The Labor Replacement Tax Strategy

A Federal, State, County, and City Framework for Funding the Machine Economy

Really Knows AI

Really Knows Network

Policy & Governance

Policy and governance is where the warning becomes a plan.

The AI crisis cannot be handled only with speeches, hearings, opinion pieces, or small agency reports. The country needs a real process. It needs a new tax structure. It needs federal participation. It needs state participation. It needs county and city participation. Every level of government has been built around the labor economy. If labor weakens, every level of government is exposed.

For more than a century, the public system has depended on a simple chain. People work. People earn wages. Wages are taxed. Workers spend money. Businesses earn revenue. Property values are supported. Cities collect local taxes. Counties fund services. States fund schools, healthcare, roads, courts, prisons, and public programs. The federal government funds Social Security, Medicare, defense, infrastructure, debt service, and national administration.

That chain is now under threat. AI agents, robots, autonomous transportation, machine-run workflows, and digital labor systems are beginning to move work away from human beings and into machines. If the work moves but the tax system does not move with it, the country will be left trying to fund a modern government from a shrinking labor base. That is not a policy problem at the edge of the system. That is a structural threat to the entire public-finance model.

The answer is not panic. The answer is design. The United States must build a new tax base before the laborless economy arrives at scale. That process should begin with a national economic meeting in January 2027.

Government Was Built on Labor

Federal, state, county, and city governments all depend on labor, either directly or indirectly.

At the federal level, the exposure is obvious. The federal government depends heavily on individual income taxes and social insurance receipts. Those are labor-linked sources. They are connected to people working, earning income, and participating in the economy. When workers disappear from payrolls, the federal government loses more than jobs. It loses taxable wages. It loses payroll contributions. It loses the funding stream that supports major national obligations.

At the state level, the dependency is also clear. States depend on personal income taxes, sales taxes, corporate taxes, business activity, fees, licenses, and revenue streams connected to working households and operating businesses. If people earn less, they spend less. If they spend less, businesses collect less. If businesses collect less, state tax collections weaken. The damage spreads.

At the local level, the connection is even more personal. Cities and counties depend on sales taxes, property taxes, business license taxes, hotel taxes, utility taxes, parking fees, permits, assessments, and local economic activity. These revenues fund police, fire, emergency response, roads, libraries, parks, public health, housing programs, courts, jails, and local administration. If labor income falls, the stress shows up in neighborhoods first.

This is the first truth of governance in the machine age:

The labor economy does not only pay workers. It funds government.

California as the Warning Example

California is one of the best examples of how a modern government depends on labor and labor-related tax structures.

California's personal income tax is the state's largest revenue source. That matters because personal income tax is directly connected to people earning income. In California's own budget materials, wages made up about 59% of personal income tax liability on average over the ten years through 2022. In tax year 2022, wages represented 66% of personal income tax liability.

That is direct labor exposure.

A simple stress lens makes the danger clear. If personal income tax accounts for most of a state's General Fund revenue, and wages make up most of personal income tax liability, then a large part of the state budget is directly tied to working people earning taxable income. If AI and robotics reduce wage income, the damage moves straight into the state budget.

That is only the first layer.

California also depends on sales and use tax. Sales tax is not technically a wage tax, but it is labor-related because households spend money from income. People buy food, clothes, cars, furniture, phones, equipment, supplies, and household goods because they have money coming in. If wages fall, consumer spending weakens. If consumer spending weakens, sales tax weakens. California expected sales tax to account for about 16% of General Fund revenues in the 2025–26 budget materials. That is a major revenue stream tied to the spending power of households.

Then comes property tax.

Property tax is not a wage tax either, but it is labor-sensitive. Wages support homebuying. Wages support rent payments. Wages support commercial demand. Wages support small-business survival. Wages help keep neighborhoods stable. When household income weakens, communities weaken. When communities weaken, property values, rental stability, commercial activity, and local revenue pressure all become part of the same problem.

In California, property tax revenue is critical to schools, counties, cities, and special districts. That means local government is deeply exposed to the health of the broader labor economy. Schools, police departments, fire departments, counties, public health systems, transportation districts, and local services all depend on revenue streams connected to working households and stable communities.

This is why the California example matters. It shows the full chain.

First, labor creates income.
Second, income creates tax revenue.
Third, income creates spending.
Fourth, spending supports businesses.
Fifth, business activity supports state and local revenue.
Sixth, household stability supports property values.
Seventh, property values fund local services.

AI labor replacement threatens that chain from the beginning.

The danger is not only that California could lose income tax revenue. The deeper danger is that a labor shock could move through the entire structure: income taxes, sales taxes, business taxes, local fees, property stability, school funding, county services, city services, and public safety.

California is not the exception. California is the warning.

Direct Labor Taxes and Labor-Related Taxes

The new tax discussion must be honest about the difference between direct labor taxes and labor-related taxes.

Direct labor taxes are the easiest to see. These include personal income taxes, payroll taxes, wage withholding, Social Security contributions, Medicare contributions, unemployment insurance contributions, and other tax streams tied directly to workers earning income.

If workers lose jobs, these tax streams are hit directly.

Labor-related taxes are different but still exposed. These include sales taxes, local business taxes, property taxes, hotel taxes, utility taxes, transportation fees, permitting revenue, and other local revenue streams that depend on working households and active communities.

If workers lose income, these tax streams are hit indirectly.

That distinction matters because critics will try to narrow the issue. They will say, “Sales tax is not a labor tax.” That is technically true but incomplete. Sales tax is not collected from wages, but wages drive spending. If household income weakens, taxable consumption weakens. The same is true for local business activity. A business license tax is not a wage tax, but if customers disappear because workers have less income, business revenue falls and the local tax base weakens.

The correct phrase is this:

Government depends on revenue that is either directly labor-derived or labor-related.

That is the structure we must measure.

A laborless economy will not only reduce wage taxes. It will reduce the economic activity that labor income supports.

The Problem With Waiting

The worst mistake America can make is waiting until the crisis is obvious.

If the country waits until millions of jobs are already gone, it will not be designing policy from strength. It will be reacting under pressure. It will be trying to rebuild the tax system while revenue is falling, families are angry, support costs are rising, and public trust is breaking.

That is the panic window.

The panic window opens when government finally realizes the old labor-funded system can no longer carry the machine economy. By then, the public conversation becomes harder. Workers are already hurt. Cities are already stressed. States are already cutting or borrowing. The federal government is already under deeper pressure. The machine economy is already powerful enough to resist reform. And the public is no longer asking politely.

That is why the policy process must begin before full rupture.

The country does not need another symbolic meeting. It needs a working conference with a real mission: build the new tax base before the old one breaks.

The 2027 National Conference on the Machine Economy and the New Tax Base

In January 2027, the United States should convene a three-day national economic conference focused on the laborless economy and the new tax base.

The purpose of this conference should be direct:

To design the federal, state, county, and city tax structure needed for an economy where AI agents, robots, autonomous systems, and machine-run platforms perform work that human beings once performed.

This should not be a technology celebration. It should not be a public-relations event. It should not be a loose academic panel where everyone gives speeches and nothing happens.

It should be a working conference.

The federal government should attend. Every state should attend. Major cities and counties should attend directly. Smaller cities and counties should be represented through official municipal and county associations. Tax agencies, budget offices, governors, mayors, county executives, public finance experts, labor representatives, AI companies, robotics companies, economists, Social Security and Medicare experts, infrastructure experts, and local government leaders should all be part of the process.

The question before the country should be simple:

How do we fund government when machines begin replacing the labor that government depends on?

That is the question.

Everything else is secondary.

The Conference Must Not Start With Politics

The conference should not begin with left versus right. It should not begin with slogans about capitalism, socialism, innovation, or regulation. It should begin with arithmetic.

Every government must answer the same first question:

How much of our revenue depends on human labor directly or labor-supported economic activity indirectly?

That is where serious policy begins.

The federal government must measure its labor-linked revenue exposure. States must measure their income tax, sales tax, business tax, and payroll-related exposure. Cities and counties must measure their dependence on sales taxes, property taxes, business taxes, permit revenue, public fees, and local economic activity tied to working households.

Before the country can build a new tax base, every level of government must measure how dependent it is on the old labor base.

That is the first job.

Day One: Measure the Exposure

Day One should be called Measure the Exposure.

The federal government should present its labor-revenue dependency. How much federal revenue comes from individual income taxes? How much comes from payroll-linked systems? How much supports Social Security, Medicare, unemployment insurance, federal operations, national defense, infrastructure, debt service, and major public obligations?

States should present their exposure. Each state should show how much revenue comes from personal income tax, wage withholding, sales tax, corporate tax, property-related transfers, business taxes, and labor-supported economic activity. States without income taxes must show their dependence on consumption taxes, property taxes, business activity, tourism, energy, services, and local spending.

Cities and counties should present their exposure. They should show what happens to police, fire, schools, housing programs, roads, libraries, public health, courts, jails, emergency response, sanitation, local infrastructure, and community services if household income falls and local spending weakens.

The point of Day One is to force every level of government to see the same thing at the same time:

The old tax base is exposed.

This must not be hidden in technical language. The public needs to understand it.

If labor income falls by 10%, what breaks first?
If labor income falls by 20%, what breaks next?
If labor income falls by 30%, what becomes impossible to fund?
If AI and robotics create a long-term labor decline, what part of government no longer works under the old model?

Those are the Day One questions.

Day Two: Design the New Tax Base

Day Two should be called Design the New Tax Base.

This is where the Labor Replacement Tax becomes the center of the discussion.

The basic principle is simple:

The tax base must follow the work.

If human labor carried the work, human labor carried much of the tax burden. If machine labor begins carrying more of the work, machine-driven value must begin carrying more of the civic burden.

That is not anti-technology.
That is not anti-business.
That is not punishment.
That is not hostility toward innovation.

It is the continuation of the old fiscal logic under new production conditions.

Day Two should define the new tax categories. What counts as machine labor? What counts as machine-driven revenue? What counts as labor replacement? What counts as labor compression? What counts as autonomous operational revenue? What counts as AI-agent revenue? What counts as robotics revenue? What counts as machine-attributable value inside a company that still has human workers?

These definitions matter because the machine economy will not arrive in clean categories.

Some companies will sell AI directly. Some will sell software that performs work humans once performed. Some will use AI internally to cut payroll while still selling ordinary goods or services. Some will run autonomous logistics systems. Some will deploy robots in warehouses, restaurants, hospitals, hotels, stores, factories, security operations, and homes. Some will replace contractors but keep employees. Some will shrink teams without calling it replacement.

The tax system must be able to see all of it.

If the machine does the work, and the work used to require people, and the company captures the value, then the public system has a claim.

That is the heart of the Labor Replacement Tax.

Day Three: Build the Governance Framework

Day Three should be called Build the Governance Framework.

This is where the conference must produce action.

By the end of Day Three, the country should have a national framework for moving forward. Not a final law, but a serious structure. The output should include model federal legislation, state participation rules, local revenue-sharing options, company reporting requirements, audit standards, anti-avoidance rules, pilot programs, and a timeline for phase-in.

The framework should answer several hard questions.

How will machine-driven value be measured?
How will companies report AI labor replacement?
How will governments distinguish ordinary software use from large-scale labor substitution?
How will revenue be shared between the federal government, states, counties, and cities?
How will companies be prevented from hiding machine labor inside bundled software contracts?
How will offshore AI execution be handled when the economic use is domestic?
How will the system protect small businesses from being treated like major machine-labor enterprises?
How will the tax phase in without creating sudden economic shock?
How will the revenue be used to stabilize the public system?

Day Three must produce a path.

Without a path, the conference becomes theater.

With a path, the country begins governing before the crisis governs us.

The New Tax Structure Must Be Federal, State, and Local

The Labor Replacement Tax cannot be only a federal conversation.

The federal government is exposed, but it is not the only level of government exposed. States are exposed. Counties are exposed. Cities are exposed. School districts are exposed. Public health systems are exposed. Transportation systems are exposed. Housing systems are exposed. Local public safety is exposed.

A top-to-bottom tax structure is necessary because the damage from AI labor replacement will move through the whole system.

At the federal level, machine-driven value should help stabilize the national obligations that labor once helped carry. That includes Social Security, Medicare, federal deficits, national infrastructure, healthcare support, transition systems, and the federal safety net.

At the state level, machine-driven value should help support state responsibilities. States fund education, healthcare programs, transportation, courts, prisons, public assistance, workforce systems, emergency response, environmental systems, and statewide infrastructure. If AI weakens labor income, states will face pressure fast.

At the county and city level, machine-driven value must help protect local government. This is where the crisis will become visible first. Police calls increase locally. Homelessness appears locally. Small businesses close locally. Housing pressure appears locally. Public health strain appears locally. Schools feel stress locally. Local governments cannot be left holding the damage while machine wealth flows upward to national platforms and private owners.

The machine economy cannot send the damage downward to cities and counties while sending the profit upward to platforms and owners.

That is not a stable bargain.

Federal Participation

The federal government should create the national Labor Replacement Tax framework.

Its job is to define machine-driven value at the national level, set broad reporting standards, create the taxability test, establish anti-avoidance rules, and direct revenue toward the national systems most exposed by labor replacement.

The federal test should be simple enough to understand and strong enough to enforce.

First, machine execution: the output is produced, delivered, or materially enabled by AI, robotics, autonomous systems, or machine-run workflows.

Second, labor replacement or labor compression: the machine system replaces, reduces, compresses, or absorbs work that would otherwise have required human workers, contractors, or professional services.

Third, private value capture: the company captures revenue, savings, margin improvement, market power, subscription fees, platform fees, operational savings, or other economic value from the machine execution.

When all three conditions are present, the tax base should follow the work.

At the federal level, the revenue should help replace the civic burden that labor once carried. It should help stabilize Social Security and Medicare. It should help cover transition support. It should help protect healthcare access. It should reduce the pressure to punish the remaining workers with higher taxes. It should help prevent the federal government from financing the machine transition entirely through debt.

The federal government cannot keep chasing disappearing payrolls while machine-driven value escapes the public structure.

State Participation

States must have their own role.

A national Labor Replacement Tax cannot treat states as an afterthought. States are responsible for too many public systems. They fund schools, universities, healthcare programs, courts, prisons, roads, bridges, emergency systems, workforce programs, and social services. If the labor base weakens, states will face the pressure directly.

States should participate in one of two ways.

They can receive a defined share of federal Labor Replacement Tax revenue based on exposure, population, labor displacement, and machine-economy activity inside the state.

Or they can adopt state-level Labor Replacement Tax systems that operate alongside the federal structure, using shared definitions and reporting standards.

The exact method can be debated. The principle should not be debated.

If AI and robotics reduce the labor base inside a state, that state must participate in the machine-driven revenue replacing it.

California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, Georgia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and every other state will face different versions of the same problem. Some depend more on income taxes. Some depend more on sales taxes. Some depend more on property, tourism, energy, business activity, or service consumption. But all of them depend on human participation.

No state can assume that the machine economy will only be a federal problem.

County and City Participation

Local governments must be protected from being last in line.

Cities and counties are where the human damage shows up first. If families lose income, local governments feel it. If homelessness rises, local governments feel it. If public safety calls increase, local governments feel it. If small businesses close, local governments feel it. If local spending drops, local governments feel it. If housing pressure rises, local governments feel it.

Local governments cannot print money. They cannot run federal-sized deficits. They cannot absorb massive social pressure without revenue. They cannot be told to manage the consequences of machine displacement while having no claim on the value created by the machine systems causing the displacement.

The Labor Replacement Tax must therefore include a local participation channel.

That channel could take several forms. It could be a direct revenue-sharing formula. It could be a machine-labor impact fund. It could be state-administered local support tied to displacement data. It could be a dedicated share of Labor Replacement Tax revenue for cities, counties, schools, housing systems, public safety, and local infrastructure.

The form can be debated.

The principle is clear:

If machine labor weakens local human economies, local governments must receive part of the machine-labor revenue.

Otherwise, the machine economy will create one of the worst political outcomes possible: national and global firms capturing the gains while cities and counties absorb the social damage.

That is how public trust collapses.

Machine-Labor Reporting

The new tax structure cannot work unless machine labor is reported.

Companies should not be allowed to replace workers with AI systems and hide that change inside vague language like “efficiency,” “optimization,” “workflow modernization,” or “digital transformation.” Those words may sound harmless, but underneath them may be a major shift from human labor to machine labor.

The country needs machine-labor reporting.

Companies above a defined size should report where AI, robotics, and autonomous systems are materially replacing or compressing human labor. They should report AI API revenue, inference revenue, autonomous platform revenue, robotic execution revenue, enterprise AI revenue, machine-handled transaction volume, payroll reduction tied to AI deployment, output maintained despite lower headcount, and labor savings connected to machine execution.

This does not mean every small business using scheduling software should be punished. A small business using ordinary tools is not the same as a major platform replacing thousands of workers with autonomous systems.

The reporting rules should be serious, but disciplined.

The target is not ordinary technology use.

The target is large-scale labor substitution.

If machine labor cannot be measured, it cannot be taxed. If it cannot be taxed, the public system breaks.

Anti-Avoidance Rules

A new tax structure will fail if companies can hide the machine-labor tax base.

That is why anti-avoidance rules must be built from the beginning.

Firms will have incentives to reclassify machine-driven value as ordinary software revenue. They may bundle AI execution inside broader contracts. They may shift inference, model operations, or autonomous processing offshore. They may split machine and non-machine revenue across related companies. They may claim that labor replacement is only “productivity improvement.” They may use transfer pricing to move machine value into lower-tax jurisdictions.

A serious Labor Replacement Tax must anticipate that behavior.

The rule should be simple:

If the economic substance is machine labor replacing human labor, the tax base follows the machine value no matter how the company labels it.

This is not unusual. Tax systems already look through labels when substance and form do not match. They already distinguish employees from contractors. They already deal with transfer pricing. They already classify revenue. They already separate ordinary income from capital gain. They already apply sourcing rules, allocation rules, credits, exemptions, and audit standards.

The machine economy will require the same discipline.

If the tax base can be hidden, the system fails.

If the tax base can be measured, reported, audited, and enforced, the system can begin to work.

Protecting Innovation Without Abandoning Society

The Labor Replacement Tax must be designed carefully because innovation matters.

AI and robotics can create enormous benefits. They can improve medicine. They can reduce dangerous work. They can increase productivity. They can accelerate science. They can improve logistics. They can help small businesses. They can expand education. They can make services faster and cheaper. They can solve problems that human systems have struggled with for decades.

This policy is not about stopping that.

It is about preventing one-sided extraction.

A society can support innovation and still demand civic contribution. A country can reward companies for building powerful technology and still require those companies to help fund the public structure when their machines replace taxable human labor.

The machine economy should be allowed to succeed.

But it should not be allowed to detach from the society that made it possible.

Private firms built the models, platforms, products, robots, chips, data centers, and systems. They deserve reward for that. But they built those systems on top of public education, public research, human knowledge, language, law, science, infrastructure, markets, users, workers, and the accumulated intelligence of civilization.

Private success does not erase public foundation.

That is why the Labor Replacement Tax is not punishment.

It is participation.

What the New Tax Base Should Fund

The Labor Replacement Tax should not disappear into the general political fog.

The public should know what the revenue is for.

First, it should replace part of the federal revenue lost when human labor declines.

Second, it should help stabilize Social Security and Medicare as payroll-linked systems come under pressure.

Third, it should support healthcare continuity as employment-based access weakens.

Fourth, it should help states maintain education, courts, transportation, healthcare programs, and social services.

Fifth, it should help counties and cities deal with local consequences: homelessness, public safety pressure, emergency response, public health, housing, and infrastructure.

Sixth, it should fund workforce transition, education, and new paths into machine-era participation.

Seventh, if policymakers choose, it could help fund a Humanity Dividend or citizen participation mechanism designed to keep people economically connected to the machine value being created from civilization’s knowledge.

The point is not to create a slush fund.

The point is to keep society from breaking while the production system changes.

The Timeline

The country needs a timeline because delay is dangerous.

January 2027 should be the starting point. That is when the National Conference on the Machine Economy and the New Tax Base should take place.

By mid-2027, federal, state, and local working groups should produce draft frameworks. These should include model federal legislation, state participation models, local revenue-sharing options, machine-labor reporting standards, taxability tests, audit rules, and anti-avoidance standards.

By 2028, the country should begin pilot reporting. Major AI, robotics, autonomous logistics, enterprise-agent, and machine-labor firms should begin reporting machine-driven revenue, labor-compression indicators, payroll-reduction data, and machine-handled transaction volume under clear rules.

By 2029, early phase-in should begin. The Labor Replacement Tax should start modestly, before the acceleration year becomes unmanageable. The goal is not sudden shock. The goal is phased replacement before panic taxation becomes unavoidable.

By 2030 and beyond, the system should expand as machine labor becomes a larger part of production. Federal, state, and local participation should grow as machine-driven value replaces more human labor across the economy.

That is the difference between governing and reacting.

Governing means building the structure before the crisis peaks.

Reacting means waiting until the old system is already breaking.

America cannot afford to react late.

The Governance Principle

The governance principle is simple:

No machine economy without civic responsibility.

AI companies, robotics companies, autonomous platforms, cloud providers, enterprise-agent firms, and machine-labor operators should be allowed to build, compete, innovate, and profit. But when their systems begin performing work that human beings once performed, the value created by that replacement cannot remain invisible to the public system.

The government must not punish remaining workers because machines displaced other workers.

The government must not force cities and counties to absorb the damage while national platforms keep the gains.

The government must not let states lose labor-supported revenue while machine-driven value moves outside the traditional tax base.

The government must not let companies describe labor replacement as harmless productivity while the public system loses the tax base that labor created.

The rule has to be clear:

The tax base must follow the work.

The Closing Warning

The laborless economy is not just a technology shift. It is a tax-base shift. It is a governance shift. It is a public-finance shift. It is a social-stability shift.

If America waits until 2029 or 2030 to build the new tax structure, it will not be governing from strength. It will be writing emergency policy under pressure. It will be trying to create calm after households are already angry, cities are already strained, states are already exposed, and the federal government is already deeper in the funding crisis.

That is the wrong way to meet the machine age.

The right way is to act before the numbers break.

The country needs to meet in January 2027. It needs to measure the exposure. It needs to define machine labor. It needs to design the Labor Replacement Tax. It needs to build federal, state, county, and city participation. It needs to create reporting rules, audit rules, anti-avoidance rules, phase-in schedules, and revenue-sharing systems. It needs to decide, before the panic window opens, how civilization will be funded when machines begin carrying the work that human labor once carried.

This is not about stopping AI.

It is about keeping the country from collapsing under a tax system built for an economy that is disappearing.

The machine economy can still be extraordinary. It can still create wealth. It can still cure disease, reduce costs, accelerate science, improve logistics, expand productivity, and open new possibilities.

But if the machine economy takes the work, captures the wealth, weakens the labor tax base, and leaves federal, state, county, and city governments fighting over a shrinking revenue structure, then it will not produce a stable future.

It will produce a rich machine layer sitting on top of a weakened human society.

That is not governance.

That is surrender.

Policy and governance must begin now. The tax base must follow the work. The Labor Replacement Tax is how the country starts building the bridge from the labor-funded economy to the machine-funded future before the old bridge collapses beneath us.