The Age of Artificial Intelligence: Labor Force Transformation, Productivity Expansion, and the Paradigmatic Reconstruction of Distributive Economics

*Zhiping Ren[1], Yangyan He[2]**
**Corresponding author: Yangyan He*
[1]Lingnan Science Industry Press, Research Fellow;
[2]Department of Economics, Nanfang College, Guangzhou, China, yaraine@163.com

Keywords

artificial intelligence; automation; labor; human capital; income distribution; universal basic income; economics of meaning

ABSTRACT

Generative artificial intelligence, autonomous agents, and embodied intelligence are extending the range of cognitive and physical tasks that machines can perform. This development places new pressure on the conventional assumption that labor and capital are complementary inputs. This paper examines the changing explanatory scope of the Cobb-Douglas production function, labor-value theory, and human-capital theory under conditions of advanced automation. It distinguishes task substitution, occupational restructuring, and the complete withdrawal of labor from production, and argues that these propositions should not be conflated. A set of formal expressions is used to clarify the relationships among automation, labor income, effective demand, and the sharing of returns to intelligent capital. The analysis further considers universal basic income, data governance, and human development as possible elements of an institutional response. The paper does not predict a fixed timetable for technological displacement. Rather, it offers a conditional analytical framework for understanding how the focus of economics may shift from production efficiency toward distribution, demand maintenance, and human well-being.

1. Introduction

Labor has never been merely a technical variable in economics. It is an input into production, but it is also the principal route through which most people enter the income-distribution system. Economics has traditionally begun from scarcity and has treated the allocation and exchange of limited resources as a central problem (Robbins, 1932). During industrialization, machines repeatedly replaced particular operations, yet new industries, occupations, and educational pathways often reorganized labor.

This experience helped establish the influential view that technical change raises productivity while workers move toward tasks of higher value.

Artificial intelligence creates a different concern because it may enter several links of the production process at once. Text, image, and code generation affect knowledge work; agents can connect retrieval, planning, and workflow execution; embodied systems seek to combine perception, decision-making, and physical action. Agrawal, Gans, and Goldfarb (2018) describe a major economic effect of AI as a reduction in the cost of prediction, while Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) draw attention to the adjustment pressures created by the automation of cognitive tasks. The relevant questions are therefore not whether labor will disappear overnight, but which tasks are substituted, which are reorganized, who receives the new returns, and how income remains connected to demand.

This paper does not treat the phrase 'the uselessness of human resources' as an empirical fact. It uses the phrase as a theoretical stress test. The question is whether, as a larger set of productive tasks can be performed by intelligent capital, established accounts of production, wages, and human-capital investment require qualification. The paper is a theoretical and normative inquiry; it does not estimate the speed of AI diffusion or forecast a determinate employment outcome.

2. Conceptual Scope and Analytical Starting Point

A discussion of AI and labor should not treat occupations, jobs, and tasks as interchangeable. Occupations are bundles of tasks, and jobs are embedded in organizations, responsibility chains, and institutional settings. Information sorting, preliminary assessment, and standardized communication within the same occupation may be automated, while on-site coordination, accountability, difficult negotiation, and value judgment may remain human tasks. Frey and Osborne (2017) estimate the technical susceptibility of occupations to computerization; such estimates cannot be read directly as unemployment forecasts because adoption also depends on cost, regulation, organizational adjustment, and demand.

Three propositions should therefore be distinguished. First, a declining labor share means that labor compensation forms a smaller proportion of total income. Second, task restructuring means that workers move from direct execution toward supervision, verification, coordination, maintenance, or relational service. Third, the complete withdrawal of labor means that production no longer requires humans to perform any economically meaningful task. Autor (2015) notes that automation may replace tasks but may also expand output and create complementarities that raise labor demand. The first two changes can be observed in some settings; the third is an extreme case requiring additional conditions.

The task framework developed by Acemoglu and Restrepo (2018) is useful in this regard. Automation can displace workers from existing tasks, whereas the creation of new tasks can increase labor demand. The relative strength of these forces is shaped not by technology alone but also by capital costs, education, market structure, and public policy. Labor's possible removal as a production factor is thus not a timetable. It is a conditional proposition for examining the limits of existing theory.

3. The Labor Term in the Production Function and Its Boundary

In its common form, the Cobb-Douglas production function is written as follows:

$$Y_t = A_t K^{\alpha} L^{\beta} \quad (1)$$

Here, Y_t denotes total output in period t; A_t denotes total factor productivity; K and L denote capital and labor inputs; and alpha and beta are the relevant output elasticities. Alpha plus beta equals one only under constant returns to scale. Output elasticities can be related to factor-income shares only under further assumptions, such as competitive factor markets. The equation therefore does not by itself justify an empirical conclusion about labor compensation.

The effect of AI can be represented by an expanded production relationship. The purpose of the following expression is not to provide a directly estimable structural model, but to show how computing, energy, data, and institutional conditions may jointly affect output:

$$Y_t = A_t F(K_t^c, K_t^e, D_t, L_t; Z_t) \quad (2)$$

In Equation (2), K_t^c denotes computing capital, K_t^e energy and equipment capital, D_t data that can be lawfully used, and Z_t organizational capability, regulation, network infrastructure, and other complementary conditions. Labor remains in the function because actual automation does not imply the immediate disappearance of labor. The expression highlights that AI productivity depends on several complementary inputs. Ignoring data governance, energy constraints, or organizational adaptation would overstate what a model alone can accomplish.

A change in labor's distributive position can be observed through the labor-income share:

$$s_{L,t} = \frac{w\_t\,L\_t}{Y\_t} \quad (3)$$

In Equation (3), w_t is unit labor compensation and s_L,t is the labor-income share in period t. A lower labor share may result from lower labor input, real wages growing more slowly than output, or faster growth in capital income. It is not equivalent to the proposition that labor no longer participates in production. A careful assessment must consider wages, employment, hours, capital income, and prices together rather than treating one indicator as decisive.

4. Labor Value, Human Capital, and Organizational Change

Labor-value theory places living labor at the center of value creation and relates commodity value to socially necessary labor time (Marx, 1990). Production settings in which algorithms plan, robots execute, and automated systems inspect output raise a serious theoretical question: how should price, profit, and distribution be interpreted if direct human labor declines as a scarce input? This question calls for a careful statement of theoretical scope; it does not erase labor's historical or continuing role.

Human-capital theory faces a new comparison as well. Schultz (1961) and Becker (1964) treat education, training, and health as investments that yield returns. An AI model may require substantial initial training resources, yet its capabilities can be deployed and updated at many endpoints. This can reduce the scarcity premium attached to some standardized knowledge skills and change how organizations allocate training resources. Susskind (2020) discusses the risk that technical change may weaken the stability of labor income. Yet the returns to learning are not exhausted by wages: critical judgment, cooperation, professional ethics, and civic participation remain essential capabilities in a complex society.

Organizations will not become mere collections of interfaces. When models and software systems assume part of execution, organizations must devote greater effort to goal setting, data quality, model monitoring, responsibility tracing, and exception handling. Traditional human-resource concerns about incentives and coordination do not disappear; they become interwoven with system reliability, algorithmic governance, and the allocation of responsibility. The phrase 'a shift from human-resource management to systems governance' describes this change more accurately than the claim that human resources have become useless.

5. Automation, Income Distribution, and Effective Demand

The central challenge of a highly automated economy is not simply whether more can be produced. It is whether additional output can be converted into broad and durable improvements in living conditions. Ford (2015) emphasizes that productivity gains do not automatically translate into improved household income. The national-income identity provides a simple point of departure:

$$Y_t = C_t + I_t + G_t + NX_t \quad (4)$$

In Equation (4), C_t, I_t, G_t, and NX_t denote consumption, investment, government expenditure, and net exports. Automation can raise potential output without ensuring that consumption demand rises at the same pace. If households rely primarily on wages for disposable income while labor compensation grows more slowly than output, the consumption side may become a constraint on the economic circuit.

Household disposable income can be written more explicitly as:

$$Y_t^d = W_t L_t + \Pi_t + Tr_t - T_t \quad (5)$$

In Equation (5), Y_t^d is disposable income, W_tL_t is labor income, Pi_t is property income received by households, Tr_t is transfer income, and T_t is taxes and charges. If automation mainly raises capital income while ownership of capital is highly concentrated, market income alone may not convert productivity gains into purchasing power for most residents. The issue then extends from whether jobs exist to how households share in growth.

Keynes's reflections on technology and leisure remind us that material abundance does not automatically create social stability (Keynes, 1930/1963). When productive capacity rises, distributional institutions, public services, and working-time arrangements affect whether technical gains are widely shared. Weak effective demand may, in turn, reduce investment incentives, leave capacity idle, and diminish the benefits of technological progress.

6. Institutional Options for Sharing Returns to Automation

Universal basic income is frequently discussed in relation to automation. Its central purpose is not to assume that everyone should withdraw from the labor market. Rather, it provides a basic floor that is not conditional on employment when income sources become unstable. If part of the returns associated with automation is placed in a public pool, per-capita basic income can be represented for accounting purposes as follows:

$$UBI_t = \frac{\eta\_t \Pi\_t}{N\_t},\ 0 \le \eta\_t \le 1 \quad (6)$$

In Equation (6), UBI_t is per-capita basic income, Π_t is automation-related income that is available for public sharing, N_t is the eligible population, and eta_t is the proportion used for transfers. The expression only records the relationship between a funding source and beneficiaries. It does not imply that corporate profit is the only feasible tax base. A practical arrangement must address the definition of profit, cross-border tax bases, fiscal substitution, public-service provision, and inflation risks.

Van Parijs and Vanderborght (2017) describe basic income as an unconditional cash transfer. It may reduce the administrative burden of eligibility tests and provide a buffer for non-standard employment, care work, and retraining. Its contested features include fiscal sustainability, labor-supply effects, and its relationship to existing social insurance. For China, the more useful question may be how cash transfers, public education, health protection, unemployment insurance, transition services, and data-dividend arrangements can be assessed as a combined institutional package rather than as a single imported model.

Institutional design must also address ownership and competition. When computing capacity, data, and platform access are highly concentrated, automation returns may intensify inequality through market power rather than productivity alone. Competition policy, data portability, public computing capacity, worker participation, and tax coordination all affect who receives the gains. Technology policy should not focus only on deployment speed; it must also consider who bears adjustment costs, who has bargaining power, and who can participate in rule-making.

7. Data, Experience, and the Evaluation of Well-Being

In highly automated systems, people do not become merely consumers. Their preferences, satisfaction, complaints, refusals, and creative feedback continue to inform product improvement, model calibration, and public-service design. Because such signals involve individual rights and social differences, data cannot be treated as a costless input. Data collection, changed uses, benefit sharing, and algorithmic explanation should be governed by informed consent, data minimization, and accountability.

If employment is no longer the sole measure of social contribution, economic evaluation also requires a fuller set of criteria. Social well-being can be represented as a weighted combination of several dimensions:

$$W_t = \omega_1 P_t + \omega_2 R_t + \omega_3 S_t + \omega_4 E_t, \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 + \omega_4 = 1 \quad (7)$$

Equation (7) is a normative framework rather than a ready-made measure for cross-country comparison. P_t can represent basic material security, R_t rights and fairness, S_t social participation and relationship quality, and E_t opportunities for education, culture, and self-development. The weights omega_i express values established through public choice. The point is not to replace complex social judgment with a single number, but to make clear that productivity is not the only public objective that institutions should recognize.

An economics of meaning should not be interpreted as replacing material conditions with subjective feeling, nor should it serve as a rhetorical device for reducing public protection. Its reasonable core is that, when technology reduces some necessary labor time, society can reconsider the value of education, care, culture, community service, and democratic participation. Education should not be understood only as preparation for employable skills; it also cultivates judgment, aesthetic capacity, responsibility, and the ability to live with others.

8. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence expands the possibility that capital substitutes for labor, but it does not establish that labor must disappear. The more defensible conclusion is that labor will be differentiated across tasks and sectors, that the stability of wage income as the main source of income for most people may weaken, and that questions of distribution, demand, and governance will become more prominent. The labor term in a production function must be understood in relation to task structure, complementary inputs, and institutional conditions; it cannot simply be deleted.

The formal expressions in this paper clarify several related relationships. Higher productivity does not imply the complete withdrawal of labor. A change in the labor share does not imply a loss of human value. If automation returns do not become household disposable income, the economic circuit may face an effective-demand constraint. Social well-being cannot be evaluated by output alone. These propositions require empirical examination using industry-level task data, corporate financial data, worker panels, and comparative institutional research.

Two simplifications should be avoided in policy discussion: technological optimism that conceals transition costs, and technological fear that rejects productivity growth. A more constructive course is to promote innovation while improving social protection, educational transition, data governance, competition policy, and mechanisms for sharing returns. The objective is to make technology an instrument that expands human choice rather than a force that intensifies the concentration of income and power.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2018). The race between man and machine: Implications of technology for growth, factor shares, and employment. *American Economic Review, 108*(6), 1488–1542. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20160696

Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). *Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence.* Harvard Business Review Press.

Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 29*(3), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3

Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education.* National Bureau of Economic Research.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies.* W. W. Norton & Company.

Cobb, C. W., & Douglas, P. H. (1928). A theory of production. *American Economic Review, 18*(Supplement), 139–165. https://doi.org/10.2307/1811556

Ford, M. (2015). *Rise of the robots: Technology and the threat of a jobless future.* Basic Books.

Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 114*, 254–280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019

Keynes, J. M. (1963). Economic possibilities for our grandchildren. In *Essays in persuasion* (pp. 358–373). W. W. Norton & Company. (Original work published 1930)

Marx, K. (1990). *Capital: A critique of political economy* (Vol. 1; B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1867)

Robbins, L. (1932). *An essay on the nature and significance of economic science.* Macmillan.

Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *American Economic Review, 51*(1), 1–17.

Susskind, D. (2020). *A world without work: Technology, automation, and how we should respond.* Metropolitan Books.

Van Parijs, P., & Vanderborght, Y. (2017). *Basic income: A radical proposal for a free society and a sane economy.* Harvard University Press.