

Why The Elite Class Wants You to Fear AI

For all the fretting and the hand wringing about artificial intelligence, it is worth stepping back for a moment and noticing what is quietly (or not so quietly) changing in the background.

Much of the public conversation fixates on the risks AI introduces. That focus is justified. In the hands of unbridled corporate giants that already control the political class, artificial intelligence becomes almost inevitably a weapon of mass destruction. To argue otherwise is to drift into irrationality and ignore a basic truth: Power behaves like power.

But the conversation often misses a more fundamental shift: The barriers that once determined who could create, who could build, and who could be heard are eroding at a speed that would have been difficult to imagine even a decade ago. This shift is making the privileged and the elites – [the so-called 9.9%](#) – very uncomfortable.

Let me explain.

For most of modern history, the ability to turn an idea into reality depended heavily on access. Access to elite education, access to networks that could open doors, your lineage, your access to capital that could sustain early failure, and sometimes, the fact that you are a brutal person with little regard for whom you will hurt or what damage you will cause on your way up. A person, a strong sense for doing good, compassion, or with a sharp insight and a healthy but not destructive will, but without those advantages often remained invisible. Today that equation is breaking down. A single individual with a laptop can design a product, write the code, generate marketing material, and reach an audience at scale. Consider the independent developer who builds a simple tool to help gig workers track fluctuating income and taxes. In the past, that person would have needed a team, funding, and distribution channels. Now they can build a prototype with AI assistance, test it with real users online, and refine it quickly based

on feedback. And on top of that, the problem they are solving is not abstract or elite. It is immediate and widely felt.

This shift is even more powerful because it favors people who are not overly conditioned by the existing system. Someone trained within a narrow professional framework often sees problems through that lens. Someone outside it may see the problem more directly. A warehouse worker might notice inefficiencies in shift scheduling that no consultant ever spots on any spreadsheet, no matter how exquisitely built. A caregiver might recognize gaps in coordination that no healthcare executive fully understands. With the tools now available, those observations can be translated into solutions without requiring permission from established institutions.

Then there is language.

Language has long been another immense gatekeeper. The ability to articulate an idea in polished, credentialed phraseologies often mattered as much as the idea itself. A venture pitch written in perfect jargon by a well connected graduate could attract funding even if the underlying concept was mediocre. Meanwhile, a brilliant idea expressed awkwardly might be dismissed. AI is flattening that distinction. A person can describe their idea plainly and receive help refining it into clear, persuasive language. This does not guarantee success, but it reduces the unfair advantage of presentation over substance. It becomes easier for the strength of the idea to carry more weight than the pedigree of the speaker.

Even the unsettling rise of synthetic media may carry a long term benefit. Today, people are still adjusting to a world where images, audio, and video can be fabricated convincingly. There are real harms in this transition period, as false clips spread and mislead. Yet there is a plausible endpoint where the public becomes far more skeptical of surface level evidence. When a shocking video appears online, the instinctive reaction may shift from belief to verification. This would represent a cultural change and in a real sense, a much welcome maturation of our epistemological receptors. For decades, people were conditioned to treat recorded media as proof. If that assumption dissolves, manipulation becomes harder, not easier,

because it no longer works automatically. A society that questions what it sees may ultimately be more resilient than one that trusts too quickly.

At the same time, automation is poised to remove large portions of the work that currently structures daily life. Much of that work is repetitive and draining. Data entry, routine customer service interactions, basic administrative processing, and countless other tasks consume human time without offering much in return beyond a paycheck. If these roles disappear, there will be disruption, but there is also an opportunity. Imagine a call center worker whose job is replaced by an automated system. In the current framework, that is simply a loss. In a different framework, it could be a transition into work that is more meaningful or into activities that are not traditionally classified as work at all, such as caring for family, creating art, or participating in community life.

Obviously, the economic implications are substantial. If goods and services can be produced more efficiently, their cost will fall. We already see early versions of this in software, education, and design. A small business owner can now generate branding, legal templates, and marketing campaigns at a fraction of the previous cost. As these efficiencies spread into physical production and logistics, the same pattern could apply to housing components, transportation, and healthcare support. Abundance becomes more plausible in certain domains, but it introduces a new problem: If fewer people are needed to produce that abundance, then fewer people will earn income through traditional labor.

This creates a tension that cannot be ignored. A system built on wages assumes that most people can sell their labor in exchange for a livelihood. If that assumption weakens, then the system must evolve. This does not automatically require a leap to extreme models where everyone receives everything they want or where all outcomes are equalized. It does, however, require rethinking what counts as contribution and how value is recognized. A person who mentors others in their community, creates widely appreciated art, or contributes to local problem solving may be generating real social value even if it does not show up in a paycheck. In a

world with more free time, these forms of contribution could become more central.

There are already small glimpses of this shift. Open source software communities operate on a model where individuals contribute code, documentation, and support without direct payment, yet the collective output powers large parts of the global economy. Content creators build audiences by sharing knowledge or entertainment, and in some cases they are supported directly by those audiences. Local volunteer networks step in during crises and provide coordination that formal institutions struggle to match. These examples are partial and imperfect, but they suggest that value can be created and recognized outside traditional employment structures.

It's crucial to note, however, that none of this unfolds smoothly if inequality is left unchecked. If a large segment of the population has ample time but lacks access to resources, frustration will grow. People do not remain passive in the face of a system they perceive as unfair, especially when they have the time and the tools to organize. History offers many examples where economic dislocation combined with perceived injustice leads to unrest. The difference now is that communication and coordination are faster and more decentralized. That makes the stakes higher. A society that benefits from technological abundance but distributes it narrowly is likely to face sustained instability.

The emerging landscape is not automatically good or bad. It is a set of shifting constraints and possibilities. What stands out is that some of the long standing advantages tied to status, credentials, and access are weakening, while the importance of direct insight, creativity, and initiative is increasing. Hence the outcry from those who have most to lose. At the same time, the foundations of how people earn a living and how resources are distributed are being challenged. If those two trends are aligned thoughtfully, the result could be a more open and dynamic system. If they are not, the friction between them will define the next phase of conflict.