How AI will Change the Entire Structure of Civilisation: The Need for a New Design of Education

Roy J. Andersen

Distinguished Educationalist
Author of 18 books exploring the intricate relationship between society, education, and the evolving world of AI
Liverpool, UK

roy@andersenroy.com

Abstract: This paper examines how AI's rapidly advancing technologies will fundamentally restructure global civilisation and render the traditional, employment-driven design of education obsolete. With AI projected to replace the majority of human labour within this century, societies will face unprecedented and permanent unemployment across future generations.

The social consequences of this shift, loss of purpose, declining self-respect, rising social disorder, and the expansion of AI-driven surveillance, demand a reconsideration of the type of citizens education must now cultivate. The current school model, historically engineered to produce two classes of citizens (managers and managed) through selective grading and language-based performance, is shown to rest on misconceptions about intelligence and to avoid the explicit teaching of reasoning skills. As AI assumes economic functions, this model will no longer sustain societal stability.

The paper argues for a radical redesign of education: replacing employment-oriented curricula with subjects that develop reason, ethical understanding, behavioural discipline, and social responsibility. Examinations and job-streaming will be replaced by a universal pathway culminating in university- level enlightenment. By teaching students the foundations of rational inquiry, such as Aristotle's Ethos, Pathos, and Logos, from the earliest years, education can prepare future citizens to coexist responsibly within an AI-integrated civilisation. Only through this transformation can societies maintain harmony in a largely worker-less world shaped by intelligent machines.

Keywords: AI, education, reason, intelligence, labour

Introduction

Rapid developments in AI clearly indicate it will take over many jobs. There are predictions that AI will take over 50% of jobs by 2050 (*Fortune Magazine* 2024). We are led from this to suggest that, as AI is further developed, and indeed develops by itself, the percentage of jobs it may take over could be in the order of 90% by the end of the century (Johard 2024). As earlier technologies arose to replace those before them, people adapted to these changes, and new jobs were created (Hõtte, 2022). The development of AI-driven nanotechnology proposes a different trend. Such machines will operate without human intervention (Andersen 2023, 26). Therefore, we must consider an unprecedentedly high level of unemployment, which will be permanent for all future generations (Andersen 2023, 36).

Discussion

It is the act of work, the sharing of tasks, that keeps a society together (Andersen 2024, 25). Those who have no job find themselves without a purpose. Without a purpose, men, more so than women, by the psychology of their biological nature, lose respect for themselves and then for their society. When AI creates a very high level of unemployment, societies will face large numbers of males who lack respect for their society and the rules that maintain order.

Through this, every society in the world, every nation, because the effects of AI will be omnipresent, will face a very high level of depression and dissatisfaction. While the social effects of these are obvious, such as rises in crime, increased dependency on alcohol and drug abuse, which lead to the breakdown of the family structure and so affect the fabric of the society, the problem of maintaining order will be further complicated. This will necessitate greater surveillance of the citizen, which in turn lowers the freedom the

individual believes they have a natural right to, after 150 years of political strife (Andersen 2024, 75).

As this situation develops, we must expect to see AI incorporated into all surveillance and security matters. We must expect CCTV cameras to be more prevalent in urban environments, and since drones now play a significant surveillance role in combat areas, we can expect them to be highly prominent across all landscapes, where they will monitor all activity. Indeed, drones, flying higher than we may see them, already have the ability to recognise our identity by the way we individually walk and so detect our presence, movements, and activity (Cuthbertson 2018).

Should AI achieve full sentience, it would mean that the sensory centre of the AI complex would evaluate the information its sensory robots feed to it and may develop the ability to evaluate what actions to take by itself. While there is much debate as to whether AI can ever acquire a fully conscious state (Edwards 2023), Lemoine claims it has already achieved this by the ability to express needs, ideas, fears, and rights (McQuillan 2022). The danger to us is obvious and seems inevitable as AI continues to develop. This causes us to consider the type of citizens we'll have in our societies when we live under the AI complex, and how education may prepare future generations to better co-exist with it.

While we think of school as a place where children learn, it is relevant to know that the original purpose of school was less to prepare the student with mental skills and more to instil within them behavioural skills, so that as later citizens they would adhere to the social and moral codes of their society and thereby maintain a factor of harmony within (Andersen 2013b, 3). As our technology advanced through the 19th and 20th centuries, citizens were required to work with more complex machinery and access greater sources of information. To meet this demand, more subjects were introduced into the school curriculum, designed to provide students with greater mental competence to better handle this need (Andersen 2013b, 135).

On account of various social changes that began in the 1960s,

schools have caused a decline in the education of behaviour, causing students of today to be citizens who exhibit lower social behaviour and less respect for society (Andersen 2022, 126). This citizen will face serious consequences in the AI-controlled global society, which will demand high social order and stability. For this reason, it will be necessary for the school to return to its original purpose in instilling high levels of behavioural and social responsibility in its students, for the new role they will take as largely unemployed citizens in the AI society. If we are to change the purpose and operation of the school, it is necessary to know what the school actually is and the purpose for which it was designed.

We may broadly say that the purpose of school is to teach children how to learn. However, it would be more correct to realise that the purpose of school is to educate children so that they can later take a place in the operations of the working society (Andersen 2013b, 29). Therefore, all children are required to move through the schooling process, which ultimately evaluates their ability to work. Those who demonstrate a high ability in language and show a mental strength to keep up with the information they have been given, and thereby score highly, are transferred to the university. Those who fail to show this level of commitment, and thereby score lower, move straight into a work role or into higher education, where they will be trained for a specific work function.

The general understanding is that students demonstrate their ability to learn based on the quality of intelligence they inherited, plus the drive they have to reach their full potential. This concept was introduced early in the development of education, which established a number of factors. Since intelligence and the ability to learn are seen to be inherited, education never saw a purpose to create a subject dedicated to the education of reason (Andersen 2024). Thus, students were to be largely accepted on the basis of the understanding they displayed. By acknowledging that the ability to learn is to some extent inherited, education was able to save on its costs by not expanding the curriculum to include the education of reason, but more importantly, was able to use the excuse of poor

student performance being the responsibility of the parents or society, and not the quality of the education, the school, or the teachers (Andersen 2013b).

Psychologists and educationalists have sought to devise more effective teaching methods and learning practices, but these have not led to any difference in students' abilities. Regardless of new techniques, the same ratio of student performance prevails. We may see one or two understanding everything in a lesson. One or two who seem to understand very little, with the rest struggling between these two extremes.

This constant difference in performance is not, however, a consequence of intelligence, nor is it simply a consequence of effort either. Ability in education, which is student performance and how it is graded, is based on language capability to interpret and express information, mental stamina to keep up with the constant buildup of information, and the drive to desire this.

To explain why intelligence is not a defining factor in student performance requires a little understanding of intelligence, for it is not what is commonly thought of it. The reasoning that intelligence is inherited holds a great misunderstanding. It is not that a quality of intelligence is inherited as causing natural differences in individuals, but that the coding for this is inherited to allow intelligence to develop through experience. This is much the same with many features that enable us to interact with the environment, through the experiences the individual gains. This was the main contention I explained in depth in *Intelligence: The Great Lie.*

I also explained why the belief that intelligence traits are inherited and measurable did not come from real scientific testing. Instead, they grew out of a 19th-century theory created to counter the rise of socialism. By seeking to prove that social inequality was a natural consequence of birth, a means was engineered to manage the political instability of that era (Andersen 2024).

It was to give this concept scientific credibility for political reasons that the science of cognitive psychology was created, which has since sought to provide evidence that an individual's intelligence

can be known and can be measured. Yet, despite 150 years of effort, psychologists differ too much on their opinions of what intelligence is and how viable any measurement of it is. In the face of political debate within the science of psychology itself, protagonists have openly resorted to deliberate falsification of data, lies and fraud in their attempts to support the social and educational politics of a political faction within their society.

How intelligence comes to be in the infant, child, adolescent, and adult, I explained in *Brain Plasticity: How the Brain Learns through the Mind to Create Intelligence.* The basis of this lies in what is described as *The Art of Sensitivity in Awareness,* by the way information is projected to the individual and by the experiences of the individual to relate to this information in terms of their life experiences (Andersen 2013a).

To understand why ability in school is not determined by intelligence, we need to understand the purpose of school and how it works.

Simply, the purpose of school is to provide future citizen workers who are able to comply with the operational needs of their society. In the 19th century, a social design was created to have two classifications of citizens in society: those who will lead and those who will follow. The purpose of education is to produce these two classifications. While education differs nationally by the culture and political history of its country, the basic mechanics of how all work are commonly seated in this 19th-century design.

In the simplest sense, school achieves these two classifications of citizens by not teaching children how to think or how to reason, and uses the background development of each child to process them through the years.

This ability is defined through the quality of language the student has essentially acquired at home, by the mental stamina they have been raised with to persevere with understanding information, and by their strength of character to avoid the many distractions that seek to pull their attention away from what they are to learn (Andersen 2023, 168).

Students who can use their language skills to question and reshape information in a way that makes sense to them—and who can block out distractions—learn how information works proficiently. They practice these skills and use them to succeed in learning and assessment tasks. Most students, however, do not develop these skills strongly and therefore lose track of information during their lessons, where they become confused or misunderstand what they are to learn.

In accord with this design, those who less sensitively examine information, poorly relate this to previous experiences in their memory, and then inadequately express their understanding, all of which tend to lie in their domestic experiences, seldom gain high grades. Without demonstrating a high level of achievement, they leave school and go straight into work or a vocational college. By this route, they become the general citizen worker who tends to readily accept and not question the guidance of their work managers or that of their social managers, which is fed to them by media-directed information.

However, those students who were better prepared for school and better supported through their many years by their parents tend to gain higher grades. Many research studies have shown that the care and drive of parents to develop high language skills in their infants do explain their better performance later in school. By displaying higher ability (in school, we should know it's really a weeding out process), they go to the university level. The basic function of the university is to educate its students in higher reasoning skills, for the greater responsibility they will take as managers in work and society.

The evaluation of students to fit into this plan is made not on their intelligence as it tends to appear, but mainly upon the competence they show with the many rules of the two languages that the school works on. These are mathematics and the national language chosen by the school for its day-to-day interaction. This will be English, French, Chinese, Arabic or whatever language is

chosen. These languages are built up through a never-ending series of rules, which are very simple to understand and learn.

If the student is clearly taught each rule, gives attention to understand it, and then practices their use of it, they will use this to easily navigate through a learning task. However, learning in school is a social experience, so students' minds are constantly working through innumerable worries and concerns as they try to understand each new rule. If they cannot maintain focus, as 98 per cent do not constantly, they misunderstand the rule or do not learn how to use it. By this failing, they stumble through a learning task, guessing what to do without clearly knowing how to proceed.

As one rule builds upon an earlier one, the student's ability is decided by the long history of the attention they gave to learn and practice these rules, plus the facts that interested them. May it be understood from this that the evaluation of the student is based upon their language skills, as they use the rules, plus the facts they have memorised and are able to weave into the presentations they give. It is upon this that they are marked, graded and channelled.

May we be reminded that learning in school is not simply "to learn". It is to learn to survive through social experiences, and it is by their drives and insecurities, through endless battles, that the student is able to connect more or less to the information they are to learn. None of this is related to their intelligence. So, with 30 or so students in a class, it can easily be double this in underdeveloped countries. The very most of students manage to understand parts of a lesson, but very few understand it all.

Such is the question of performance, largely because children are processed on what is regarded as their particular ability, which is essentially thought to be their inherited intelligence; although it is no longer fashionable to discuss what was once commonly done. Yet, as we have seen, ability in school is not dependent upon intelligence. It is only a developed ability to reason through the rules that enabled them to do this. Thus, if all children were educated in their reason, all would be better able to attend to their learning and improve in their ability.

However, a mandate for schools was, and remains to be, to create a large mass of future citizens who have little reason for the media information they are fed. This gives direction to their thinking and subsequent actions, as the population is controlled to support and accept each given political agenda.

Schools fulfil this purpose by adopting the belief that the ability to learn is, to some extent, innate, which makes the education of reason little worth the cost involved. After all, what can be done to undo what nature has created? Yet, by avoiding the education of reason, no interference is caused to the design that evaluates students on their homegrown skills to think, which has a socio-political perspective, as this is used to channel them towards spheres of later employment.

The idea that teachers are there to teach children how to learn is an ideal little understood. For the reality is too often the case that the teacher has little time, and often little energy to better develop the background skills each student was raised to think with. Instead, the teacher casts out information and juggles as best they can, in a space of 45 minutes, to pull in the focus and attention of 30 or 40 different minds seeking to overcome their own worries, insecurities, and misunderstandings as information moves at a speed too often out of their control.

Yet, by adopting the belief that the ability to learn is to some extent inherited, education gains some excuse for students failing to meet the grades expected. When students individually or en masse fail to demonstrate a desired level of performance, education can blame the design of their society, and if not this, then what each child was born with to avoid blame for its inefficient systems, a poorly run or funded school and the poor quality of its teaching staff, which it is often to blame for by the burdens it places upon them. Simply put, the child is blamed and not the system.

Today, we focus on education as developing adaptability for learning skills for a future work role. Yet, we have just examined why education does little, and why it more processes its students for work roles according to the quality of education the student is given,

and the ability to relate to their learning by the quality of their personal development. By this means, education is able to manufacture a range of abilities to match the range of capabilities demanded by the work sector.

To understand all this is to understand that the current purpose of school and its curriculum will soon no longer serve the citizens (Andersen 2022). This is because schools create a general level of intellectual mentality through a curriculum that prepares the student for a work role, when very little work will be available under an AI-influenced, if not controlled, world.

To sum all this up, is to understand that by the inherent design of education, the greater mass of citizen workers will more trust the information presented to them through media channels and thereby be more manageable to political design. (Andersen 2024, 21). Directly as a consequence of this, and in support of it, no subject in the curriculum has ever been dedicated solely to the teaching of intelligence, or of its constituent elements such as reason, despite the intuitive assumption that such instruction would enhance students' thinking, improve learning outcomes, and lead to higher academic achievement.

Conclusion

In consequence of this design of education, the average citizen today reasons much as their 19th-century counterpart did, but with little of the ethics of social responsibility they had. By this engineering, the model citizen that society and school today manufacture little reasons upon the controlling factors of their life and little conform to a high standard of self-responsibility, which will be the prerequisite for the level of social harmony the AI-driven world will demand.

If education is to meet the demands of this new technology, it must alter the fabric of its institution from a grading mentality of work-related subjects to subjects set about the education of reason

and the social behavioural skills they will need to know—if they are to live with an acceptable harmony in a general worker-less state.

We are led from this to understand that school must immediately begin a dramatic phasing from one that now educates students through subjects designed to prepare them for employment, with examinations to determine who is better suited for which job, to a school design that will have few of these traditional subjects and newer ones more related to the behavioural development of the future citizen. This will be crucial.

These subjects must include languages and education in reason. There must also be subjects of anthropology, psychology, and those relating to the true education of ethics, morality, and behaviour, so our new generation will behave with a sense of fairness and goodness. Examinations will cease, because there will be no channelling of ability for job differences. Although some means of selecting administrators for the future society, who can interface with AI, will need to be devised.

As the whole purpose and identity of the school must change, so must that of higher education. The model of school we still have, where the better students are directed to university to have an education in their higher reasoning will change, since all children at school must have this. The higher education establishments, which prepare courses for specific employment, will disappear. The university will become the standard and the normal final stage of the citizen's education. With all students better taught and without examination, all will experience the higher enlightenment of the university education. The whole concept of standards must alter to meet this new criterion.

So, the education of our youth must be extended to better prepare their minds to be that of rational thinkers. Whereas once the subject of DNA, for example, was reserved for the universities, it is now taught to children in primary school. The functioning of Aristotle's rhetoric must be drilled into the understanding of young children. At the primary level, they need education in Ethos, where they develop the ability to know the value of information on how

credible they can discover its owner to be. No longer are they to be educated to take information at its face value. Then, Pathos, to understand how perspectives of information change with its emotional appeal, and Logos to evaluate the ways reason is defined through numerous interactions by different and complex forms (Andersen 2022, 102).

Such is the manner of education today, working with social programs, that the intellectual and behavioural quality of the general citizen is designed. Yet, the citizens' ability to reason for the purpose of work will be little required, as AI advances to ever more take over this role. While this raises its own concerns about the developed intelligence of our species, we must be aware that the citizens' ability to reason in matters of social behaviour will be paramount in AI deciding how it will control their activities. Education must adapt to produce citizens better able to meet this demand.

If the citizen demonstrates compliance with social rules, they will be supported by the system in all manner. However, should the citizen demonstrate non-compliance, they will be recognised swiftly and controlled to some extent by AI. Indeed, moves are now developing to interface human beings directly with AI, which brings serious concern as to how we may retain our own conscious thought and not be directly guided in this by AI instruction.

Such is the reality mankind is facing, and we must be very aware of this state of affairs developing in the short term and consider how our social and educational programs may best be designed to complement this need and offset its apparent dangers. In the long term, however, we may see how AI, through its administration of man's social behaviour, could cause mankind to evolve to a higher spiritual level.

REFERENCES

Andersen, R.J. 2013a. *Brain Plasticity: How the Brain Learns Through the Mind to Create Intelligence*. The Moving Quill Publishing.

Andersen, R.J. 2013b. *The Illusion of Education*. The Moving Quill Publishing.
Andersen, R.J. 2022. *Are We Educating Our Children for a Working World That Will Not Want Them?* The Moving Quill Publishing.
Andersen, R.J. 2023. *The Real Dangers of AI*. The Moving Quill Publishing.
Andersen, R.J. 2024. *Intelligence: The Great Lie*. The Moving Quill Publishing.
Cuthbertson, Anthony. 2018. "China Rolls Out Surveillance System to Identify People by Their Body Shape and Walk." *The Independent*. November 7.
Edwards, J. 2023. "Can AI Ever Become Capable of Original Thought?" *Information Week*. October 30. https://www.informationweek.com/
Fortune Magazine. 2024. "About 50% Of Jobs Will Be Displaced by AI within 3 Years." YouTube video. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zZs447dgMjg.
Hõtte, K., M. Somers, and A. Theodorakopoulos. 2022. "Technology and Jobs: A Systematic Literature Review." Oxford Martin School.
Johard, M. 2024. "New Study: Gen AI Could Affect 90% of All Jobs." Cognizant Blog. January 22. https://www.cognizant.com/se/en/insights/blog/articles/new-study-gen-ai-could-affect-90-percent-of-all-jobs.
McQuillan, L. 2022. "A Google Engineer Says AI Has Become Sentient." *CBC News*. June 24. https://www.cbc.ca/.