



Pensions, Robotics and Taxes, the New Challenges of Taxation

Miguel de Haro

EasyChair preprints are intended for rapid dissemination of research results and are integrated with the rest of EasyChair.

June 3, 2021

PENSIONS, ROBOTICS AND TAXES, THE NEW CHALLENGES OF TAXATION.

Miguel de Haro Izquierdo

**Professor of Financial and Tax Law at
Faculty of Law of the Universidad
Complutense of Madrid. Spain.**

I. INTRODUCTION.

In the following lines we address questions that directly affect the future of the welfare state with the irruption of AI and robotics. Should robots have personalities? Will they put an end to the reality of the current world of work? Will robotisation generate greater inequality among citizens? Should they pay Social Security contributions as robotised workers?

Robots will change countries' traditional Social Security and tax systems. Then, the question is, how can such changes be integrated in our societies and legislation?.

II. THE CONTRIBUTION OF ROBOTS TO PENSIONS.

The fourth industrial revolution will minimise career opportunities for a large part of the population and will also have an impact on economic aspects of public spending policies of states, consumption, reduction of welfare state income for pensions and services for the elderly, the payment of subsistence income, etc.

Economists predict an influence of robots on labour recruitment, on the availability of labour and a decrease in wages, savings, pension contributions, so that there will be a shift of resources from labour to capital.

We do not believe that the reduction in Social Security contributions can be replaced by a contribution from robots to

Social Security as such, as this would distort the very essence of the concept of contributions, as these are benefits and measures that are put in place by Social Security to anticipate, repair or overcome certain situations of misfortune or states of need of workers, and therefore tend to cause a loss of income or excess expenditure for the people who suffer them. We understand, a priori, that it is not possible for the robot to obtain these benefits as if it were a legal person with rights and obligations.

Being subject to Social Security obligations and receiving benefits is intrinsically linked to the fact of recognition of a legal personality, consequently, the capacity of rights and duties is the only attribute that is exclusively considered by the courts to determine the legal personality of any entity.

If robots, with an industrial and social character, have been enabled to do different kinds of acts by humans, it is impossible that they can be granted a legal personality. Robots, as well as all elements of AI, are treated as tools supervised and ultimately controlled by a human being who is legally responsible for their actions, responsible for ensuring that they operate within the limits of the law.

Autonomy and self-determination are not considered grounds for legally conferring rights over any entity, and thus do not manifest a legal standing as a subject of rights and obligations.

III.- SOME TAX MEASURES THAT CAN COMPLEMENT THE REDUCTION IN INCOME FROM THE SPREAD OF AUTOMATION.

Tax policy has a key role to play in tackling inequality, including income inequality that may be increased as a result of the social revolution and robot work. Shifting taxation from labour income to a higher tax burden

on capital income could be a way to redistribute revenue.

Establishing Social Security contributions based on the productivity of robots as opposed to replacing labour income would alleviate the reduction in revenue from labour contributions.

Capital income could be distributed to those who have lost their jobs or have not adapted to labour change. The transfer of income to capital could be a clear drag on investment and the economy, but if it is phased in gradually and based on robot productivity parameters, revenue-raising innovations could be introduced that do not harm investment.

IV. CONCLUSION

The great challenge we face is that arising from the reorganization of work by robots. The differences between an increasingly depleted active population contributing resources to Social Security and, on the other hand, the high economic costs of the elderly and dependent "consumers of state resources" for pensions, will generate an increase in health expenditure and significant allocations of resources for dependency that could lead to serious financing problems.

Taxation, as a redistributive tool, can generate a tax-based compensation for the generation of resources and the increase in industrial productivity, or in the services of highly robotised companies, not by means of Social Security contributions, but through alternative channels such as the distribution of state income by transferring less revenue from personal labour income to capital income, or, as a more recommendable measure, the establishment of contributions to Social Security according to the productivity of robots with a clear purpose of organising income.

REFERENCES

- (1) Deloitte Services LP "Forces of change: Industry 4.0 A". Deloitte series on Industry 4.0.
- (2) Debraj Ray, Dilip. Mookherjee †. Growth, Automation and the Long Run Share of Labor. October, 2019
- (3) S M. Solaiman- "Legal personality of robots, corporations, idols and chimpanzees: a quest for legitimacy". University of Wollongong, 201
- (4) Jeffrey D. Sachs Seth G. Benzell, Guillermo LaGarda Robots: Curse or Blessing? A basic framework. Working Paper 2109. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w2109>. National Bureau of Economic Research.
- (5) Barak Obama "Intelligence, Automation, and the Economy". Executive Office of the President (EOP). 2016.
- (6) Understanding Changes in Inequality in the EU Background to "Growing United: Upgrading Europe's Convergence Machine". World Bank Report on the European Union.