

Editorial: *Good Thinking, Advances in the Coexistence of Human Intelligence and AI, and Being Successful in the Distribution Industry Disrupted by GenAI*



The U.S. think tank Brookings Institution (a nonprofit public policy organization based in Washington, DC.) brought recently to our attention an article about the lessons for the U.S. of the European elections, which: *“are as ambiguous as their results... a warning to the mainstream, not a defeat. But it is a warning that should be taken seriously on both sides of the Atlantic”* (Dionne and Galston, 2024).

Fourteen years ago, an Adams Professor of Political Leadership and Democratic Values, Emerita from Harvard Kennedy School (Mansbridge, 2010), wrote about the gold standard represented by the deliberative polling, the well-known concept introduced in 1988 by Professor James S. Fishkin of Stanford University (Luskin, n.d.). Six years ago Fishkin (2018) poses the following question: *“What would the people think if they were effectively motivated to pay attention and enabled to get information about competing arguments and if they could discuss those issues with their fellow citizens in moderated, civil discussions?”* And he continued: *“These simple requirements lead to the design...”*

A Nobel laureate (and astrophysicist at the University of California, Berkeley), Saul Perlmutter recently stated: *“Throughout history, the most dramatic scientific advances have been made by people who disagree with each other working together to sharpen each other’s thinking.*

Scientific culture understands this as almost a prerequisite to good thinking ... Groups of people are pretty good at judging what to make of evidence and expert opinion. They don't always get it perfect, but they're remarkably capable of balancing the evidence. Then their points of view often change" (MacCoun, Perlmutter and D'Arc, 2024).

There is an increasing feeling for various groups of people regarding a pressure effect coming from the coexistence of human intelligence and artificial intelligence (Kureshi, 2024; Pogla, 2024; Tilburg University, 2024; Simplilearn, 2024; Saltz Gulko, 2024), without benefitting of a global deliberative polling in this matter. Elspeth Kirkman brought to our attention even that *"AI has caused humans to have a slight existential crisis and question whether we're great at pattern recognition"* (Kirkman and Borruso, 2024).

Of course, from the point of view of the current business concerns with regard to the GenAI quality and capabilities, for instance, there are relevant findings as those revealed by the latest Baine's quarterly executive survey on AI (Rapoport et al., 2024) and confirming the focus on real business value generation (unlike the previous year in which the focus was on possibilities' exploration). Among the expectations underlined by this study it was interesting to note the heavily relying in results on "data quality and the ability to operationalize use cases to meet users' needs", as well as an increased number of decisions "to buy rather than build".

On the other hand, it is worth highlighting the opinion published on 18 June, 2024 by O'Reilly (2024) with regard to a responsible and ethical way of creating a GenAI supply chain ecosystem in which everyone benefits, for this context coining the term of "architecture of participation" described as follows: *"The World Wide Web (and the underlying internet itself) had a fundamentally different idea, which I have called an "architecture of participation." Anyone could host their own content, and users could surf from one site to another. Every website and every browser could communicate and agree on what can be seen freely, what is restricted, and what must be paid for. It led to a remarkable expansion of the opportunities for the monetization of creativity, publishing, and copyright."* As an interesting coincidence, on the same day of June, MIT Technology Review published an article signed by Douglas Heaven (2024) in which the author underlined the need to examine how the large language models (LLMs) work in order to understand why these models hallucinate (say something that is not true). And that because most of the time LLMs appear to be correct at what they do, making them to be trustful, AI hallucination negatively impacting a more widespread adoption of chatbots.

A day before the publication of the above-mentioned two articles, a Senior Research Associate at Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, Oxford University (Newman, 2024) made comments about the 13th edition of their Digital News Report which documented both the scale, and impact of platforms (like the expanding TikTok, Instagram Reels, and YouTube) resetting within the context of changes brought by the rapid advances in AI, including from the point of view of consumer attitudes towards the AI use in the news. Among other aspects, this research underlined publishers' (who are quickly adopting AI) need *"to proceed with caution, as the public generally wants humans in the driving seat at all times."*

Allow us to end by remembering that Aghte and Ran (2024) highlighted distributors' need to embrace GenAI technologies (which help value creation in various business functions, such as: sales and marketing, procurement, inventory management, logistics, and customer service). And in order to leverage the rapidly advancing GenAI adoption and application, distributors need to implement a vigorous strategy (based on a strategic road map considering including e-commerce players) and the prioritized use cases, ensuring good use case execution and effective governance of GenAI tools utilization (based on developed centers of excellence), preparing for change (based on change management) and investing in capability building so as to ensure real business value generation (from GenAI tools utilization).

Theodor Valentin Purcărea

Editor-in-Chief

References

Aghte, I., Ran, N. (2024). How generative AI is disrupting distribution, McKinsey & Company, Distribution blog, March 8, 2024, Available at: <<https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/industrials-and-electronics/our-‘insights/distribution-blog/how-generative-ai-is-disrupting-distribution?>> [Accessed 31 May 2024].

Dionne, E.J. Jr. and Galston, W.A. (2024). Did the EU voting provide any clues for the coming U.S. election? The Brookings Institution, Commentary, June 18, 2024. Available at: <<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/did-the-eu-voting-provide-any-clues-for-the-coming-u-s-election/?>> [Accessed 24 June 2024].

Douglas Heaven, W. (2024). Why does AI hallucinate? MIT Technology Review, June 18, 2024. Available at: <<https://www.technologyreview.com/2024/06/18/1093440/what-causes-ai-hallucinate-chatbots/?>> [Accessed 23 June 2024].

Kirkman, E. and Borruso, M. (2024). Author Talks: Can thinking like an artist improve your decisions? McKinsey Global Publishing, Interview, June 6, 2024. Available at: <<https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-on-books/author-talks-can-thinking-like-an-artist-improve-your-decisions?>> [Accessed 25 June 2024].

Kureshi, R. (2024). Artificial intelligence: How is it different from human intelligence? , . Available at: <<https://online.hull.ac.uk/blog/what-is-artificial-intelligence-and-how-is-it-different-from-human-intelligence>> [Accessed 24 June 2024].

Luskin, C. (n.d.). Deliberative Polling: A Synopsis, Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy. Available at: <https://lkyspp.nus.edu.sg/docs/default-source/ips/deliberative_polling_synopsis.pdf> [Accessed 24 June 2024].

MacCoun, R., Perlmutter, S. and D’Arc, S. (2024). Author Talks: How scientific thinking can help us tackle our toughest societal problems, McKinsey & Company, Interview, May 29, 2024, pp. 1-12. Available at: <<https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/mckinsey-on-books/author-talks-how-scientific-thinking-can-help-us-tackle-our-toughest-societal-problems>> [Accessed 15 June 2024].

Mansbridge, J. (2010). "Deliberative Polling as the Gold Standard." Review of When the People Speak: Deliberative Democracy and Public Consultation, by James S. Fishkin. Good Society Journal, 19.1, 2010: 55-61. Available at: <<https://www.hks.harvard.edu/publications/deliberative-polling-gold-standard-0>> [Accessed 24 June 2024].

Newman, N. (2024). Overview and key findings of the 2024 Digital News Report, The Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism – University of Oxford, 17th June 2024. Available at: <<https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2024/dnr-executive-summary?>> [Accessed 23 June 2024].

O'Reilly, T. (2024). How to Fix "AI's Original Sin", O'Reilly Media, Radar, June 18, 2024. Available at: <<https://www.oreilly.com/radar/how-to-fix-ais-original-sin/?>> [Accessed 23 June 2024].

Pogla, M. (2024). Artificial Intelligence vs Human Intelligence, AutoGPT Official, February 10, 2024. Available at: <<https://autogpt.net/artificial-intelligence-vs-human-intelligence/>> [Accessed 24 June 2024].

Rapoport, G., Bicanic, S., Wang, J., Lichtenstein, R. and Dutt, A. (2024). AI Survey: Four Themes Emerging, Bain, June 20, 2024. Available at: <<https://www.bain.com/insights/ai-survey-four-themes-emerging/?>> [Accessed 23 June 2024].

Saltz Gulko, R. (2024). Enhancing Product Design with AI: A Journey of Creativity and Customer Experience, CustomerThink, June 18, 2024. Available at: <<https://customerthink.com/enhancing-product-design-with-ai-a-journey-of-creativity-and-customer-experience/?>> [Accessed 25 June 2024].

Simplilearn (2024). AI vs Human Intelligence: Key Insights and Comparisons! Jun 4, 2024. Available at: <<https://www.simplilearn.com/artificial-intelligence-vs-human-intelligence-article>> [Accessed 24 June 2024].

Tilburg University (2024). Human vs AI: What is true Intelligence? 7th May 2024. Available at: <<https://www.tilburguniversity.edu/human-vs-ai>> [Accessed 23 June 2024].

