In the Age of Artificial Intelligence: What if we reinvented our social model?

Cyril Reinhard

Summary

Artificial Intelligence is already transforming our ways of working and producing. Yet our social systems (pensions, unemployment, healthcare) remain entirely funded by human labor. This gap raises a fundamental question: what will happen when AI massively replaces human employment?

The numbers speak for themselves:

- 300 million jobs could be affected by AI (Goldman Sachs)
- 40% of global jobs impacted (IMF)
- 60% of professions could be automated in the near future (McKinsey)

An opportunity to seize now

Rather than passively enduring this transformation, couldn't we make it a lever for progress? Here are some concrete approaches addressed in this document:

- **Create an "AI social contribution"**: companies that automate contribute proportionally to the gains achieved
- **Reduce charges on human employment**: use these new resources to reduce social charges for companies that continue hiring
- **Rethink our success indicators**: beyond GDP, measure well-being, quality of social bonds, access to free time

The urgency to act given AI's speed

Artificial Intelligence evolves in months, even weeks, while our governments think in years and our legislation in decades. If we don't anticipate now, we will suffer tomorrow's transformation without regulation. What if AI became a "time liberator"? More time to train, engage, create, care for others and the planet. The AI revolution can become a lever for social equality rather than a source of inequalities. Provided we act collectively—businesses, citizens, politicians—to build this new social contract.

The debate is open. Let's participate together.

#AI #DigitalTransformation #SocialInnovation #FutureOfWork

Why this document?

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is already profoundly transforming our ways of producing, deciding, and working. Yet our major collective balances—such as retirement, unemployment insurance, social protection, education, and healthcare—remain largely indexed to one thing: human labor. This gap should make us question ourselves. Can we really continue to finance our solidarity model on a foundation that will erode?

Let's be clear: we are not facing a simple technological advancement. This is a fundamental, structural, and lasting transformation. A change that calls for broad, collective, and urgent societal reflection that we must undertake together.

We also know that this subject is complex, as it would involve a profound refounding of our society, based on a redefinition of the role of work in society and in human life, not forgetting its ecological impact. Couldn't AI be a unique opportunity to transform our society for more equality, more sharing, and more free time?

I know that this awareness, this reflection to imagine a new social model, is not simple and even seems impossible. It must be carried collectively by citizens, businesses, and politicians worldwide. How do we think about the world of tomorrow, the one we will leave to our children? Couldn't AI, instead of being merely a vector of job destruction and fear, be the key to true human liberation and the lever for a new capitalism that is more social, more balanced, and more respectful of humans and the planet?

What if AI became a "time liberator for humans"?

- **Free time to train and adapt**: Access quality continuing education, retrain more easily, explore new intellectual or creative passions.
- **Free time to engage civically**: Actively participate in community life, invest in associative projects, advocate for environmental or social causes.
- **Free time to contribute to non-profit research and innovation**: Put one's intelligence at the service of solving major global challenges (diseases, climate, poverty) without the constraint of immediate profit.
- **Free time to care for the planet**: Dedicate time to concrete actions for environmental preservation, permaculture, or developing sustainable solutions.
- **Free time to cultivate social and intergenerational bonds**: Strengthen local solidarity, help the most vulnerable, transmit knowledge and experiences.
- **For artistic creation and personal development**: Fully engage in artistic activities, develop physical and mental well-being, explore spirituality.

I grant you, all this is somewhat utopian, but I think dreaming and thinking is essential. We must imagine a wonderful world to achieve a good one.

A very real paradox

Artificial Intelligence increases productivity, replaces certain human tasks, but does not contribute to the systems that ensure social cohesion and security. Why wouldn't an AI model generating value also be called upon to contribute?

Today, a company that massively automates its production via AI agents reduces its human costs but does not compensate for this decrease with an equivalent contribution. This fiscal and social void ultimately threatens the very balance of our solidarity systems.

Introduction

This morning, hearing talk, once again, for the umpteenth time, about pension reform—64 years, 66 years, 67... and in Denmark, 70 years planned by 2040, and why not 80 years?—I have the impression that we constantly adjust old formulas without ever changing the calculation model. And yet, a tsunami is coming.

Rarely, if ever, do I hear serious political or media reflection on the impact of Artificial Intelligence on our current economic and social model. We keep our old reference points, even as they are about to be overturned. If we do nothing now, will it be possible to act later, once we're backed against the wall? Shouldn't we collectively prepare for this?

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is not a simple evolution. It's a revolution. It transforms our ways of working, producing, creating... and it's already disrupting the balance on which our society rests. As *Sundar Pichai, CEO of Google and Alphabet, emphasized as early as 2018—yes, as early as 2018!:* ***"AI is probably the most important thing humanity has ever worked on. I think its impact will be more profound than that of electricity or fire."*** Such a statement underlines the magnitude of the challenge that awaits us and that will also profoundly change humanity.

Isn't it time to rethink our economic and social models, today founded primarily on employee contributions?

Isn't now the time to do it, before AI transformation imposes itself without regulation and without us being able to guide it?

But how do we do this? Faced with the exponential acceleration of AI, our institutions seem caught off guard. Where Artificial Intelligence evolves in months, even weeks, our governments think in years, our legislation in decades, and our social reforms in generations. This temporal asymmetry between technological innovation and the global political world's capacity for adaptation poses an unprecedented challenge: ***how do we regulate and guide a revolution that advances faster than our collective ability to understand and frame it?***

Should we, can we imagine an expanded social contribution model to finance education, healthcare, pensions... in a world where AI progressively replaces human work?

But who should bear this burden? The tech giants who develop and commercialize AI solutions? The user companies that automate their processes and reduce their workforce thanks to these technologies?

Or should we consider taxation on data flows, the true fuel of the digital economy? Perhaps even a contribution based on productivity gains generated by AI?

This question reveals a fundamental issue: technology producers versus automation consumers, but also data owners versus optimization beneficiaries. Because beyond the technical aspects, what's at stake is the distribution of value created by AI.

Yes, we must now define an expanded social contribution model linked to AI. Who contributes? How? On what basis? These questions remain to be defined collectively, but we can draw inspiration from existing models: electricity distribution and consumption, carbon taxes based on environmental footprint, or contributions from digital solution publishers.

Should we target companies that automate their activities and reduce their payroll? New companies that build themselves from the start with an army of AI agents? Should we create an "AI employee" status with its own contributions? The essential thing is to act now to lay the foundations of this new financing system before the transformation becomes irreversible.

Wouldn't this also be the opportunity to broaden the base of social contributions in order to lighten those, currently too heavy, of companies that continue to hire humans?

Here, as an introduction, is the reflection I wish to open and share, for responsible and profoundly human AI. If we know how to transform our models together, then AI can become and will become a solution for a more balanced, more inclusive, more responsible society. In a word, a reinvented social capitalism. This reflection, as I said above, must be collective, involving businesses, citizens, and the politicians who govern us, because this is a profoundly human subject that concerns all of us.

The AI Paradox: Increased Productivity, Zero Social Contribution

AI replaces, automates, augments. But it doesn't contribute. Numerous studies converge on striking estimates: Goldman Sachs (2023) estimates that 300 million jobs could be affected by generative AI, with 25% of tasks susceptible to automation in the United States and Europe. The International Monetary Fund predicts that AI will impact 40% of jobs worldwide, with 60% in economically advanced countries. McKinsey estimates that 60% of occupations could be automated in the near future, and that more than 30% of hours worked in Europe and the United States could be automated by 2030.

More specifically, the Goldman Sachs study reveals that 46% of administrative tasks, 44% of legal jobs, and 37% of architecture and engineering professions could be automated. The International Labour Organization notes that 80% of American workers could see at least 10% of their tasks replaced, and 19% could see this share reach 50%. This concretely means that a growing number of human functions is, and will be, partially or even totally taken over by digital agents.

For example, in the banking sector, AI already analyzes credit risks or detects fraud with formidable efficiency. In journalism, algorithms write sports reports or basic financial reports; Associated Press already uses AI to automate the writing of thousands of articles on company financial results, freeing its journalists for more in-depth investigations. Even in the legal field, AI is beginning to analyze thousands of documents for jurisprudence research or contract preparation, tasks that were once time-consuming for lawyers and legal professionals.

In accounting, certified public accountants see AI taking over automatic invoice entry, expense categorization, and even the preparation of standardized tax returns. Software like Sage or QuickBooks now integrate AI functionalities that can automatically process photographed receipts and classify them according to accounting rules.

Business consulting is also experiencing this transformation: management consultants see AI taking over the analysis of hundreds of dashboards, automatically identifying operational bottlenecks and proposing optimization strategies. Where a junior consultant used to spend weeks poring over financial and HR data to prepare a diagnosis, tools like those developed by McKinsey (QuantumBlack) or Boston Consulting Group can now analyze performance patterns in a few hours, detect budgetary anomalies, and even suggest organizational restructuring. Strategy consultants also use AI to automate competitive intelligence and market analysis, tasks that traditionally mobilized their teams for days.

In public services, this silent revolution is already at work. Prefecture agents see AI automatically processing driver's license or passport applications, verifying file compliance, and even directing users to the right procedures via increasingly sophisticated chatbots. At Pôle Emploi (French employment agency), algorithms pre-analyze CVs and propose matches with job offers, considerably reducing manual processing time.

And yet, during this time, our solidarity systems (pensions, healthcare, unemployment insurance) remain financed almost exclusively by human labor. We replace employees with AI models, but not a single additional euro enters the common coffers.

So, who will pay? This debate is not merely technical. It is profoundly political and ethical.

Why act now rather than wait?

I am not against AI; on the contrary, I work in this field and I am convinced that AI can become a formidable tool for social equity. My professional journey in tech and AI, enriched by regular practice of meditation and mindfulness, has taught me the importance of silence and returning to the sources of our inner being. My ten-day retreats in complete silence, in the Vipassana tradition, offer a unique perspective: they reveal how much our humanity resides in this capacity to observe, to feel, to be present beyond the analytical mind.

This experience of silence has taught me one essential thing: the true revolution does not lie in replacing humans with machines, but in their complementarity. AI excels in the rational, calculation, analysis of complex patterns, and processing massive volumes of information.

Humans bring intuition, empathy, creativity, emotional wisdom, and this unique capacity to give meaning beyond data.

Rather than seeing these two intelligences oppose each other, we can see them as two sides of the same coin: AI as an extension of our cognitive capacities, and humans as guardians of our values, our ethics, and our humanity.

This vision of responsible AI that augments humans assumes, however, that we do not let this technology deploy alone, without framework, without collective consciousness. This is exactly why it is crucial to act now to orient this transformation toward a model that serves human flourishing rather than its enslavement.

Satya Nadella, CEO of Microsoft, agrees with this sentiment by stating that ***"AI is not just a new technology we need to adopt, it's a way to amplify human ingenuity and solve some of our most pressing challenges."*** (Microsoft Build Conference, 2023). It is this amplification that we must channel toward shared progress. But this assumes that we act before AI transforms society alone, without framework, without collective consciousness. We must stop being blind and ignoring the magnitude of what will happen, let's stop being reactive when we're facing the wall! Let's not wait to face this wall because it risks being insurmountable. It is imperative to be proactive and transform ourselves before it's too late.

Yes, I think we must now define an expanded social contribution model linked to AI. Who contributes? How? On what basis? These questions remain to be defined collectively, the essential thing is to act now to lay the foundations of this new financing system before the transformation becomes irreversible.

Anticipating will allow these companies to plan for these contributions and organize accordingly. Integrating this social contribution from the conception of business models will prevent them from being surprised or blocked by late and potentially brutal regulation. It is also a way to make digital transformation more sustainable, more predictable, and therefore more just for everyone.

We must lay the foundations of a clear, stable framework that allows AI to deploy with responsibility, in service of the community and not to its detriment.

What if a company had only one human employee?

Let's take a concrete example that illustrates the urgency: in financial and technological circles, there's sometimes a dream of **"One company, one employee, one billion"** – *a company that, with a single human employee and an army of AI agents, would be capable of generating one billion in revenue.*

This is no longer science fiction; it's a vision actively pursued. So, a simple question arises: ***what social contributions will this company pay? And if tomorrow, this model becomes widespread, what will remain of the financing of our protection systems?***

AI agents are already everywhere. They write texts, respond to customers 24/7, detect fraud, run advertising campaigns, assist programming (GitHub Copilot suggests entire lines of code), and optimize supply chains. In industry, collaborative robots work hand in hand with human operators. These are invisible or metallic collaborators, tireless, but socially non-existent from a contribution standpoint.

Hence this fundamental question: why wouldn't they also be subject to social contributions?

As emphasized by *Elon Musk ("There will come a point where no job will be necessary")* and *Sam Altman ("AI will produce enough wealth for everyone to have what they need... The big question is how we're going to distribute this wealth"),* we must radically rethink our approach.

Perhaps the real question is not whether we should retire at 64, 67, or 70 years old... but rather whether we could consider retiring well before 60, or working four or three days a week, thanks to an equitable redistribution of AI productivity gains.

Now is the time to think about it. Because tomorrow, it will probably be too late.

This transformation also concerns our public administrations. AI agents are already transforming government services: automated processing of benefit applications, virtual queue management, digitization of procedures. Yet governance and financing models have not been designed to match these upheavals.

We have a historic opportunity to create a balanced social and digital pact, where automation liberates humans instead of weakening them.

Concrete Paths for a New Social Pact in the Age of AI

To move forward, because I like to be action-oriented and idea-driven, here are some concrete paths we could study:

Couldn't we establish a Social Contribution on the "Digital Employee"?

Couldn't we implement an expanded social contribution, paid by companies that automate human functions via AI agents? A portion of the savings achieved or profits generated by automation would be transferred to a public fund.

We would need to imagine an annual declaration of automation level (similar to carbon footprint) that could serve as the basis for this AI contribution, modulated according to criteria such as the percentage of automation, personnel reduction, or volume of automated tasks. This would make leaders accountable and avoid windfall effects.

All companies and administrations would be concerned:

This logic must concern both private companies and public administrations:

- **Large enterprises**: Those that automate their activities on a large scale (production, customer relations, marketing, support) would contribute proportionally to the gains obtained, as with payroll social charges.
- **"AI-native" companies**: These new structures, exploiting AI as their main production force with few human employees, must also contribute to avoid unfair competition and system imbalance.
- **Public administrations**: The gains from automating government services (prefectures, ministries processing files, responding to citizens) could be partially reinvested in solidarity financing (social services, training, health), making the state an example.

This model would allow redistribution where heavily automated companies contribute more, while on the other hand lightening social charges and tax pressure on companies that focus on human employment. This will also be a powerful means to increase employees' purchasing power by bringing net income closer to gross income.

Shouldn't we extend the contribution to AI Solution Providers?

At the heart of the AI revolution, solution providers—whether cloud infrastructure giants or specialized business application publishers—play a central role and derive considerable value from this transformation.

Wouldn't it become legitimate and necessary to consider an "AI provider Social Contribution": a specific contribution levied on their activity, so that this new economy participates equitably in financing our social model and the profound adaptations it requires?

The establishment of such a contribution should not be perceived as a burden, but as an investment in our collective future. It carries a profoundly optimistic vision: that of a technology which, beyond its productive power, becomes an active partner in general well-being and strengthening our social pact. This would involve implementing virtuous mechanisms where part of the fruits of this technological innovation irrigates the entire social body, thus supporting the transition toward a society where AI is synonymous with progress for all.

To implement this "AI provider Social Contribution," two main application levels can be considered:

Contribution from AI Technological Infrastructure Providers

This first level would target the fundamental actors of the AI ecosystem, such as major platforms like OpenAI, Google, Mistral AI, Amazon Web Services (AWS), Microsoft, Meta, and other cloud service providers. These companies provide the computing power, foundation models, programming interfaces (APIs), and environments that enable large-scale deployment of AI agents.

A contribution could be levied proportionally to the volume of activity generated by their clients on a given territory (for example, based on API request volume, bandwidth consumed by AI services, or localized revenue related to AI).

This logic is comparable to that applied to electricity providers. The latter, producing and distributing an essential resource, are subject to regulation and solidarity mechanisms (such as CSPE, Contribution to Public Electricity Service, or TURPE, Public Electricity Network Usage Tariff in France). These contributions finance network maintenance, support for renewable energies, or guaranteed access to electricity.

Artificial intelligence, operating on distributed infrastructures and consuming a strategic resource (computing power), feeds a globalized digital economy. AI platforms thus play a structuring role analogous to that of an energy network. It is therefore legitimate that they participate in maintaining and vitalizing what could be called the "social and societal network," by transferring part of their activity to finance the social adaptations necessary in the face of large-scale automation.

Contribution from Integrators and Business AI Agent Providers

This second level would concern companies that design, sell, or deploy AI agents specifically intended to replace or directly assist human functions in businesses (for example, for marketing automation, human resources, finance, customer support, etc.).

Here, the contribution could be modulated according to a combination of models to ensure relevance and equity.

Per "Digital Employee" (Active AI Agent): Each software automaton in service, fulfilling defined tasks, could be considered a "virtual workstation" subject to a contribution. Vigilance would be necessary to avoid circumvention (for example, a single overpowered agent performing multiple tasks). A clear definition of the "agent" or "automated work unit" would therefore be crucial.

By Resource Consumption Level: Drawing inspiration from energy pricing models or carbon taxes, the more an AI system consumes computing power (and therefore mobilizes material and energy resources), the higher its contribution would be. Indicators could include the volume of requests processed, processor time (CPU/GPU) used, or attributable energy consumption.

By Effective Automation Rate: The contribution could be linked to the percentage of business processes actually replaced or delegated to AI systems within an organization, thus reflecting the direct impact on human employment structure.

The objective of a multi-criteria and combined approach is to avoid windfall effects, guarantee equitable treatment between small and large structures deploying AI, and encourage automation that is not only efficient but also socially responsible and contributory.

Such a system would also promote transparency, with companies being encouraged to document their level of automation, thus facilitating monitoring, regulation, and public understanding of ongoing transformations.

What Other Transformations in the Age of Artificial Intelligence?

As *Yann LeCun, Chief AI Scientist at Meta and professor at NYU, says,* ***"AI and robotics will create more jobs than they destroy, but they will be different jobs."*** (Frequently stated, including in 2023). This inevitable transition to "different jobs" and transformed lifestyles requires extensive societal preparation and adaptation of our thinking frameworks.

To navigate this transformation and build this new chapter of our social pact, here are some action paths.

Couldn't we create an "AI Social Investment Fund"?

This strategic fund would represent a major innovation in managing our collective resources. Fed by all AI social contributions, automation and digital contributions (both from users and providers), it would constitute an entirely new financing mechanism, distinct from traditional social charge circuits.

The idea would be to create an autonomous fund, managed optimally and transparently, that would specifically collect contributions related to digital transformation to then fund our fundamental systems: pension funds, education modernization, hospital transformation, adaptation of our public services to the digital age.

Why a separate fund rather than integration into existing collection mechanisms?

This approach presents several advantages.

Transparency and traceability: Citizens could precisely track how contributions from automation concretely finance the modernization of their public services. No more budget opacity where everything gets mixed up!

Optimized management: A dedicated fund would allow strategic resource allocation according to digital transition priorities, with investment criteria specific to AI and automation challenges.

Responsiveness to transformations: Unlike traditional social charge systems, often rigid and slow to evolve, this fund could quickly adapt to technological changes and the new needs they generate.

Democratic legitimacy: Companies and sectors that benefit from automation would directly contribute to financing necessary social adaptations, creating a direct link between technological transformation and collective solidarity.

Innovation in public financing: This model could become a laboratory for experimenting with new social financing mechanisms, inspiring other countries facing the same challenges.

How could this fund concretely function?

The fund would collect all the AI and digital contributions mentioned earlier, then redistribute them according to democratically defined priorities, for example:

- **40% for pension systems**: Compensate for the decline in traditional contributions linked to automation
- **30% for education modernization**: Train for tomorrow's jobs, develop digital education, equip institutions
- **20% for hospital transformation**: Modernize equipment, train staff in new technologies, improve care efficiency
- **10% for social innovation**: Experiment with new forms of social protection adapted to the digital world
- ...

This distribution could evolve according to needs and democratic choices, guaranteeing dynamic and relevant resource allocation. Couldn't such a fund become the symbol of a society that makes technological revolution a lever for shared progress rather than a source of inequalities?

Reducing Charges on "Human Work" through AI Social Contributions

Wouldn't the new sources of financing from various AI contributions allow us to significantly reduce the social charges weighing on proximity jobs and those with high human added value (crafts, personal services, education, culture, etc.)?

Couldn't we thus actively support SMEs, micro-enterprises, and local job creators who maintain the social fabric and vitality of our territories?

A virtuous circle for employment and purchasing power

The idea would be that AI contributions compensate for the decline in traditional contributions linked to automation. Couldn't we then considerably reduce the social charges that today weigh so heavily on companies that employ humans?

Today in France, an employee paid minimum wage receives a net salary of approximately **1,406 euros** per month. For this amount to reach them, the employer actually pays out **nearly 2,252 euros**, once employer social contributions are added to the gross salary set at **1,801.80 euros**. In other words, **nearly 40% of the total labor cost** goes neither to the employee nor to the company, but to mandatory deductions. This gap between what the company pays and what the employee receives creates a threshold effect that can hinder hiring, especially in small structures. It also reveals a structural mechanism that creates a chasm between the real cost of work and the compensation actually received.

Progressive and targeted relief

We could take a targeted and progressive approach and consider reducing these charges, particularly for:

- **SMEs and micro-enterprises**: 50% reduction in social charges for companies with fewer than 50 employees, allowing them to hire more easily and better compensate their teams.
- **High human value sectors**: Crafts, personal services, private education, culture - areas where automation is limited but employment is essential - would benefit from priority relief.
- **"Human-centered" companies**: Those that maintain or increase their human workforce despite automation possibilities would be rewarded with reduced charges.

The impact on purchasing power

This approach would have a dual beneficial effect:

1. **For employers**: Reduced salary costs would allow for more hiring, salary increases, or investment in company development.
2. **For employees**: Bringing net and gross salaries closer together would mechanically increase purchasing power. An employee paid 2,000€ gross (1,560€ net today) could see their net income increase by 200 to 400€ depending on the level of relief.

A rethought economic model

This approach would positively change the French economic equation:

- **Consumption revival**: More purchasing power = more domestic demand
- **Enhanced competitiveness**: Reduced labor costs facing international competition
- **Territorial attractiveness**: Companies would be incentivized to establish themselves in regions that maintain human employment
- **Social justice**: Those who automate contribute to financing relief for those who hire

Wouldn't this be a true evolution: transforming the AI revolution into a lever for increasing purchasing power and supporting the real economy, the one that sustains our territories and maintains social bonds?

Couldn't we create an "AI assessment" to measure automation footprint?

In addition to the new social contributions on AI that we just discussed, shouldn't we also have a transparent and standardized measurement tool?

The "AI assessment": monitoring automation consumption

Like the carbon footprint that measures environmental impact, couldn't we develop an "AI assessment" that would quantify each organization's automation footprint? This monitoring tool would allow us to:

- **Measure AI consumption**: API request volume, computing time consumed, number of automated tasks, equivalent "human work hours" replaced
- **Establish sectoral mapping**: Identify which sectors are automating most rapidly and with which technologies
- **Create a public database**: Enable researchers, decision-makers, and citizens to understand ongoing transformations
- **Standardize declarations**: Like for CO2, establish common methodologies and shared reference frameworks

A public policy steering tool

This AI consumption monitoring would serve public authorities to:

- **Target training**: Direct retraining programs toward sectors undergoing major transformation
- **Anticipate territorial impacts**: Identify employment basins most affected by automation
- **Adapt public aid**: Concentrate support where transformations are most rapid
- **Measure policy effectiveness**: Evaluate the impact of AI contributions and charge reductions

Transparency and accountability

Like carbon footprint, this approach would create a dynamic of transparency and accountability: companies would be incentivized to communicate about their automation strategy and its social impact, consumers could make informed choices, and investors could integrate these criteria into their decisions.

Shouldn't we create a right to algorithmic disconnection?

As AI becomes omnipresent in our work environments, wouldn't it be appropriate to reflect on a balance between technological efficiency and human well-being?

How can we ensure that this digital revolution serves professional fulfillment rather than creating constant pressure?

Concrete situations that raise questions

Let's take some examples from daily professional life: a delivery driver whose every route is optimized in real time by an algorithm, a call center employee whose breaks are timed by an automatic system, or a salesperson whose objectives are adjusted daily by predictive AI. Don't these situations raise questions about autonomy and human rhythm?

Some reflection paths to preserve balance

Couldn't we explore several approaches:

- **Digital breathing spaces**: What if companies offered moments where algorithms don't dictate the pace? For example, allowing a logistics employee to choose their own route once a week, or letting a customer advisor manage their calls according to their intuition rather than a distribution algorithm.
- **The right to understand automated decisions**: When an AI recommends an assignment or evaluates performance, shouldn't the employee be able to understand the criteria used and have the possibility to discuss this evaluation with a human manager?
- **Dialogue spaces**: What if we established regular moments where teams can discuss their relationship with digital tools? Time for exchanges to adjust AI use according to real field needs.
- **Preserving human judgment**: In certain sensitive situations, such as evaluating a colleague or making career development decisions, wouldn't it be wise to maintain systematic human validation?

A benevolent rather than constraining framework

The idea would not be to slow innovation, but rather to accompany this transformation while preserving what makes human work rich: creativity, adaptability, interpersonal relationships. Couldn't we inscribe these principles in our collective agreements, as we did for the right to digital disconnection?

Wouldn't this approach allow companies and their employees to build together an AI usage that is both efficient and respectful of human rhythm?

Shouldn't we educate about AI from an early age, throughout life?

Isn't it fundamental to prepare all citizens to understand and interact with AI, not only as a tool, but also as a major political and social subject? Shouldn't this education include:

- Learning the basics of how artificial intelligence works from elementary school, through playful approaches, simple examples, and adapted experiments.
- In-depth teaching in middle and high school on key concepts, algorithmic biases (for example, showing how a recruitment algorithm could unintentionally discriminate if trained on non-representative historical data), system transparency, personal data protection, and ethical issues.
- Integration of a transversal "citizen and critical AI" module in curricula, on the same level as civic education or sustainable development education.

- Continuing education for teachers, parents, professionals, and citizens so they can accompany and participate in this technological acculturation. Understanding algorithmic logic, potential biases, autonomy issues, and the societal impacts of AI—shouldn't this be part of the common foundation of enlightened and active digital citizenship?

Should we consider an "AI employee" status: a complex question with global stakes?

We mentioned earlier the notion of "AI employee" in the context of AI social contributions. This idea raises a deeper question: shouldn't we collectively reflect on creating a true status for these "AI employees" who take on tasks formerly performed by humans?

A necessary but complex reflection

Without going so far as to recognize full legal personality for these systems, wouldn't it be relevant to explore a hybrid status for the most autonomous AI agents? This question challenges us: when an AI makes important decisions (recruitment, credit, medical diagnoses), who is really responsible? The software publisher? The company using it? The programmer who trained it?

But is this really possible and desirable?

This idea immediately raises several major questions:

- **Technical feasibility**: How do we precisely define that an AI system deserves this status? From what level of autonomy? How do we avoid circumvention?
- **International coherence**: Wouldn't such a status need to be defined at the global level to avoid distortions? What legitimacy would a purely French definition have against American or Chinese tech giants?
- **Risks of complexification**: Wouldn't we risk creating a heavy bureaucratic system for uncertain benefit?

An approach that would merit global coordination

Shouldn't this reflection be part of a broader framework, involving:

- International organizations (UN, OECD, European Union)
- Major technological powers
- Digital companies themselves
- Civil society and citizens

Maybe start more simply?

Rather than immediately creating a complex status, couldn't we first focus on:

- Transparency of AI systems used (who does what, how, with which data)
- Traceability of important decisions made by these systems
- Clear responsibility of companies that deploy them

Wouldn't this progressive approach allow us to advance concretely while preparing in-depth reflection on these status questions, which indeed deserve global debate?

Shouldn't we reexamine the purposes of economic growth in the age of AI?

Today, most of our economic policies rely on the dominant indicator of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth, often correlated with a frantic search for productivity. But in a world

where much of this productivity is provided by intelligent machines, should we continue to rely on this single criterion to measure our progress? Isn't it time to broaden our compass? Concretely, couldn't this involve:

- Creating and adopting an **"augmented prosperity index"** or **"sustainable well-being"** indicator, integrating the quality of social bonds, physical and mental health of the population, access to education and culture, environmental quality, reduction of inequalities, access to free time, and work-life balance, alongside the environmental impact of automated processes.
- Introducing **"freed time budgets"** in public policies: how do we quantify and value the human work hours that AI innovations allow us to save or reallocate? How is this "time dividend" redistributed between work, caring for loved ones, training, civic engagement, volunteering, or leisure?
- Experimenting with **collective time allocations** or innovative mechanisms so that gains from automation can be converted, for example, into additional rest days, funding for extended parental leave, paid training leave, or support for social utility projects. Wouldn't this allow us to move from an economic performance model centered on "always faster, always more production" to a more human and sustainable model, where prosperity is also measured by what we choose to slow down, preserve, cultivate, and transmit? Precision agriculture, where drones and AI sensors optimize water and input usage while reducing hardship, shows that we can aim for productivity that is more respectful of the environment and well-being, a key dimension of redefined prosperity.

How to develop ethical AI that respects and values humans?

Beyond questions of financing and regulation, shouldn't we question the values that guide AI deployment in our organizations? How can we ensure that this technology truly serves human flourishing rather than constraining it?

The ethical challenge: AI in service of humans, not the reverse

Isn't the central question how to integrate AI in a way that preserves and even strengthens what makes human work rich? Rather than systematically seeking to replace humans, couldn't we conceive AI as a true partner that augments our capabilities?

Concrete examples of ethical AI at work

Let's imagine some situations where AI could truly serve humans:

- **A doctor** assisted by an AI that analyzes scans, allowing them to dedicate more time to listening and dialogue with patients
- **A teacher** assisted by tools that personalize exercises for each student, freeing time for individual pedagogical support
- **A craftsperson** using AI-assisted design tools to explore new creations while maintaining mastery of gesture and aesthetics

Some paths for ethical integration

Couldn't we encourage organizations to:

- **Train their teams** in critical and thoughtful use of AI, understanding its possibilities but also its limits
- **Design hybrid positions** where AI handles repetitive tasks to allow humans to focus on creativity, empathy, and complex problem-solving
- **Establish ethical charters** defining how AI should be used in the organization, with what guarantees for employees
- **Regularly measure** AI's impact on workplace well-being, to adjust its use according to team feedback

Wouldn't this approach make AI a true lever for humanizing work rather than a source of concern?

Why not encourage the creation of a "social and ethical AI label"?

Couldn't we establish a public framework, co-constructed with stakeholders, that values and distinguishes companies, organizations, and services that develop or integrate AI in an ethical, inclusive, transparent, and socially redistributive manner; somewhat like the organic label for agriculture or the B-Corp label for impact companies? Concretely, couldn't this label be based on several demanding criteria:

- **Transparency of AI systems used**: declaration of purposes, automated functions, and human supervision.
- **Respect for fundamental rights**: algorithmic non-discrimination, data protection, possibility of human recourse.
- **Impact on employment**: integration of AI agents in a logic of strengthening human employment, skills development, or retraining.
- **Direct social contribution**: participation in an AI solidarity fund or redistribution mechanisms linked to automation.
- **Ethics in the value chain**: regular audits of AI subcontractors, respect for ethical standards throughout the technological lifecycle.

Shouldn't we thoughtfully study the opportunity for "automation quotas" or "human presence thresholds"?

In certain sectors particularly critical for human dignity and social bonds (such as healthcare for direct care, education for personalized support, justice for high-impact decisions, care for vulnerable people), wouldn't it be relevant to study the possibility of establishing minimum thresholds for human intervention or limits on complete automation of essential functions? This is not about slowing innovation, but about preserving the irreplaceable character of human interaction where it is crucial.

Researcher Kate Crawford warns against blind confidence in AI, emphasizing in her work "Atlas of AI" (2021) that **"AI systems are neither artificial nor intelligent. They are made of natural resources and human labor, and they embody forms of power."** This critical

perspective is essential for guiding any regulation and ensuring that humans remain at the center of systems, especially in the most sensitive domains.

Conclusion: A new social pact to write together

Faced with artificial intelligence, a machine that requires no vacation, no training, no social coverage, that works 24/7, in all languages, without ever stopping, a fundamental question arises:

Why wouldn't it also be subject to social contributions, like any other "worker" who participates in collective wealth?

What if, instead of passively enduring this technological revolution, we actively chose to make it a lever for positive transformation of our societies?

What if AI, rather than simply threatening our jobs or increasing inequalities, offered us a historic opportunity to rethink our relationship to work, value, and time?

Fewer arduous and repetitive tasks could mean more time to reconnect with the essential: nature, family, children's education, creativity, civic engagement, caring for others.

Perhaps instead of constantly pushing back retirement age, we could advance it. Perhaps instead of intensifying work, we could collectively reduce our working time. What if AI were an opportunity, not to produce ever more frantically, but to live better, more serenely and more solidarily?

This perspective invites us to reflection that goes far beyond mere questions of direct financing. AI's implications are profound and touch the foundations of our collective organization and our fundamental pact: why do we work? For whom? And what will we dedicate the time that technology could free up for us?

I pose questions. I make an appeal: let's reflect together, now, on what we want to do with AI, before it alone decides what we will become. Because if we make the right choices, AI can become a powerful lever for building a more balanced, freer, and more solidary society.

Finally, even though this reflection has focused on artificial intelligence, these issues apply equally to the arrival of physical and humanoid robots in our factories, streets, hospitals, and schools. Autonomous drones are already beginning to ensure rapid deliveries in rural areas or for urgent medical products, and humanoid robots are being tested for elderly assistance or reception in public places.

These machines, equipped with advanced interaction and learning capabilities, will tomorrow take over many human tasks in the tangible world. There too, the question of their contribution, recognition, and regulation will arise acutely.

The boundary between tool, agent, and collaborator is blurring. It's time to open this debate, without naïveté, but with ambition and responsibility.

The debate is open.

Annexes : citations ou déclarations sur l’avenir des agents IA

Meta (2025) "AI will redefine the very category of advertising, by automating the entire creation and distribution cycle."

Mark Zuckerberg, CEO of Meta "Personalized AI agents could transform how we interact with technology, making interactions more natural and intuitive."

Mark Zuckerberg "Meta will become the 'ultimate business agent', using AI to directly drive results and significantly increase the share of GDP devoted to advertising."

ELON MUSK

Elon Musk, CEO of Tesla (2025) "Humanoid robots and deep intelligence will unlock almost infinite potential for products and services."

Elon Musk, Tesla (2025) "Humanoid robots will allow everyone to produce an almost infinite range of goods and services, disrupting the very notion of monetary value."

Elon Musk, CEO of Tesla (2025) "Tesla plans to produce thousands of Optimus robots by the end of 2025, with revenue potential of over $10 trillion."

Elon Musk, CEO of Tesla/SpaceX "AI requires proactive regulation to avoid drift and damage..."

Elon Musk "Humanoid robots and deep intelligence will unlock almost infinite potential for products and services."

GOOGLE

Thomas Kurian, CEO Google Cloud (2025) "AI agents must be able to communicate with each other, quickly and reliably. This interoperability will be the key to the agentic ecosystem."

Google, Agents Companion White Paper (2025) "The future of AI is agentic. Agents will collaborate, learn from humans, and solve complex problems as a team."

Google, Agents Companion White Paper (2025) "Contractor agents will work like professionals you hire, with clear objectives and the ability to negotiate tasks."

Google (2025) "AI agents will transform information search by leveraging the power of Google Search to access enterprise data."

Google (2025) "AI agents in enterprises will allow small structures to access advanced automation tools, leveling the playing field against large groups."

Google (2025) "AI agents in cars will make the driving experience more intuitive, managing navigation, entertainment and assistance."

Sundar Pichai, CEO of Google and Alphabet (2025) "We are making progress with agents... by chaining them together... we are now working on recursive self-improvement paradigms. The potential is immense."

Google (2025) "AI 'contractor' agents will be reliable for critical tasks, from project management to scientific research."

AMAZON

Amazon AWS (2025) "Agentic AI has the potential to become AWS's next multi-billion dollar business."

Amazon (2025) "Nova Act, our new AI agent, will be able to book, order, fill out forms... all without human intervention."

Amazon (2025) "The integration of AI agents into Alexa+ will put advanced automation within reach of millions of homes."

AWS (2025) "AI agents are fundamental to the next wave of innovation."

Amazon (2025) "The Nova Act AI agent will be able to navigate the web, book, order, fill out forms – all without human intervention."

Jeff Bezos, founder of Amazon "AI agents will become our digital assistants, helping us navigate the complexities of the modern world. They will make our lives easier and more efficient."

Jeff Bezos, Amazon "Advances in AI and machine learning promise to make certain jobs obsolete through automation and change our world forever."

MICROSOFT

Microsoft Work Trend Index (2025) "Every employee will become an 'agent boss', orchestrating sophisticated networks of autonomous AI agents."

Microsoft Work Trend Index (2025) "Orchestrating autonomous AI agents will require new skills, close to those of leaders."

Microsoft (2025) "AI will transform every employee into a conductor of automated processes, multiplying creativity and productivity tenfold."

Satya Nadella, CEO of Microsoft "AI agents will become the primary means of interacting with computers. They will understand our needs and help us proactively accomplish tasks and make decisions."

Bill Gates, co-founder of Microsoft "AI is a tremendous tool. We just need to make sure it's used for good."

Bill Gates (AI Forward 2023) "Whoever manages to win the race to the personal agent will win a huge treasure, because you will never again go to a search site, or a productivity site, or Amazon."

Satya Nadella, CEO of Microsoft "AI agents are about to replace traditional applications, challenging the SaaS model."

DUST

Dust (2024)
« Les agents Dust peuvent utiliser plusieurs outils pour résoudre des problèmes complexes : recherche sémantique, analyse de données, navigation web… tout-en-un. »

Dust (2024)
« Orchestrer des équipes d'agents spécialisés qui collaborent avec les humains, c'est la nouvelle organisation du travail. »

DIVERS

Jamie Dimon, CEO de JPMorgan
« L'intelligence artificielle mènera à une semaine de travail de trois jours et demi pour la prochaine génération d'employés. »

Larry Fink, CEO de BlackRock
« Les pays développés ayant une population en déclin seront les grands gagnants, car ils pourront rapidement développer la robotique et l'IA pour élever leur niveau de vie. »

Larry Fink (CERAWeek 2025)
« L'IA va transformer le marché du travail et la façon dont nous pensons à la productivité et à la croissance. »

Rapport Davos – BCG (2025)
« 67 % des dirigeants envisagent d'adopter les agents IA en 2025. »

Sheryl Sandberg, ex-COO de Meta
« L'IA et les agents intelligents offrent une opportunité unique pour repenser l'inclusion et l'équité dans le monde du travail. »

Tim Cook, CEO d'Apple
« Les agents IA deviendront des partenaires essentiels dans la vie quotidienne, garantissant confidentialité et sécurité à chaque étape. »

Collectif – Sommet mondial de l'IA à Paris (2025)
« L'IA est en train de transformer tous les secteurs, de l'économie à la culture, en passant par la santé et l'environnement. »

Rapport Anthem Creation (2025)
« L'agent IA de 2025 ne se contente pas d'exécuter, il anticipe, conseille et agit avec discernement dans un écosystème numérique complexe. »

Collectif – AI Agents in 2025 (LinkedIn, 2025)
« Les organisations qui prospéreront ne seront pas forcément celles qui ont les agents IA les plus avancés, mais celles qui sauront les adapter à leurs besoins et bâtir des fondations solides pour l'avenir. »

DUST

Dust (2024) "Dust agents can use multiple tools to solve complex problems: semantic search, data analysis, web navigation... all-in-one."

Dust (2024) "Orchestrating teams of specialized agents that collaborate with humans is the new work organization."

MISCELLANEOUS

Jamie Dimon, CEO of JPMorgan "Artificial intelligence will lead to a three-and-a-half-day work week for the next generation of employees."

Larry Fink, CEO of BlackRock "Developed countries with declining populations will be the big winners, as they will be able to rapidly develop robotics and AI to raise their standard of living."

Larry Fink (CERAWeek 2025) "AI will transform the job market and how we think about productivity and growth."

Davos Report – BCG (2025) "67% of leaders are considering adopting AI agents in 2025."

Sheryl Sandberg, former COO of Meta "AI and intelligent agents offer a unique opportunity to rethink inclusion and equity in the workplace."

Tim Cook, CEO of Apple "AI agents will become essential partners in daily life, ensuring privacy and security at every step."

Collective – Global AI Summit in Paris (2025) "AI is transforming all sectors, from economy to culture, including health and environment."

Anthem Creation Report (2025) "The 2025 AI agent doesn't just execute, it anticipates, advises and acts with discernment in a complex digital ecosystem."

Collective – AI Agents in 2025 (LinkedIn, 2025) "The organizations that will thrive will not necessarily be those with the most advanced AI agents, but those that know how to adapt them to their needs and build solid foundations for the future."