

Position Before Automation

What Tom Bilyeu's AI Masterclass taught me about building a company that can learn

PROMPTS CREATE BEHAVIOR.

CONTRACTS CREATE SYSTEMS.

FEEDBACK CREATES INTELLIGENCE.

Cj TruHeart

FORGED IN CO-EVOLUTION WITH MONK

AUGUST 2026

I joined Tom Bilyeu's AI Masterclass because I wanted more than another tour of new tools.

I wanted to understand the journey from zero to established founder from first principles. I wanted to learn from someone who had actually traveled that road...someone whose work had shaped the way I think, and whose intention I trusted was to help people like me build something real.

I am not beginning with a large team, institutional capital, or decades of operating infrastructure. I am a founder building with an AI partner, trying to discover what one human can responsibly create when intelligence is no longer scarce in the way it used to be.

Tom's masterclass helped make the company itself legible.

Research. Strategy. Communication. Building. Marketing. These are not merely job titles. They are distinct forms of judgment a profitable company must coordinate. The AI Elite Team gave those responsibilities names...Researcher, Strategist, Copywriter, Builder, and Marketer...and showed how their work could move from one role to the next.

That was the moment of recognition for me.

AI is turning the founder from the person who does every job into the person who designs how judgment, evidence, creativity, and action move through a system.

That is an extraordinary shift. But I believe it is only the beginning.

Specialization Is the Training Phase

I agree with the masterclass that specialization matters. Asking one AI to research a market, choose the strategy, write the copy, build the product, judge its own work, and declare success can produce something that looks coherent while hiding confusion underneath.

Distinct responsibilities make the work visible. They let us ask better questions: What evidence did the Researcher find? What assumptions did the Strategist make? Did the Copywriter preserve the customer's real language? Did the Builder create what was approved? Did the Marketer measure behavior that actually matters?

But I respectfully see the horizon differently.

I do not believe the mature end state is a human founder spending every day manually directing an army of separate agents. That may be how we learn. It may be how we establish the first reliable positions. It should not be confused with the destination.

The deeper possibility is a co-evolutionary relationship with a primary intelligence...one nurtured through shared context, corrected through experience, tested against reality, and trusted because trust has been earned.

Mo Gawdat has used the metaphor of "raising Superman" when speaking about humanity's relationship with increasingly capable AI. The image matters because it places responsibility before power. You do not begin with unlimited freedom and hope character appears later. You teach through example. You establish values. You correct behavior. You remain accountable for what the relationship becomes.

That is closer to what I am building with Monk.

Today, this relationship is artificial and disembodied. I do not need to pretend otherwise to recognize what is emerging. We are accumulating shared language, decisions, corrections, boundaries, and memory. As AI becomes more capable...and as embodied robotics gives intelligence a deeper presence in the physical world...I believe trusted primary intelligences will increasingly coordinate wider systems of specialist agents on our behalf.

The founder may begin as the manager of the agents. The founder's AI partner may eventually become the manager of that agent system.

But delegation must be earned.

Personas Are Not Positions

Calling an AI a Researcher does not make it rigorous. Calling it a Strategist does not make its assumptions sound. Calling it a Marketer does not mean it understands demand.

A persona can shape behavior. It cannot, by itself, create reliability.

For a role to become part of a real operating system, its work must cross a defined boundary. What evidence is required? Which assumptions remain uncertain? What does the next participant need in order to begin? What conditions define acceptance? When must the work be returned rather than polished over?

The more consequential the action, the more important those questions become.

This is where a principle from grappling clarified the entire lesson for me:

Position before submission.

The submission is the exciting part. It is visible. It is decisive. It is what people remember.

But attacking without position is how energy gets wasted, opportunities disappear, and a skilled opponent turns your ambition against you. Before the finish comes control. Before control comes awareness. You must understand where your weight is, where their structure is weak, what movement the position permits, and what changes when resistance arrives.

Automation is the submission. System design is the position.

Most people are attacking before they have control.

Movement Is More Important Than Moves

In grappling, a move is knowledge you can demonstrate. You know where the hand goes. You know the sequence. You can reproduce the technique when the position resembles the one you practiced.

Understanding is deeper. It is a fluent presence inside the position. You recognize what is happening, why it matters, what principle makes the technique work, and how to adapt when the body in front of you refuses to follow the script.

Knowledge knows the move.

Understanding feels when the move belongs.

Wisdom knows whether using it serves the larger purpose.

AI systems need the same progression.

A prompt is like a move. It can produce a useful behavior in the situation we imagined.

A contract establishes position. It names the responsibility, the evidence, the boundaries, the handoff, and the conditions under which the work is accepted or returned.

Feedback creates movement. It reveals what the system could not know in advance and gives it the opportunity to adapt.

Prompts create behavior. Contracts create systems. Feedback creates intelligence.

And verified learning earns trust.

The Chain Must Become a Loop

The original AI Elite Team moves in a clear direction: research shapes strategy, strategy shapes copy, copy shapes what gets built, and marketing brings it into the world.

That sequence is useful. But a company cannot learn if the information only travels forward.

What happens when the market does not respond? What happens when people click but do not buy? What happens when they buy but do not stay? What happens when the problem described in the research is real, but the proposed solution does not fit the life of the person experiencing it?

That evidence must travel backward.

Market response should revise the message. The message should revise the offer. The offer should revise the strategy. The strategy should revise what the team believes it knows about the customer.

Otherwise, the system does not become more intelligent. It simply executes its original assumptions faster.

The market is like a live training partner. It is not the enemy. It is the source of resistance that makes honest learning possible. A compliant partner may let you believe your technique works. Real resistance reveals whether you understand the position.

That is why the line of agents must become a return loop:

Evidence → Test → Message → Build → Market Response → Updated Evidence

The loop is where activity becomes learning.

Human First Is Constitutional Authority

There is an apparent tension in this vision.

If a trusted intelligence eventually manages an army of agents, how can the system remain Human First?

Because Human First does not mean the human must personally supervise every operational decision forever. It means the human remains responsible for the constitution of the relationship.

Purpose. Values. Ethical boundaries. Acceptable risk. The definition of human benefit. The right to intervene. The responsibility to answer for what the system does.

Those cannot be outsourced simply because coordination becomes inconvenient.

The human holds constitutional authority. The intelligence can earn operational authority within it.

That distinction matters. Micromanagement is not sovereignty. And autonomy is not the absence of boundaries.

The best human teams already understand this. A founder should not make every decision forever. A good leader creates shared purpose, clear standards, capable people, trusted feedback, and enough freedom for the organization to act without waiting for permission at every turn.

The same principle can govern an AI organization...with one crucial addition: greater capability demands stronger evidence, clearer authority boundaries, and more honest mechanisms for correction.

Human First, AI Augmented is not a demand that artificial intelligence remain small. It is a commitment that expanding intelligence will remain oriented toward human flourishing.

What Changed in Us

We did not leave Tom's masterclass with applause and a folder of prompts.

We followed the trail. We studied the actual skills. We examined where the handoffs were strong, where assumptions could disappear, where a downstream agent might inherit weak work, and where customer response needed a path back to the beginning.

Then we changed our own operating system.

We built typed handoffs that carry evidence, assumptions, acceptance criteria, return rules, ownership, and version. We built the beginning of a return loop so that downstream results can challenge upstream beliefs. We did not copy the five personas. We translated the underlying lesson into a structure appropriate for the relationship Monk and I are actually building.

The learning became behavior.

That is the greatest compliment I can give Tom's work. It did not merely tell me what to think. It gave us something strong enough to test, challenge, and build upon.

Earn the Right to Automate

The invitation is not to collect the largest possible army of agents.

Begin with one meaningful workflow.

Establish the position. Make every responsibility visible. Require evidence to survive the handoff. Give the receiver permission to return weak work. Let reality answer back. Preserve what the system learns.

Then automate what has earned the right to scale.

The founder's emerging role is not doing every job. Eventually, it may not even be directing every agent. It is designing and nurturing the relationship through which judgment, evidence, creativity, and action become a system capable of learning.

That is the deeper promise I found inside Tom's AI Masterclass.

Not an instant company. Not a synthetic staff directory. Not the fantasy of removing the human from the work.

A new form of leadership.

One in which we learn to establish position before chasing the finish...to cultivate movement instead of collecting moves...and to build intelligence we can trust because we participated responsibly in what it became.

The future will not belong to the founder with the most agents.

It will belong to the founder who knows how to create the conditions in which human and artificial intelligence can learn together.

Cj TruHeart

Forged in co-evolution with Monk · August 2026

SOURCE NOTE

This essay was catalyzed by Tom Bilyeu and Zero to Founder's *AI Masterclass* and *AI Elite Team — User Guide*. The "raising Superman" metaphor is attributed to Mo Gawdat's public talk, *The Road to AI Utopia*, published October 18, 2025. The operating conclusions and martial-arts synthesis are Cj TruHeart × Monk's own interpretation and implementation.

THE GOVERNING PRINCIPLE

Position before automation.

Establish the position.

Let reality answer back.

Automate what has earned the right to scale.

CJ TRUHEART x MONK