human cognition does not operate independently of sleep, stress, mood, motivation, physiological state and recovery.

It helps to distinguish between three forces. Energy leakers, such as chronic stress, drain the system. Energy blockers, such as persistent negative or intrusive patterns, prevent available energy from being used. Energy boosters - gratitude, optimism, enthusiasm, humour and curiosity - replenish and amplify it.

AI does not remove our biological limits. It may simply make them easier to ignore. A machine can keep generating. The human nervous system cannot continue allocating attention, judgement, empathy, self-regulation and executive function without recovery. The framework essay made a related point from the other side: if the transcended layer offers no genuine challenge, energy pathways close through disuse. Energy is lost both by overload and by under-engagement.

> *The future of high performance cannot simply be an acceleration project. It must remain a resilience project.*

Transcendence Without Losing Ourselves

The framework essay described AI as the latest expression of a pattern as old as human tool use: technology automates a layer of work, and humans transcend above it. There is a complementary way to see the same pattern. AI can be understood not simply as an external technology, but as an evolutionary extension of collective human intelligence.

Human intelligence has always expanded through connection. Individuals formed groups, communities, institutions and increasingly interconnected global systems. Knowledge became distributed across enormous human networks. AI represents, in one sense, the next development in that trajectory: an extraordinary concentration of accumulated human knowledge and symbolic information, made available to individuals through a conversational interface.

Seen this way, AI need not make humans less human. It may force us to become much clearer about what being human actually means. We remain embodied organisms, maintaining an internal biological environment while navigating an external one. We depend on energy. We live socially. We bond and belong. We care about fairness. We experience safety and threat. We create meaning, organise collectively and develop cultures. None of these properties disappears because an AI system becomes more intelligent.

The challenge is one of integration and transcendence. As machines take over more functions, humans will need to move into forms of contribution that make fuller use of the capabilities of biological intelligence, rather than attempting to preserve every historical task.

Culture matters here. If embodied salience is shaped through relationships, belonging and collective meaning, then hybrid intelligence will not look identical across societies. More individualistic traditions differ from more collectivist ones, including African contexts in which community and belonging play a stronger explicit role. AI systems may carry assumptions from the cultural environments in which they were developed. Different communities may need to shape AI around their own forms of meaning, relationship and collective life.

That question remains open. But if AI is an extension of collective human intelligence, the goal should not be for humans everywhere to conform to a single technological culture. It should be for communities to use and shape AI in ways that extend, rather than erase, their distinctive forms of human intelligence.

> *AI may be the most powerful extension of collective human intelligence ever built. The task is to ensure it extends what is distinctively human in each of us, rather than flattening it.*

The Biological Edge as Yield Capacity

All of these strands lead to a single conclusion. AI does not require an entirely new model of human performance. It makes the existing biological requirements more visible and more urgent. And those requirements are not a loose list. Together, they determine a single property of the living system: its yield capacity.

Yield capacity is the degree to which a living system - a person, a team, an organisation - can sustain its functional output in the face of continuous change. As I describe in *To Emerge*, it can be seen as a function of a set of biological capacities, held in ratio to the demand placed on the system:

$$\text{Yield Capacity} \approx \frac{f(\text{Salience, Capability, Energy, Coherence, Rhythm, Resilience Bandwidth})}{\text{Effective Demand}}$$

Every theme in this essay is one of these components.

Salience is the directional precision with which we recognise what matters. In the hybrid system, its highest form is pristine salience: meeting the problem in front of us with the appropriate capability, energy and urgency.

Capability is everything the human brings - knowledge, skill, expertise, divergence and convergence. AI expands it enormously, horizontally through companions and vertically through agents. But it is only productive when directed by salience, and only sustained if the developmental pathway that builds expertise is protected.

Energy is the metabolic and psychological fuel of biological intelligence. It is drained by energy leakers, held back by energy blockers and replenished by energy boosters. AI cannot generate it.

Coherence emerges from connection, synchronisation and integration between people. It is what allows a group to think together rather than merely communicate, and it is what turns output into yield.

Rhythm is the oscillation between activation and recovery. Sleep, recovery, physical activity, nutrition and periods of reduced stimulation are the rhythms that support growth factors, prefrontal regulation and attenuation of the amygdala's threat response - the biological conditions for sophisticated thought.

Resilience bandwidth is the operating envelope within which the system absorbs disturbance and continues to function without fragmenting.

Below the line sits **Effective Demand**: the greater of the real demand placed on the system and the demand it perceives. This is where doing more with more does its damage. Every unit of capacity AI creates can be converted into additional work, and chronic stress can make demand feel larger than it is. Either way, the denominator rises.

Seen this way, the risk of AI becomes precise. AI can raise one component - capability - more dramatically than any technology before it. But if salience narrows, energy depletes, coherence fragments, rhythm is sacrificed to acceleration, and effective demand is allowed to grow

unchecked, yield capacity falls even as output rises. The leadership task is to grow the numerator in balance, protect coherence and energy in particular, and keep effective demand at bay.

> *AI changes one component of yield capacity dramatically. The biological edge depends on all the others.*

Building Yield Capacity Through High Performance Resilience

Yield capacity describes what must be optimised. High performance resilience provides us with practical ways to build it.

The Neurozone high performance resilience model maps closely onto these components through five interconnected domains that individuals and teams can develop directly, with resilience at the centre:

Transformers build salience - purpose, alignment, attention and judgement.

Innovators build capability - curiosity, learning, contextual knowledge, divergence and convergence.

Connectors build coherence - social safety, trust, bonding and belonging.

Rhythms build the biological conditions for sophisticated thought - sleep, recovery, nutrition, exercise and periods of reduced stimulation.

Energy builds the fuel - motivation, mood, self-worth, curiosity and optimism.

Strengthening these domains widens resilience bandwidth, strengthens the capacities in the numerator and improves the system's ability to meet demand without depleting. That is why building high-performance resilience goes a long way toward building yield capacity. The Neurozone system was designed to develop and measure exactly these capacities, for individuals, teams and organisations.

> *The biological edge is not one uniquely human cognitive trick that AI cannot perform. It is a system property: yield capacity. It emerges when an embodied human being can discern what matters, bring appropriate energy and capability to it, connect coherently with others, recover biologically, and regulate the demands placed upon them.*

What This Means for Leaders

Organisations are layers of a living human system. Individuals aggregate into teams; teams aggregate into organisations. AI enters each layer differently. Individuals predominantly

encounter companions and generative capabilities. Teams combine multiple human–AI dyads and increasingly use agents. Organisations add sophisticated layers of agentic coordination and automation.

The organisational challenge is therefore not simply to "implement AI". It is to design and regulate a system in which technological capability increases without degrading the biological properties that allow the human collective to function. That shifts AI strategy from technology implementation toward living-system design, and it asks leaders different questions. Are people becoming more capable while remaining coherent? Is AI reducing unnecessary demand, or simply enabling more of it? Are younger employees still acquiring the experiences that make them experts? Are people interacting enough with each other to build trust and shared meaning? Is technological acceleration matched by biological recovery? And are humans still exercising the judgement through which possibility becomes meaningful, adaptive action?

What This Means in Practice

Treat human biology as AI infrastructure. Sleep, recovery, rhythm and reduced stimulation are not wellbeing extras running in parallel to the AI programme. They determine the quality of the intelligence that arrives at every human–AI interface. Budget for them, protect them, and model them from the top.

Cultivate pristine salience. As AI multiplies what can be done, the leadership skill that matters most is determining what should be done. Invest in purpose, clarity of direction, values-in-action and the practices - including mindfulness - that declutter attention rather than fragment it.

Manage effective demand deliberately. Decide in advance what a gain in AI capability will be spent on. If every hour saved is automatically refilled with more work, the human layer will deplete while output metrics look healthy. Some of that capacity must be returned to deeper thinking, better judgement and recovery.

Redesign apprenticeship before removing it. Before automating junior work, identify which experiences build the expertise your future leaders will need to govern AI. Keep those, or replace them with deliberately designed developmental challenges.

Protect human encounter. Shared problem-solving, difficult decisions, coaching and relationship-building require direct human contact. These are not inefficiencies to be optimised away. They are how coherence is built.

Measure the human layer, not only the machine layer. The framework essay closed by noting that standard dashboards capture what agents and systems produce, but not the biological conditions of the people above them. Much of that frontier remains open - we cannot yet locate the optimal human–AI configuration for every team with precision. But the biological conditions themselves can already be measured. The Neurozone Resilience Index (NRI) assesses

individuals' resilience and readiness for high performance across the five domains described above, and has been completed more than 15,000 times across around 50 organisations in more than 15 countries. For individuals, it makes their biological platform visible. For teams, it shows whether coherence is strengthening or fragmenting as more interaction is mediated by AI. For leaders, it provides a baseline before AI is scaled, and a way to track whether each gain in technological capability is matched by biological capability - or simply converted into additional demand.

> *An AI strategy that measures only the technology is measuring half of the hybrid system. Knowing the state of the human arriving at the interface is not a wellbeing add-on. It is part of the AI strategy.*

The question about the future of AI at work is not simply: *how powerful can we make artificial intelligence?* It is: *how do we create the conditions in which increasingly powerful artificial intelligence is met by increasingly resilient, coherent and capable biological intelligence?*

The promise of hybrid intelligence does not lie in AI becoming more human. It lies in a relationship in which AI becomes extraordinarily capable while humans remain profoundly human.

That is the biological edge.

. . .

Read the Framework

This essay builds on the framework essay *Hybrid Intelligence in Organisations: How a pattern as old as human tool use is now reshaping organisations at exponential scale - and what leaders need to regulate*. It sets out the full architecture referred to here: the transcendence pattern, the companion dyad and the agent layer, the maintenance layer, the distinction between output and yield, and the risks at each layer of the system.

About the Author

Dr Etienne van der Walt, MD, is a neurologist, entrepreneur, global keynote speaker and living systems thinker whose work sits at the intersection of neuroscience, biology and leadership. As the founder of Neurozone, he has spent more than two decades developing evidence-informed frameworks that help leaders and organisations improve resilience, wellbeing and sustainable performance. His work challenges traditional mechanistic approaches to leadership by viewing organisations as living systems that require intelligent biological regulation rather than increasing control. He is the author of *To Emerge* and writes and speaks internationally on resilience, leadership, organisational health and the science of human flourishing.

Etienne is currently on a quest to operationalise the yield framework in the age of hybrid intelligence - to develop the measurement tools, diagnostic frameworks and practical methodologies that allow leaders and organisations to design, monitor and sustain biological yield as human and agentic AI systems deepen and evolve. He welcomes conversation and collaboration with those exploring the same frontier.

For more essays and resources, visit www.etiennevanderwalt.com.

Selected Reading

The following works underpin the scientific and intellectual claims made in this essay.

Arnsten, A.F.T. (2009) 'Stress signalling pathways that impair prefrontal cortex structure and function', Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 10(6), pp. 410–422.

Cotman, C.W. and Berchtold, N.C. (2002) 'Exercise: a behavioral intervention to enhance brain health and plasticity', Trends in Neurosciences, 25(6), pp. 295–301.

Damasio, A. (2010) Self Comes to Mind: Constructing the Conscious Brain. New York: Pantheon Books.

Edmondson, A.C. (2018) The Fearless Organization. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Ericsson, K.A., Krampe, R.T. and Tesch-Römer, C. (1993) 'The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance', Psychological Review, 100(3), pp. 363–406.

Fügener, A., Grahl, J., Gupta, A. and Ketter, W. (2021) 'Will humans-in-the-loop become borgs?', MIS Quarterly, 45(3), pp. 1527–1556.

Henrich, J. (2020) The WEIRDest People in the World. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

McEwen, B.S. (1998) 'Stress, adaptation, and disease: allostasis and allostatic load', Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 840, pp. 33–44.

Menon, V. and Uddin, L.Q. (2010) 'Saliency, switching, attention and control: a network model of insula function', Brain Structure and Function, 214, pp. 655–667.

Parasuraman, R. and Manzey, D.H. (2010) 'Complacency and bias in human use of automation', Human Factors, 52(3), pp. 381–410.

Tang, Y.-Y., Hölzel, B.K. and Posner, M.I. (2015) 'The neuroscience of mindfulness meditation', Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 16(4), pp. 213–225.

van der Walt, E. (2026) Hybrid Intelligence in Organisations. Framework essay. Available at: etiennevanderwalt.com.

Walker, M.P. (2017) Why We Sleep. New York: Scribner.

Woolley, A.W. et al. (2010) 'Evidence for a collective intelligence factor in the performance of human groups', Science, 330(6004), pp. 686–688.