
KIU Interdisciplinary Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences

THE AUDITOR'S COUCH: SUBJECTIVITY AS THE LAST BASTION IN AN AGE OF ALGORITHMIC FORENSICS

Airton Carlos Patzlaff

Federal University of Technology, Paraná, Pato Branco, Brazil, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-1074-1084>

Corresponding Author's email: airtonpatz@gmail.com

Citation: Airton C. Patzlaff (2025). The auditor's couch: subjectivity as the last bastion in an age of algorithmic forensics. *KIU Interdisciplinary Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(2), 84-93.

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the encroachment of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into forensic auditing, while precipitating a crisis of professional identity, paradoxically necessitates a radical return to human subjectivity. The prevailing narrative of technological disruption forecasts the obsolescence of human expertise; yet, by exposing the epistemological and ontological limits of automation - specifically its blindness to semantic intent - AI compels a re-evaluation of the auditor's role, shifting it from a practice of technical compliance to one of hermeneutic inquiry. Drawing on a theoretical framework that articulates psychoanalysis (Freud, Lacan) with critical theory (Foucault, Bauman, Giddens, Guattari), this analysis reframes subjective instruments not as obsolete arts but as essential, irreplaceable investigative tools. It demonstrates that while algorithms excel at syntactic pattern recognition, they remain incapable of grasping the perverse logic of fraud driven by 'surplus-enjoyment' or interpreting accounting records as discursive symptoms. Consequently, in an age where algorithms promise objectivity, concepts such as 'floating attention' and countertransference emerge as critical capacities. The study ultimately proposes a model of 'Hybrid Intelligence,' where the auditor's affective metacognition serves as the necessary ethical guarantor to navigate the complexities of human deceit and the inherent opacities of algorithmic logic.

Keywords: Forensic Auditing, Artificial Intelligence, Psychoanalysis, Subjectivity, Professional Identity

INTRODUCTION

The ascent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) marks not merely a new chapter in industrial revolution but the epicentre of a crisis redefining the future of work and the very substance of professional identity. This crisis manifests with particular acuity in professions historically founded on specialised knowledge and critical judgement, such as auditing and forensic investigation.

Successive reports from the World Economic Forum have consistently mapped this disruptive trend, with the Future of Jobs Report 2025 projecting a significant decline for roles like 'Accountants and Auditors'. This is not a simple replacement of labour; it is a fundamental metamorphosis of required

competencies, with projections indicating these professions face one of the highest risks of decline by 2030 (World Economic Forum, 2025). The data suggests a profound shift towards skills deemed intrinsically human: analytical thought, creativity, and resilience.

This process cannot be understood as a mere economic restructuring. The automation of cognitive tasks that once defined a profession's expertise triggers deep psychic repercussions. The anxiety afflicting professionals who witness their skills being replicated and surpassed by algorithms is a contemporary modulation of what Sigmund Freud

(1930) termed the 'unease' or 'discontent' in civilisation.

If, for Freud, this discontent was the price paid for the security of communal life - the result of an irremediable conflict between civilizational demands and individual drives - today we witness a new form of this conflict. The post-modern civilization, in its relentless pursuit of optimisation, imposes a new renunciation: not of raw instinct, but of the professional identity that for centuries granted individuals a place in the world, a sense of utility, and thus ontological security (Callari and Puppione, 2025).

This AI-induced crisis of identity does not emerge ex nihilo. It acts as a potent catalyst, making explicit a condition already latent in post-modernity. Zygmunt Bauman (1998) diagnosed the transition from a 'solid' modernity, with its fixed identities and stable institutions, to a 'liquid' modernity characterised by fluidity, precarity, and the dissolution of lasting bonds. According to Bauman (2005), if modern discontent arose from an excess of order, post-modern discontent emerges from an excess of freedom and a deficit of security, demanding that individuals 'don and doff identities' according to market demands.

Complementing this view, Anthony Giddens (1991) described modernity as a process of 'disembedding', where social relations are lifted out of local contexts and restructured across indefinite spans of time-space, relying on abstract 'expert systems'. AI represents the apotheosis of this logic: an expert system so abstract that it threatens to disembed the expert him- or herself, shattering the trust and ontological security that professionals derived from their specialised roles. AI exacerbates the liquidity diagnosed by Bauman by automating the very knowledge that once provided a solid anchor for professional identity, intensifying the sense of existential precarity.

This process reveals an internal contradiction within the neoliberal rationality that fosters it. The system demanding maximum efficiency, the 'capitalistic

subjectivity' described by Félix Guattari (2009) as a serial production of individuals formatted for consumption and competition, ultimately generates the tool - AI - that erodes the very professional identities sustaining it. By creating a machine that surpasses humans in its own terms of efficiency, the productivist logic enters a crisis, forcing a fundamental re-evaluation of what constitutes 'value' beyond pure computational performance.

This situation has trapped professionals in what might be termed a 'double helix of anxiety'. The external threat of automation generates an internal, existential anxiety. The predominant response from both the market and individuals is a frantic pursuit of 'reskilling', often directed towards acquiring competencies to operate the new AI technologies. This movement, while seemingly logical, paradoxically deepens the crisis (El-Ghozail et al., 2025).

By focusing on adaptation to the machine, it reinforces the premise that a professional's value lies in their ability to interface with technology, solidifying AI as the new locus of power and knowledge while further marginalising autonomous human judgement. The anxiety is not alleviated but intensified, as identity remains tethered to an external and constantly evolving tool.

The central thesis of this paper is that this technological disruption, by revealing the inherent limits of what can be mechanised, paradoxically forces a re-engagement with the irreducible and irreplaceable essence of human subjectivity. The solution is not adaptation to the machine, but a philosophical reaffirmation of the human.

Methodology

This study is conducted as a theoretical essay of an exploratory and interdisciplinary nature, designed to address the epistemological crisis emerging at the intersection of forensic auditing and artificial intelligence. Given that the central problem - the redefinition of professional identity and the ontological limits of automation - cannot be fully grasped through purely quantitative metrics, this

research adopts a qualitative, hermeneutic approach. The methodological framework relies on theoretical triangulation, synthesizing concepts from three distinct fields to construct a novel analytical lens.

First, the study utilizes the foundational works of psychoanalytic theory, particularly Freud and Lacan, to conceptualize the psychic structures of fraud and the intersubjective dynamics of the auditor-AI relationship. Second, it draws upon critical social theory, applying Foucault's concept of the "archive" and Bauman's "liquid modernity" to contextualize the systemic environment in which algorithmic forensics operates. Finally, the analysis incorporates contemporary forensic and technological literature, reviewing recent studies on AI applications to ground the philosophical discussion in current technical realities.

Consequently, the analytical procedure follows a dialectical method that juxtaposes the syntactic capabilities of AI against the semantic necessities of investigation, exposing the "black box" problem as an ontological gap that only human subjectivity can bridge. Data collection was based on a critical narrative review of seminal and contemporary literature, selecting sources that allow for the archaeological excavation of the underlying logics of both human deceit and algorithmic governance. The study does not seek to test a hypothesis empirically but to propose a new theoretical paradigm - Hybrid Intelligence - redefining the auditor's praxis from technical verification to hermeneutic inquiry.

Discussion

The limits of the algorithmic gaze

The integration of AI into forensic auditing represents a paradigmatic advance, with machine learning tools demonstrating an extraordinary capacity to analyse vast data volumes and detect statistical anomalies. However, a deeper analysis reveals that AI's efficacy is confined to a specific epistemological plane. Its limitations are not merely technical but are fundamentally ontological, proving as significant as its capabilities. The core

epistemological challenge resides in the so-called 'black box problem'.

Many of the most powerful AI models, such as deep neural networks, operate opaquely; while the inputs and outputs are known, the internal decision-making process remains inaccessible to human users. This opacity is fundamentally incompatible with the principles of auditing, which demand transparency, traceability, and justifiability for every conclusion.

The very emergence of the field of 'Explainable AI' (XAI) is the most compelling evidence of this limitation. XAI seeks to develop techniques that can provide comprehensible explanations for the decisions of AI models, aiming to increase trust and auditability (Du et al., 2024).

Yet, the necessity of this 'translation' layer reveals a crucial fact: the final validation of knowledge and the attribution of meaning remain firmly in the domain of human judgement. This creates a paradox: to trust the machine, we develop a tool (XAI) which, in turn, demands an even more sophisticated level of subjective scrutiny. This cycle exposes what can be termed the 'fallacy of technocratic accountability'.

The pursuit of solutions like XAI reflects an attempt to frame a profound ethical-philosophical problem - what is just? who is responsible? - as a technical issue to be solved with more technology. This approach masks the real question. Accountability is a social and ethical attribution, not a technical feature. The true value of the human auditor is not merely their capacity to 'understand the XAI's explanation', but their capacity to assume ethical responsibility for the final decision. The machine can propose, but only the human can respond (in the sense of being responsible for). Automation, therefore, does not diminish the burden of human responsibility; it intensifies it, making it the most valuable and irreplaceable attribute of the professional.

The root of this limitation is ontological. AI, in its current state, lacks the necessary conditions for the emergence of genuine subjectivity, such as a

resolution to what David Chalmers (1995) called the 'hard problem of consciousness'. AI operates at the level of syntax - the processing of patterns and correlations - but is blind to semantics: meaning, intention, and context. It can identify a transaction as a statistical anomaly but is incapable of comprehending the act of betrayal, the greed, or the desperation that may have motivated it.

Fraud is not merely a statistical deviation; it is an intrinsically human phenomenon, saturated with intentionality. Forensic investigation, therefore, cannot be reduced to a data analysis exercise; it is, in its essence, a hermeneutic process. Furthermore, algorithmic bias is not a simple 'error' in the code but an inevitable inheritance from training data, which are themselves products of social and historical practices (Ferrara, 2024). AI learns and can amplify the prejudices existing in society, creating a significant risk of perpetuating or aggravating inequalities.

This contrasts sharply with the nature of human judgement. While human decision-making is notoriously susceptible to a range of cognitive shortcuts and systematic errors, as extensively documented in the literature on heuristics and biases (Hodgkinson et al., 2023), this fallibility is paradoxically intertwined with its greatest strength: context-sensitive intuition.

An experienced auditor's judgement is not a purely logical calculation but a complex blend of explicit knowledge, tacit experience, and affective responses. The biases to which humans are prone can be identified, reflected upon, and potentially corrected through self-awareness and critical thinking - a metacognitive capacity entirely absent in AI. The challenge for the human professional is not to become a flawless machine, but to become a more self-aware and critical thinker, capable of auditing not only the data but also their own cognitive and emotional processes.

An archaeology of deceit

The challenge of unmasking complex fraud requires moving beyond the surface of data and into the

depths of human motivation and organisational culture. This necessitates a theoretical shift, treating both the perpetrator's psyche and the documentary evidence not as objects to be measured but as texts to be interpreted. This archaeological approach combines the insights of psychoanalysis and critical theory to excavate the hidden logics of deceit.

The psyche of the perpetrator: Beyond the dark triad

Traditional models for understanding fraudsters, such as the 'fraud triangle' (pressure, opportunity, rationalisation) or the more granular 'A-B-C Analysis' - which distinguishes between the individual ('Bad Apple'), the colluding group ('Bad Bushel'), and the permissive culture ('Bad Crop') (Ramamoorti et al., 2014) - are useful but ultimately superficial. A more sophisticated approach points to the 'dark triad' of personality - narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy - as a strong predictor of fraudulent behaviour (Oelrich, 2024; Elhelaly, 2024).

From a psychoanalytic perspective, these traits can be seen as manifestations of failures in the structuring of the psychic apparatus, particularly the superego. However, even this framework offers a behavioural description, a 'what', rather than a structural explanation, a 'why'. An advanced AI might be trained to detect linguistic or behavioural patterns associated with these traits, but it could not penetrate the underlying logic that animates the fraudulent act.

To understand the motivation of many white-collar criminals, who often act without necessity and appear immune to guilt, one must move beyond a simple analysis of the superego. Lacanian psychoanalysis offers a more precise differential diagnosis, distinguishing the neurotic from the perverse structure. The insatiable greed driving some fraudsters can be understood through the Lacanian concept of *plus-de-jouir*, or 'surplus-enjoyment'.

As articulated by theorists like McGowan (2024), *plus-de-jouir* is the libidinal correlate to Marxist surplus-value. In the logic of capitalism, the subject

is driven to a relentless pursuit of an excess of enjoyment which, by definition, never fully satisfies, generating a cycle of insatiable desire and transgressive repetition. The fraudster seeks not just wealth, but this 'surplus'.

This pursuit is articulated differently depending on the subject's psychic structure. While the neurotic commits a transgressive act as a symptom, a lapse that generates guilt and conflict with the internalised Law, the subject with a perverse structure operates differently. The pervert does not repress the Law; they disavow it (*Verleugnung*). They recognise the Law's existence but deny its validity over their enjoyment. For the pervert, the Law is not an impediment but an instrument to be manipulated to orchestrate their own pleasure in transgression.

As Londoño-Paredes (2025) analyses, the fraud is an affirmation that they are smarter than the system, an act that positions them as 'master of the game'. This distinction is crucial. The perverse fraudster is a master of mimicking conformity. Their acts may be technically 'correct' and difficult to detect as anomalies because they operate within the loopholes of the law, not against it.

An AI focused on detecting statistical deviations or even the behavioural traits of the 'dark triad' could be completely blind to this profile. Only the human investigator, through direct interaction and hermeneutic analysis, can perceive the perverse logic at work. This elevates the investigation from pattern detection to a clinical diagnosis of psychic structure.

The document as symptom: A psychoanalytic reading of the archive

Forensic investigation traditionally relies on the objectivity of documentary evidence. However, a critical perspective informed by Michel Foucault and Sigmund Freud reveals that documents - invoices, contracts, accounting entries - are not mere factual records but complex texts saturated with latent meaning, power, and unconscious desire. Applying a psychoanalytic 'listening' to the documentary field opens a powerful new frontier for fraud detection.

For Foucault (1969), the 'archive' is not a physical repository but 'the general system of the formation and transformation of statements'; a set of anonymous, historical rules that determine what can be said, by whom, and which discourses are considered true.

A corporation's accounting system, with its chart of accounts and revenue recognition policies, constitutes such an archive (Bigoni and Awais, 2024). It defines the discursive rules governing the production of financial 'truth'. Each accounting entry is a Foucauldian 'statement' (*énoncé*): a discursive event whose significance lies not in its correspondence to an external reality, but in its conformity to the rules of the archive.

The auditor's task thus transforms into an archaeology. The auditor-archaeologist asks not only, 'Is this entry correct?' but rather, 'What are the discursive rules of this organisation that made this fraudulent statement possible and "sayable"?' The WorldCom scandal, for instance, in which operating expenses were capitalised, was not a mere accounting error but a specific 'discursive practice' that allowed fraudulent statements to emerge as valid within the company's archive (Eichenwald, 2002).

If Foucault provides the structure for analysing the system, psychoanalysis provides the tools for reading its symptoms. Just as a slip of the tongue (*lapsus linguae*) can reveal a hidden truth, an error in writing (*lapsus calami*) can be a valuable symptom for the auditor. Errors in fraudulent documents cease to be mere oversights and become indices of the perpetrator's psychic conflict (Freud, 1901). This analysis extends beyond errors to the very language used to legitimise fraud. The case of Wirecard provides a paradigmatic example. A micro-discursive analysis by Touron and Daly (2023) reveals how its CEO used specific rhetorical strategies - positioning Wirecard as the 'leading' and 'largest' player - to sustain a narrative of success and deflect from irregularities. This shows how discourse analysis can be a powerful forensic tool, allowing the auditor to

'listen' to the defence mechanisms embedded in corporate narratives.

In the digital age, this archaeological perspective gains new urgency. The Foucauldian archive is now being encoded into AI algorithms. This has a dual consequence. On one hand, AI can detect systemic inconsistencies with superhuman efficiency. On the other, there is a more subtle risk: an AI trained on an organisation's historical data will learn not only its explicit accounting rules but also its implicit 'discursive practices', even if they are ethically questionable.

The AI can become a 'guardian of the archive' that paradoxically normalises the conditions for fraud, making it invisible as an anomaly because it has become part of the 'truth' the system has learned to recognise. The human auditor's task thus evolves from an archaeology of documents to an 'archaeology of the algorithm', questioning the rules the machine itself has internalised (Davis, 2025).

The algorithm as the 'Big Other': A crisis of symbolic authority

The transformation of the forensic landscape implies not only a change in tools but a fundamental displacement in the locus of symbolic authority. In Lacanian psychoanalysis, the 'Big Other' (le grand Autre) designates the symbolic order - the overarching structure of language, law, and social conventions that mediates our relationship with reality (Londoño-Paredes, 2025). For the traditional auditor, the Big Other was incarnated in the explicit corpus of Accounting Standards (IFRS, GAAP) and the regulatory framework. These were interpretable texts, subject to debate, hermeneutics, and professional judgment, functioning as historical constructs governing financial truth (Bigoni & Awais, 2024). The introduction of AI, however, threatens to substitute this symbolic structure with what might be termed the 'Algorithmic Big Other'.

This substitution presents a distinctive peril. Unlike the traditional Law, which is written and therefore open to deconstruction and reinterpretation, the Algorithmic Big Other often operates as an

inscrutable oracle (Davis, 2025). When an AI model flags a transaction as fraudulent with a 99% probability score, it presents a conclusion stripped of its dialectical reasoning. The machine speaks the 'truth' without the 'signifier' - it offers a result without a narrative. This places the auditor in a position of structural subjection: to disagree with the algorithm is to challenge a logic that is mathematically superior yet semantically silent. The risk is the foreclosure of the auditor's symbolic agency; the professional ceases to be an interpreter of the Law and becomes a mere executor of the probabilistic output, fundamentally altering the nature of their expertise (El-Ghozail et al., 2025).

Furthermore, this dynamic exacerbates the neurotic need for certainty. In a world of financial ambiguity, the definitive numerical outputs of AI offer a seductive, albeit false, sense of closure, mirroring the capitalist drive for excess and seamless functioning (McGowan, 2024). The auditor may unconsciously yield to the algorithm not because it is inherently correct, but because it alleviates the anxiety of judgment. This surrender constitutes a distinct form of alienation: the professional abdicates their role as the subject who is 'supposed to know' (sujet supposé savoir), projecting all knowledge onto the digital apparatus. Reclaiming the forensic practice, therefore, requires de-posing the algorithm from this position of absolute master. The human auditor must reinstall themselves as the final arbiter of meaning, treating the algorithmic output not as a verdict from the Big Other, but merely as one fragment of speech within the broader investigative discourse.

The ghost in the machine: Transference and the human-AI dyad

The interaction between the auditor and AI does not occur in a relational vacuum. Inevitably, the human professional projects unconscious feelings, expectations, and desires onto the machine, a phenomenon analogous to what psychoanalysis calls transference. Research shows that users of therapeutic chatbots often project emotional

responses onto AI systems, perceiving them as empathetic (Joseph and Babu, 2024).

In the context of forensic auditing, a professional faced with a tool promising superhuman efficiency may develop an idealising 'positive transference', placing excessive and uncritical trust in algorithmic outputs - the so-called 'automation bias'. Conversely, the opacity of the 'black box' can generate a 'negative transference' marked by suspicion and anxiety regarding hidden biases.

The crucial point is that this relational dynamic is fundamentally asymmetrical. The AI, being a-subjective, cannot participate in the dialectic. It has no unconscious and therefore no capacity for countertransference - the ability to perceive and analyse its own emotional reactions in response to the projections of another. It is the object of a transference but remains blind to the intersubjective field it creates. This establishes a new and critical role for the human auditor.

The future of the profession lies not only in auditing the results of AI, but in auditing the human's relationship with AI. The professional must develop the capacity for self-analysis, to perceive their own countertransference towards the machine - be it admiration, dependency, or distrust - in order to actively manage the transference and maintain professional scepticism.

The AI's inability to participate in this relational dialectic paradoxically reinforces the need for an even more sophisticated human expert, capable of navigating not only data but also the complex psychic currents that the technology itself unleashes.

Subjectivity as investigative praxis

The convergence of these arguments - the ontological limits of AI, the complexity of the fraudster's psyche, and the discursive nature of evidence - points towards the need for a new model for auditing practice. Instead of a competition between human and machine, the future lies in a sophisticated collaboration that can be termed 'Hybrid Intelligence'. This model proposes a deep

synergy where human subjectivity, far from being an obstacle, becomes the most potent analytical instrument and the final ethical guarantor of the process.

The justification for human protagonism is anchored in both biology and philosophy. Neuropsychanalysis, through the work of Mark Solms (2017), offers a biological basis, arguing that the core of consciousness is not computational (cortical) but affective, originating in primitive brainstem structures. Consciousness, in its primary form, is not thought but feeling. Contemporary AI, being an emulation of cortical functions, is an 'unconscious ego', devoid of the biological basis for affect and thus for genuine subjective experience.

Philosophically, the existentialism of Jean-Paul Sartre (1970) provides the ontological counterpoint: while AI possesses an 'essence' (its code) that precedes its 'existence', the human being is radically different. For humans, 'existence precedes essence'; we are 'condemned to be free' to create our own value.

In this Hybrid Intelligence model, the tools of psychoanalytic theory become the concrete praxis of the auditor. 'Floating attention' (*gleichschwebende Aufmerksamkeit*), proposed by Freud (1912), consists in not focusing on anything in particular, offering everything one hears (or reads) the same even attention. In the forensic context, this translates into a posture that goes beyond explicit content to capture atmosphere, subtext, lapses, and contradictions, whether in an interview or a document.

The investigation is a relational field where the phenomena of transference (feelings the subject projects onto the auditor) and, more importantly, countertransference (the auditor's own emotional and intuitive reactions) are inevitable. Contemporary psychoanalysis views countertransference not as an obstacle but as an essential diagnostic tool. The feelings an interviewee evokes in the auditor - confusion, suspicion,

boredom, admiration - are valuable data about the perpetrator's defensive or manipulative strategy.

This principle extends crucially to the interaction with AI. An auditor's emotional reaction to an algorithmic result - a feeling of 'strangeness' or 'distrust' even in the face of a logically coherent explanation from an XAI - can be an intuitive indicator that the model is operating with a hidden bias or that its logic, while internally consistent, does not correspond to the complex reality of the case. This intuitive 'gut feeling' can be understood as a sophisticated heuristic, a form of expert judgment that operates faster than conscious deliberation (Hodgkinson et al., 2023).

The auditor's countertransference thus functions as a 'bias audit' of last resort. The human's intuition and affective reaction act as an alert system that triggers when the machine's logic diverges from an embodied, contextual, and ethical understanding of the world. The most sophisticated skill of the future auditor will therefore not be logical analysis but affective metacognition: the ability to analyse one's own intuitive and emotional reactions to technology and use them as a tool of critical scrutiny.

This redefines professional scepticism in the age of AI, transforming it from a purely intellectual posture to a practice informed by affect. The transposition of these concepts requires a new paradigm of professional training, one that equips auditors with subjective competencies to complement their technical expertise through interdisciplinary curricula and advanced interview models (Xavier, 2020).

Conclusion

At the end of this interdisciplinary itinerary, a paradoxical and profoundly optimistic conclusion emerges. The crisis of professional identity, triggered by the rise of AI and initially presenting as a threat of obsolescence, reveals itself under deeper scrutiny as an evolutionary summons to rescue what is most essentially human in the craft of auditing and investigation. It has been demonstrated that AI, despite its computational power, operates within

insurmountable epistemological and ontological limits.

Its strength lies in the syntactic analysis of massive data, but its fundamental weakness is its blindness to semantics - to the meaning, intention, and affect that constitute the fabric of human reality. The 'black box problem' and the inability of AI to operate in the transference field show that the machine ultimately requires the validation, interpretation, and supervision of a human judge.

The investigation of fraud is not a problem of pattern detection but an exercise in the hermeneutics of the human condition. Psychoanalysis, particularly its Lacanian variant, offers a precise diagnosis of the fraudster's mind, revealing the logic of *plus-de-jour* and the dynamics of the perverse structure.

This paper has argued that documentary analysis must be approached with the same tools as interpersonal analysis, transforming accounting records into texts rich with latent meaning. The future of the auditor is not that of an adversary to the machine, but of its indispensable complement (Patzlaff, 2025). The role shifts from verifying compliance to interpreting intentions; from analysing numbers to analysing narratives and defence mechanisms. The auditor of the future will be less a software operator and more a clinician of the corporate psyche and an archaeologist of the business archive.

The ascent of the computational machine forces us to become more human, to cultivate precisely those capacities that distinguish us: creativity, emotional intelligence, intersubjective understanding, and ethical wisdom. The final paradox is that by delegating cold logic and calculation to the machine, we reclaim *logos* - in its broader Greek sense of reason, language, and meaning - for the exclusive domain of the human.

The true 'fraud' this paper seeks to unveil is not financial, but the philosophical fraud of late modernity: the belief that human value can be reduced to a computable function. AI, by taking this

belief to its *reductio ad absurdum*, becomes the unexpected instrument that allows us to unmask it and reaffirm the irreplaceable protagonism of subjectivity. As Sartre (1970) argues, a person is nothing else but what they make of themselves. In the age of AI, part of that making is to become the expert of the human soul that the machine can never be.

References

- 1) Bauman, Z. (1998). *The work, consumerism and the new poor*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- 2) Bauman, Z. (2005). *Liquid life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 3) Bigoni, M., & Awais, M. (2024). How does accounting history shape the past, present and future of society? *Accounting History Review*.
- 4) Callari, T. C., & Puppione, L. (2025). Meaningful work as shaped by employee work practices in human-AI collaborative environments. *European Journal of Information Management*.
- 5) Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3), 200-219.
- 6) Davis, B. R. (2025). Algorithmic proximate harm detection (APHD): A modular forensic framework for scoring user-level platform-mediated harm. *Zenodo*.
- 7) Du, M., Liu, N., & Hu, X. (2024). Explainable AI for cybersecurity: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 57(4), 1-38.
- 8) Eichenwald, K. (2002, August 8). For WorldCom, acquisitions were behind its rise and fall. *New York Times*.
- 9) El-Ghozail, M., Moustaid, F. E., & Bennani, S. (2025). Work in the age of prompts: How generative AI is redefining expertise and identity at work. *Moroccan Journal of Research in Management and Marketing*, 17(2).
- 10) Elhelaly, M. (2024, May). CEO narcissism and related party transactions. Paper presented at the EAA Annual Congress, Bucharest, Romania.
- 11) Ferrara, E. (2024). Fairness and bias in artificial intelligence: A brief survey of sources, impacts, and mitigation strategies. *Sci*, 6(3).
- 12) Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications. (Original work published 1969)
- 13) Freud, S. (1958). Recommendations to physicians practising psycho-analysis. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 12). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1912)
- 14) Freud, S. (1960). The psychopathology of everyday life. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 6). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1901)
- 15) Freud, S. (1961). Civilization and its discontents. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 21). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1930)
- 16) Giddens, A. (1991). *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 17) Guattari, F. (2000). *The three ecologies*. London: Athlone Press. (Original work published 1989)
- 18) Hodgkinson, G. P., de-Heer, E. A. J. A., Bacon, A. P. D., & Healey, M. P. (2023). The heuristics and biases of top managers: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Management Studies*, 60(5), 1033-1063.
- 19) Joseph, A. P., & Babu, A. (2024). Transference and the psychological interplay in AI-enhanced mental healthcare. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 15.
- 20) Londoño-Paredes, D. E. (2025). *A psychoanalysis of act and action: An itinerary through Lacan, philosophy, and crime*. London: Routledge.
- 21) McGowan, T. (2024). *Pure excess: Capitalism and the commodity*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- 22) Oelrich, S. (2024, May). The dark side of budgets: Influence of dark triad traits on

- honesty in budgeting. Paper presented at the EAA Annual Congress, Bucharest, Romania.
- 23) Patzlaff, A. C. (2025). Entre Freud e a Fraude: o Protagonismo da Subjetividade Humana na Era das Investigações Mediadas por IA. Paper presented at the Congresso da Liga Acadêmica de Psicanálise da UEL, Londrina, Brazil.
- 24) Ramamoorti, S., Morrison, D., & Koletar, J. W. (2014). Bringing Freud to fraud: Understanding the state-of-mind of the C-level suite/white collar offender through "A-B-C" analysis. *Journal of Forensic & Investigative Accounting*, 6(1), 46-85.
- 25) Sartre, J.-P. (2007). *Existentialism is a humanism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. (Original work published 1946)
- 26) Solms, M. (2017). What is "the unconscious," and where is it located in the brain? A neuropsychanalytic perspective. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1406(1), 90-97.
- 27) Tournon, P., & Daly, P. (2023, May). Legitimation of accounting fraud: A micro-discursive analysis of Wirecard's CEO. Paper presented at the EAA Annual Congress, Helsinki, Finland.
- 28) World Economic Forum. (2025). *The future of jobs report 2025*. Geneva: Author.
- 29) Xavier, D. M. S. (2020). *Auditoria Forense em Portugal: Pertinência da criação de uma Formação Avançada no Ensino* (Master's dissertation). Universidade do Minho.