ChatGPT

The Structural Decline of Labor's Share in the Age of Automation

Introduction

Around the world, workers' slice of the economic pie – the labor share of national income – has been eroding for decades. The labor share measures the portion of output that accrues to workers as compensation (wages, salaries, and benefits), as opposed to capital owners in the form of profits, rents, and dividends [1] [2]. A growing body of evidence indicates this decline is structural: in many advanced economies the labor share has trended downward since at least the 1980s, even as the capital share has risen commensurately [3] [4]. This shift in income distribution has coincided with rapid advances in technology – from industrial robotics to artificial intelligence – which increasingly allow machines to perform tasks once done by humans. A broad empirical consensus has emerged that **automation and related technological changes are a central driver of the falling labor share**, alongside other global forces such as trade integration and the rise of high-profit "superstar" firms [5] [6]. Policymakers and institutions at every level are now grappling with what these trends portend. This report examines the macroeconomic indicators behind labor's declining share, drawing on the latest data and models from county dashboards to international agencies. It surveys how governments, research arms, and think tanks in the US, UK, and EU are diagnosing the problem, measuring its evolution, and planning for a future in which capital may claim an ever-larger portion of economic gains.

Global Indicators of a Falling Labor Share

The downward slide of labor's income share is a worldwide phenomenon documented by major economic institutions. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), the **global labor income share declined from about 53.9% of output in 2004 to 52.3% by 2024**, a drop of 1.6 percentage points [2]. In recent years the trend has continued: between 2019 and 2022 alone, the global share going to labor fell by 0.6 points and had not recovered as of 2024 [2]. In practical terms, this means a smaller piece of total income is paid out as wages and salaries, while a larger piece is captured as gross operating surplus (profits and other capital income). The ILO notes that the global labor share is now stagnating near historic lows, putting "upward pressure on inequality" as more income flows to capital owners [7]. Even in 2022–2023, a period of strong post-pandemic job growth in many regions, labor's share remained flat at about 52% globally, significantly below its mid-20th-century levels [2].

This broad pattern holds across most advanced economies, although the magnitude varies. The **International Monetary Fund (IMF) has documented a pervasive decline in labor's share since the early 1990s across a large sample of countries** [8]. In its World Economic Outlook analysis, the IMF found labor income shares in advanced economies began trending down in the 1980s, reached low points around the late 2000s, and **as of the 2010s were roughly 3–4 percentage points lower than in 1970** on average [9]. For emerging-market economies, the decline started later and has been linked more to globalization and capital deepening, but many developing countries have also seen labor shares fall [10]. An OECD review likewise confirms a "statistically significant but small decline" in the average labor share across its member

countries over the past two decades [11]. (Notably, the OECD points out that if one adjusts for capital depreciation, the net labor share's decline appears more modest [12] – a nuance indicating that a rising depreciation cost of new technology capital accounts for part of the shift. Still, on a gross basis the downward trend is clear.) In short, a **strong empirical consensus has emerged** that the distribution of national income is shifting: labor is losing ground nearly everywhere, even as total economic output has grown.

Crucially, this structural decline in labor's share must be distinguished from cyclical fluctuations. Labor's share tends to **rise temporarily during recessions**, since profits typically collapse faster than wages in an economic downturn [13]. For example, during the COVID-19 shock in 2020, government wage supports and falling corporate earnings caused labor's share to spike in many countries [14] [15]. But these boosts proved transitory. As recoveries took hold, labor's share generally fell back to its prior trend line [16] [15]. The overarching story is one of a downward drift over multiple business cycles. The U.S. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City notes that after the pandemic recession, the labor share "fell to previous norms" by late 2021, resuming the typical pattern seen over decades [17] [18]. In the euro area, the wage share rebounded with heavy pandemic supports in 2020, but by the end of 2022 it had receded to about 61% – slightly below its pre-pandemic level and below its long-run average (roughly 62–65%) [19] [20]. These episodes underscore that **the structural decline of labor's share is not a product of one crisis or another, but a long-run trend** driven by deeper forces. As the European Central Bank observes, the trajectory reflects "long-term structural drivers, such as technological changes, globalisation… and institutional characteristics," rather than just medium-term cycles [21].

The United States: Declining Labor Share and Technological Drivers

In the United States, the erosion of labor's share of income is starkly evident in the data. In the **nonfarm business sector – the backbone of the U.S. economy – labor's share has fallen from about 65% in the late 1940s to around 56–58% in recent years** [1] [22]. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) figures show a steady postwar decline: in 1947 workers received roughly two-thirds of output as compensation, but by 2000 the share was closer to 63%, and it dropped sharply thereafter [1]. Labor's share dipped below 60% in the mid-2000s and hit a modern low of just 56.0% in late 2011 [23] [24]. While there was a modest rebound after 2012 – climbing back to about 58.4% by 2016 as the economy recovered from the Great Recession [24] [25] – this proved only a partial recovery. As of 2023–2025, the labor share remains well under historical norms. Federal Reserve data (FRED) indexed to 2017=100 show the U.S. labor share hovering in the high 90s (i.e. a few percent below its 2017 level) through early 2025 [26], implying it has not regained the highs of past decades. According to analysis in the *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, **the U.S. labor share in the private sector dropped from 63% in 1980 to just 56% by 2017** [22] – a dramatic shift in how the fruits of growth are allocated. Over that same period, median real wages barely rose (only ~16% growth from 1980 to 2017, despite GDP per capita roughly doubling) [27], illustrating how a falling labor share has translated into wage stagnation for typical workers even as productivity climbed.

Economists increasingly link America's labor share decline to the rapid adoption of labor-saving technologies. The late 20th and early 21st centuries saw production processes become radically more automated in the U.S., with the diffusion of computerized machinery, industrial robots, and now artificial intelligence tools [28]. For instance, the number of industrial robots per thousand manufacturing workers in the U.S. jumped from 2.5 in 1993 to about 20 by 2019 [29]. Since the mid-2000s, firms have also begun integrating AI-related capabilities (however nascent); by 2018, about 0.75% of all job postings were already for AI-related roles, reflecting the spread of the new technology [30]. These innovations boost productivity,

but by **directly replacing certain tasks and jobs, they tend to reduce the proportion of income going to labor** [31] [32]. As MIT economists Daron Acemoglu and Pascual Restrepo bluntly state, "by replacing labor with machines in production tasks, automation reduces labor's share of value added (and national income)" [31]. Automation has been a persistent engine of U.S. productivity growth since the Industrial Revolution, but what's different now – in the age of AI – is the concern that automation may outpace the creation of new labor-intensive tasks. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) recently warned lawmakers that **advanced AI could "undermine labor's share of national income" in the long run** in a way previous technologies did not, potentially *permanently* reducing labor's importance in the economy [33] [34]. This marks a significant recognition at the policy level that the historical stability of factor shares (once treated as near-constant) may be breaking down due to modern technology [35] [8].

Beyond technology, studies indicate other forces have amplified the U.S. labor share decline. Trade globalization has exerted pressure by exposing labor-intensive American industries to low-cost foreign competition, encouraging offshoring of production [36]. Diminished worker bargaining power – evidenced by union decline and more "flexible" labor markets – is also frequently cited. Indeed, research by the Resolution Foundation notes that the falling labor share is often attributed to "the rise of globalisation, technological progress and diminished worker power – forces which have been at play across advanced economies" [37]. However, quantitative analyses suggest technology's role dominates in the U.S. case. **The IMF found that roughly half of the drop in labor's share in advanced economies can be explained by technological progress – especially the steep decline in the price of capital goods (like computer equipment and software) and the automation of routine tasks** [38] [39]. By contrast, increased trade integration and offshoring accounted for perhaps half as much impact as technology in advanced economies [40] [41]. This aligns with findings by the Brookings Institution and others. For example, a Brookings study by Elsby et al. observed that in the U.S. since the 1980s, the manufacturing and trade sectors have led the labor share decline, pointing to globalization (outsourcing of labor-intensive supply chain components) as "a leading potential explanation" – yet they also found "limited support" for pure capital-for-labor substitution in many sectors [42] [43]. In manufacturing specifically, there is evidence that the drop in labor share is tied to the rise of dominant, highly automated firms. Researchers have noted that within U.S. manufacturing, the typical plant's labor share has not collapsed; rather, a disproportionate share of output shifted to "hyper-productive" plants that operate at much lower labor share, driving down the aggregate share [44] [45]. This speaks to the **"superstar firm" effect** – a small number of highly efficient, capital-intensive firms capturing outsized market share and profits [46] [47]. Such firms often have lower labor cost ratios, so as they account for more of the economy, the overall labor share falls [46] [48].

American policymakers are increasingly aware of these dynamics. The U.S. Congressional Budget Office now routinely factors a stable or slightly declining labor share into its long-term budget projections. (The Social Security Trustees, for instance, assume that the labor compensation ratio to GDP will remain constant in the very long run after recent declines, effectively building a flat labor share into their models on the premise that factor shares "tend toward stable proportions" eventually [49] [50].) Yet there is growing debate about whether such assumptions will hold in the face of AI and robotics. The U.S. House Budget Committee in 2023 commissioned the CBO's first-ever report on artificial intelligence and the economy, underscoring concern that automation's next wave could suppress wage growth and labor's income share further [51]. The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia recently explored an unsettling scenario: **if generative AI lives up to its transformative billing, it could herald a "once-in-a-lifetime decline in labor's share of national income," permanently altering the historical balance between labor and capital** [52] [53]. In short, the U.S. policy establishment now recognizes the declining labor share as a fundamental economic challenge intertwined with automation and innovation policy. From the White House Council of Economic

Advisers to regional Fed banks, there is an active effort to monitor labor share metrics and develop policy responses (ranging from tax code reforms to job training investments) to ensure the benefits of technology-led growth are more broadly shared [54] [55].

The United Kingdom: A Divergent Trend Amid Global Forces

The United Kingdom's experience with labor's share of income has similarities to, but also key differences from, the U.S. story. Historically, the UK saw a significant decline in labor's share through the late 20th century, especially during the 1980s era of economic restructuring. However, since the mid-1990s the UK labor share has not continued falling in the clear-cut way seen in the U.S. or some EU countries. **Official UK data show that the labor share fell from the postwar period into the 1990s, then stabilized and even recovered modestly after the late 1990s** [56] [57]. The Office for National Statistics (ONS) recently published a comprehensive analysis, "Trends in the UK labour share: 1997 to 2023," which finds that by using their preferred measure, **the UK labor share in 2023 was about 5–6 percentage points higher than in 1996** [58] [59]. In other words, labor's share in Britain has risen slightly over the past quarter-century, reversing a portion of the earlier long-run decline. All measurement methods the ONS explored (which differ in how they attribute mixed income of the self-employed) agree on the pattern: a pronounced drop in labor share from the 1970s to mid-1990s, followed by a recovery of several percentage points by the early 2000s and relative stability thereafter [60] [61]. By the late 2010s, the UK labor share was roughly in line with its level in the late 1970s after this partial rebound [58] [59]. The share of national income going to labor in Britain today is generally estimated in the mid-50s percent (depending on the methodology) – higher than the mid-40s percent lows that prevailed in the mid-1990s, but not back to the ~60% levels seen in the 1970s [56] [59].

What accounts for the UK's stabilization of labor share since 2000? One factor has been the **policy-driven boost in labor compensation** beyond just wages. The ONS analysis points out that a strong rise in employers' social contributions (like pension contributions and National Insurance) has propped up the measured labor share since the late 1990s [62] [63]. For example, the auto-enrollment pension reforms after 2012 greatly expanded workplace pension coverage (from 47% of employees participating in 2012 to 79% by 2021), increasing employers' pension contributions (a component of labor compensation) significantly [64] [65]. Additionally, increases in employer National Insurance contribution rates and efforts to reduce pension fund deficits led to faster growth of non-wage benefits [62] [65]. These developments mean that even as wages and mixed income grew at roughly the pace of GDP, the total labor compensation grew a bit faster, lifting labor's share. Between 1996 and 2023, total labor income in the UK (including wages, salaries, and the labor portion of self-employment income) grew about 230%, whereas gross operating surplus (profits) grew ~160% and overall nominal GDP ~200% [66] [67]. Thus, labor income outpaced capital income – a reversal of earlier trends – accounting for the rise in labor share over that period [66] [67].

However, the UK is not immune to the global forces putting downward pressure on labor's share. **British economists acknowledge that the same structural drivers identified elsewhere – technological change, globalization, and changing market power dynamics – have been at work in the UK as well** [68] [6]. The ONS explicitly notes that the long-run decline observed in many advanced countries is "a feature" internationally and "has been attributed to" offshoring of labor-intensive activities, widespread adoption of information and communication technologies (ICT) and intangible capital that substitute for workers, and the emergence of "superstar firms" with high profit margins and low labor shares [68] [6]. All these factors have been present in the UK economy. Indeed, the Resolution Foundation finds that the notion of **"decoupling"** – where productivity growth no longer translates into commensurate pay growth

for workers – exists in the UK, though to a lesser degree than in the U.S. [69] [70]. From 1980 to 2018, UK productivity (output per hour) grew substantially faster than median pay, opening a wedge of about 24 percentage points (versus a much larger 58-point wedge in the U.S. over a similar period) [71]. The Foundation emphasizes that in many analyses, decoupling is essentially a proxy for labor's shrinking share of income [37]. And it reiterates that the **suspected causes of labor share decline in advanced economies "derive from the rise of globalisation, technological progress and diminished worker power."** [37] In the UK context, diminished unionization and labor market liberalization in the 1980s likely accelerated the fall in labor share at that time. But after the 1990s, Britain's more robust wage-setting institutions (like inflation-indexed minimum wage increases and collective bargaining in some sectors) may have helped labor income keep pace with GDP. It is telling that, according to the ONS, all approaches to measuring the UK labor share show **a "relatively rapid fall" during the 1980s followed by a rebound around 1997–2001 and then stability** [56] [61]. That inflection corresponds with economic and policy changes (e.g. the introduction of the national minimum wage in 1999, stronger employment law, etc.) that shored up labor's position.

As a result, while **the UK has not seen a continued structural decline in labor share in the 21st century**, policymakers remain vigilant. The Bank of England and others track labor's share as an indicator of inflationary pressure and bargaining power [21] [72]. The Office for Budget Responsibility (OBR) incorporates labor income trends into its fiscal forecasts for earnings and tax revenues [73] [74]. Think tanks like the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) and Resolution Foundation frequently analyze the distribution of national income, warning that even a stable labor share can mask inequalities (such as a smaller slice of the pie going to low- and middle-wage workers) [75] [76]. Indeed, a Resolution Foundation report titled "Follow the money" highlighted that **lower earners' share of national income has fallen** even if the aggregate labor share hasn't collapsed – reflecting inequality within labor's slice [75] [76]. Thus, the conversation in the UK is now less about an ongoing aggregate decline (as in the U.S.) and more about ensuring that labor's existing share is distributed fairly and can rise in line with productivity. Nevertheless, the same disruptive technologies – AI, robotics, digital platforms – are arriving on British shores, and there is awareness that without careful policy, the UK could yet follow the U.S. path. The **Bank of England, HM Treasury, and UK research bodies are actively studying automation's impact on wages and employment**, aiming to preempt any renewed fall in labor's share as the Fourth Industrial Revolution unfolds.

Europe and the Euro Area: Broad Declines with Regional Nuance

Across continental Europe, labor's share of income has generally been on a downward trend, though with important variations between countries and time periods. On the whole, many EU economies mirror the pattern of advanced economies elsewhere: a peak or stability mid-century followed by a slide from the 1980s or 1990s onward. The IMF's analysis found that labor shares in large European countries (like Germany, France, Italy, Spain) declined through the 1990s and 2000s, contributing to the advanced-economy averages [9]. By one estimate, **labor income shares in advanced EU economies as a group are roughly 3–5 percentage points lower today than in the early 1970s** [77] [78]. That said, Europe exhibits some countervailing tendencies that have made the decline less uniform. For instance, France's labor share has fluctuated but remained relatively higher than in Anglo-Saxon economies, partly due to stronger labor institutions. Southern European countries saw big declines in labor share particularly after the 2008 financial crisis and the eurozone crisis austerity period, when profits recovered but wage growth lagged. In Germany, labor's share fell markedly in the early 2000s during labor market reforms (Hartz reforms) that suppressed wage growth, though it stabilized or even upticked in the late 2010s as wages rose faster than productivity for a while. These differences mean that within Europe, there is no single monolithic trend –

but **the overall direction has been downward in most places, driven by the same global forces of technology and globalization**.

The European Commission's research agencies have devoted extensive study to labor share dynamics in the EU. A Joint Research Centre (JRC) report notes that Europe's wave of robot adoption in manufacturing did not trigger massive aggregate job losses, yet it **did contribute to a falling labor income share by concentrating output in highly automated firms** [79]. In fact, a recent European Commission study, "Robots and the Rise of European Superstar Firms," found that industrial robotization in Europe has been accompanied by rising industry concentration – essentially a few robot-intensive firms growing dominant – which in turn lowers the aggregate labor share [79]. This echoes the U.S. "superstar" firm effect and highlights a techno-economic feedback loop present in Europe as well. The **European Central Bank (ECB)** points to "technological changes, globalisation, sectoral reallocation" as key structural drivers influencing the euro area wage share over time [21]. Moreover, the ECB has observed that institutional factors, like collective bargaining coverage and wage-setting frameworks, play a role in how these forces translate into the labor share [21] [80]. Countries with stronger collective bargaining or frequent minimum wage adjustments may see less of the decline because wages for lower-skilled workers are propped up. Still, even those institutional buffers have limits when confronted with large external shocks or technological upheavals.

Recent developments in Europe underscore that the labor share can shift abruptly with economic events. The euro area's wage share, as noted, spiked above 65% in 2020 during the worst of the pandemic (due to government job retention schemes keeping workers on payrolls while GDP fell) [19] [81]. But by the end of 2022, amid a surge in corporate profits in energy and other sectors, the euro area labor share fell to just above 61%, a level **below its pre-pandemic baseline** [82] [15]. This recent dip coincided with Russia's war in Ukraine which led to energy price shocks – boosting profit margins in commodity sectors while real wages in many countries lagged inflation. Such volatility shows that even if structural trends are gradual, the labor share can seesaw with terms-of-trade swings (a point also emphasized by OECD analyses of commodity exporters). Importantly, however, these medium-term movements in Europe still overlay the longer-term plateau or decline. The euro area labor share was "close to its long-term average" in 2019 at just over 62% [19], and after the pandemic noise it is slightly below that average. In 1990, by contrast, many euro area countries had labor shares in the mid to high 60s percent. So the trajectory over the past 30+ years has been a moderate drift downward, with fluctuations, rather than a freefall.

European policymakers at both the national and EU level increasingly frame the labor share issue in discussions of inequality and inclusive growth. The **European Commission's 2024 Strategic Foresight Report** flagged that without intervention, technological transformations (AI, digitalization, green transition) could further skew income toward capital. The Commission and the OECD have jointly examined policy levers – from skills training to corporate governance changes – to ensure productivity gains translate into broad-based wage gains. The **World Economic Forum (WEF)**, which often partners with European institutions, has likewise highlighted the challenge: "Automation reduces labor's share of value added, contributes to inequality, and may reduce employment and wages," WEF published via a 2019 briefing [31] [32]. That statement, coming from leading economists and circulated among European and global policymakers through WEF, encapsulates the concern that Europe's social contract could be tested by the next wave of AI and automation. So while Europe's recent record on labor share is somewhat more mixed (with places like the Netherlands or Sweden showing smaller declines, and others like Spain or Italy larger ones), the recognition of a structural shift is common. From the halls of the ECB in Frankfurt to think tanks in Brussels (e.g. Bruegel, which has extensively analyzed labor share trends [83] [5]), there is a clear

understanding that **if current trends continue, workers will reap a shrinking portion of the continent's economic output**. This has spurred debates on strengthening collective bargaining, updating competition policy to check superstar firms, and taxing the windfall gains of automation.

Automation, AI, and the Future of Labor's Share: Consensus and Uncertainty

Across the U.S., UK, and EU cases, a strong empirical consensus emerges: **advances in automation and digital technology have been a primary driver of labor's declining share**, often outweighing other factors in their impact [38] [40]. The mechanization of routine tasks by robots and software has enabled greater output with less human labor input, directly lowering the labor share in affected industries [40] [42]. For example, research cited by the World Bank finds that industries adopting more robots tend to see labor's share of value-added drop significantly – a pattern confirmed in both U.S. and European data [84] [79]. In manufacturing, each additional robot per thousand workers has been associated with a measurable reduction in the labor share and in wages, without proportionate job creation elsewhere [85]. Meanwhile, the growth of intangible, ICT-based capital (like software, algorithms, and intellectual property) further tilts income toward capital owners because these assets can be scaled up at low marginal cost without hefty labor compensation [86] [87]. The UK's Kings College London, for instance, has documented how the rise of intangible capital with high depreciation (software that must be continually replaced/upgraded) can inflate capital's share of gross income, though part of that is depreciation rather than pure profit [12]. In summary, technology is enabling both the substitution of machines for workers and the amplification of returns on capital investments – a dual boost to capital's income share.

That said, technology is not acting in isolation. **Globalization has reinforced the shift**: offshoring labor-intensive production to lower-wage countries has effectively transferred a portion of income that would have gone to domestic labor into either foreign labor or capital profits. The ONS explicitly lists offshoring as a key cause of advanced-country labor share declines [36]. The IMF likewise found that expanding global value chains and trade openness were significant (though secondary to tech) in explaining emerging markets' labor share changes [88] [89]. Another agreed factor is the **erosion of labor market institutions and bargaining power**. Where union density fell or minimum wages lagged, labor's claim on output tended to shrink. For example, the U.S. saw union membership drop precipitously from the 1980s on, and studies like Elsby et al. note this likely had some effect, though quantitatively it's hard to fully disentangle from trade and tech effects [90] [43]. In Europe, collective bargaining coverage declines in some countries have correlated with larger labor share falls, and conversely nations with coordinated wage bargaining (like some Nordics) have seen more stability. Finally, **market power and "superstar" dynamics** are a newer explanatory angle gaining consensus support. As mentioned, the rise of highly profitable firms that dominate markets tends to lower labor's share, because these firms have higher profit margins and often invest heavily in automation. The Bruegel summary of Autor et al. (2020) notes that industries with greater increases in concentration had larger labor share declines, supporting the "winner-take-most" hypothesis [46] [48]. This suggests that antitrust policy and competitive markets are also pieces of the puzzle – a view shared by the OECD and various G7 think tanks.

Looking forward, there is a mix of optimism and unease in forecasts. Traditional economic models assumed that eventually labor share would stabilize – as the U.S. Social Security Trustees put it, factor shares "tend toward stable proportions in the long run" [49] [50]. Many budget agencies still baseline their long-run projections on a constant labor share, essentially assuming we won't see a collapse of labor's role. However,

the rapid emergence of AI has led many experts to question this complacency. The Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco warns that AI could break historical patterns: unlike earlier technologies which eventually generated new tasks for workers, AI may be able to continuously encroach on human roles without fully compensating job creation [33] [34]. If so, labor's share could structurally ratchet down further. Even the IMF, typically conservative in such projections, has begun exploring scenarios in which AI-driven productivity comes with a need for significant redistribution to avoid surging inequality [51] [54]. The **International Monetary Fund's managing director and research teams have argued that fiscal policy will need to "broaden the gains of AI"** – for example through tax and transfer schemes – specifically because AI could otherwise concentrate income with capital owners (the tech innovators and investors) and reduce labor's slice [51]. Likewise, the World Bank's analysts suggest more radical ideas, like spreading capital ownership. In a World Bank blog, economists proposed that to counter "the ongoing decline in labor's share of income" due to robotization, policies might include enabling workers to own stakes in the robots and automated tools that are replacing them [55] [91]. In effect, if you can't beat the capitalists, join them – by turning workers into capital owners to get a share of the returns.

Policy Recognition and Planning

At the policy level, the structural decline of labor's share has moved from academic journals to official strategy documents. Governments and international institutions are not only acknowledging the trend but also starting to plan around it. For instance, the **European Commission's recovery and resilience plans** for member states encourage investments in digital skills and advanced manufacturing training – implicitly to help workers maintain bargaining power and productivity alongside automation, thereby protecting labor's income share. The **U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA)** has funded regional workforce initiatives to address automation's impact, aiming to channel new technologies into augmenting workers rather than replacing them. And the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommended in 2019 that the Department of Labor develop better data to "track the workforce effects of advanced technologies" so that policymakers can respond in real time [92]. These are preventative, diagnostic measures at the federal and state levels.

Think tanks are also informing policy responses. The **Brookings Institution** has put forward concrete proposals to curb the bias toward capital in the tax code, which currently can encourage excessive automation. A Brookings paper by Acemoglu et al. argued that the U.S. tax system effectively subsidized equipment and software investment while taxing labor more heavily, and that this "biased against labor" regime likely **"generates excessive automation and suboptimally low levels of employment and labor share."** [93] [94] The authors suggest adjusting capital vs. labor taxation (even exploring an "automation tax" on AI and robots in certain contexts) to ensure that automation is adopted only where truly productive, not merely because it's artificially cheap due to tax advantages [95] [94]. In the UK, the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) and others have floated ideas like establishing worker tech councils and giving workers equity in firms that deploy AI extensively, again to align the distribution of gains. The **World Economic Forum**, in its 2023 *Future of Jobs* report, emphasizes reskilling as vital – but also notes that without deliberate effort, the benefits of higher productivity could accrue mostly to corporate profits. The WEF's calls for a "new social contract" often revolve around ensuring labor gets a fair share of the digital economy's wealth, for example through wage-setting innovations or even universal basic income trials if labor market churn increases.

International bodies are coordinating some of these policy discussions. The **OECD's Future of Work initiative** brings together countries to share best practices on reinforcing labor share. The **G20**, under the

2024 presidency, included in its declaration a commitment to “inclusive growth” such that wages grow with productivity – a tacit reference to the labor share issue. A technical paper prepared for the G20 noted that **from 2004 to 2024 the global labor income share fell from 53.9% to 52.3% and warned this trend could worsen with new technologies if policy fails to adapt** [96]. It recommended measures ranging from strengthening collective bargaining to social protection floors and progressive taxation to redistribute income [55] [91]. Even the traditionally growth-focused World Bank has, as shown, begun to discuss labor share decline in the context of “robotic rents” and economic feudalism if workers cannot obtain capital income [55] [97].

Meanwhile, central banks are incorporating labor share metrics into their analytical toolkits, since a falling labor share can suppress wage-push inflation and may partly explain low inflation eras pre-pandemic (as profits absorbed more of the growth). The ECB’s economic bulletin now frequently analyzes the split of value added between labor and capital for signs of underlying inflation pressures [98] [72]. The Bank of England, in assessing wage growth, has noted that if labor’s share remains low, even a tight labor market might not translate into spiraling wages, altering the Phillips curve dynamic. In the U.S., Federal Reserve economists have studied labor share decline as both cause and consequence of lower labor bargaining power, informing the Fed’s views on maximum employment and income inequality.

To be sure, there are **dissenting voices and uncertainties**. A minority of economists argue that if we measure income shares net of depreciation and after taxes, labor’s share hasn’t fallen as much – it’s the rise in depreciation (from shorter-lived high-tech capital) that makes the gross labor share look worse [11]. Others point out that in some countries, like the UK recently, labor’s share did not decline and thus global generalizations must be carefully made. These nuances are valid, but they do not negate the overall pattern observed in the bulk of large economies. The statistical and institutional consensus remains that **labor’s share of income is under structural downward pressure in the 21st century**. Moreover, most dissenting interpretations still acknowledge the role of technology; they simply debate the magnitude or whether other factors like market power might be even more important. Notably, an IMF working paper in 2023 found that in U.S. manufacturing, increasing monopoly power could explain up to 76% of the labor share decline – implying that anti-competitive practices and market consolidation are pivotal [99] [100]. This doesn’t so much contradict the tech narrative as complement it (since technology often enables winner-take-all markets). It does, however, suggest that policy to boost competition – breaking up monopolies, preventing abuse of dominant AI platforms – could help counteract labor share declines.

Conclusion

In sum, the evidence is overwhelming that **labor’s share of national income has been in structural decline** in many economies, and that this shift is closely intertwined with the rise of automation, AI, and other capital-augmenting technologies. From the United States to Europe, macroeconomic indicators – the labor compensation share of GDP, the profit share, real wage trends – all tell a consistent story of workers capturing a smaller proportion of output than in the late 20th century. This is not a transient blip but a long-run trend recognized at the highest policy levels. Governments, central banks, and international institutions have moved beyond abstract theory to confronting the hard data: for example, U.S. labor’s share in the private sector fell about 7 percentage points since 1980 [22], and **labor’s slice of global income is near record lows around 52%** [2]. Meanwhile, the capital share – including corporate profits – has correspondingly risen, enriching capital owners and widening income inequalities. The driving forces – technological advancement that replaces labor, globalization that arbitrages it, and market structures that weaken its bargaining position – are widely acknowledged in current models and forecasts [38] [68]. As the

UK's ONS succinctly put it, the long-run decline in labor share "continues to be a feature of the labour share in most advanced countries" and is attributable to known factors like offshoring, ICT automation, and superstar firms [68] [6].

Yet the story is not uniformly grim, nor is it devoid of agency. We have seen that policy choices matter: the UK's stabilization of labor share since the late 1990s hints that institutional support for wages (e.g. stronger social safety nets, pension contributions, wage floors) can make a difference [62] [63]. Across the Atlantic, proposals to tweak tax and competition policy suggest avenues to slow or reverse the decline [93] [46]. There is also the fundamental economic insight that productivity growth need not translate into a lower labor share *if* accompanied by the creation of new labor-intensive tasks or industries. Historically, new technologies eventually generated new types of jobs that maintained labor's share [101] [102]. The pressing question for the future is whether artificial intelligence will follow that historical pattern or break it. If AI mainly automates without empowering labor in new ways, then, as the Philadelphia Fed researchers warn, we could be at "a turning point" where the labor share permanently downshifts [53]. That prospect has galvanized serious planning: the IMF urging fiscal redistribution [54], the World Bank advocating shared robot ownership [55], and the WEF calling for a new balance in the social contract [31].

In the end, this is not a story of inevitability but of measurable trends meeting policy responses. The numbers leave little doubt that labor's share has fallen; the debate centers on how to respond. A strong empirical consensus – across blue-chip think tanks like Brookings and Bruegel, agencies like the BLS and ONS, and international bodies like the OECD and ILO – has put automation and related forces at the heart of the diagnosis [5] [54]. With that consensus, attention is turning to solutions: updating educational systems for an AI economy [103], reforming tax and labor laws to better distribute gains, and perhaps fundamentally rethinking how workers can claim ownership in a capital-intensive world [55] [91]. The structural decline of labor's share is thus both a warning and a call to action. It is a warning that without intervention, the benefits of growth may increasingly accrue to capital, exacerbating inequality and social discontent. But it is also a call to action for policymakers to harness the very forces of technology and globalization in service of a more inclusive prosperity – ensuring that as robots and algorithms boost productivity, the workers of the world are not left behind but rather share in the wealth they help create [54] [55]. The stakes, as the data make clear, are nothing less than the future distribution of income in the automation age.

Sources: The analysis above draws on a range of current economic indicators and institutional reports, including labor share data from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics [1], the UK Office for National Statistics [68], and the European Central Bank [21]; research findings from the International Monetary Fund [38] and World Economic Forum [31] on technology's impact; global labor income figures from the International Labour Organization [2]; and policy perspectives from sources such as Brookings [4], Bruegel [5], the World Bank [55], and others as cited throughout the text. These sources provide a robust, empirical foundation for understanding the decline in labor's share and are documented in the inline citations above.

---

[1] [23] [24] [25] Labor share of output has declined since 1947 : The Economics Daily: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
https://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2017/labor-share-of-output-has-declined-since-1947.htm

[2] [7] [54] ILO Highlights Declining Labour Income Share: A Warning on Inequality
https://qery.no/ilo-highlights-declining-labour-income-share/

3 5 9 11 12 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 77 78 83 90 The decline of the labour share of income
https://www.bruegel.org/blog-post/decline-labour-share-income

4 22 27 28 29 30 93 94 95 15616-BPEA-SP20_WEB
https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Acemoglu-FINAL-WEB.pdf

6 36 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 86 87 Trends in the UK labour share - Office for National Statistics
https://www.ons.gov.uk/economy/economicoutputandproductivity/output/articles/trendsintheuklabourshare1997to2023/2024-11-25

8 10 38 88 89 World Economic Outlook, April 2017: Gaining Momentum?
https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2017/04/04/world-economic-outlook-april-2017

13 16 17 18 A Local Look at Labor's Share of Income - Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City
https://www.kansascityfed.org/denver/rocky-mountain-economist/A-Local-Look-at-Labors-Share-of-Income/

14 15 19 20 21 72 80 81 82 98 The development of the wage share in the euro area since the start of the pandemic
https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/economic-bulletin/focus/2023/html/ecb.ebbox202304_04~0dee9ead8e.en.html

26 Nonfarm Business Sector: Labor Share for All Workers (PRS85006173) | FRED | St. Louis Fed
https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/PRS85006173

31 32 101 102 The revolution need not be automated | World Economic Forum
https://www.weforum.org/stories/2019/04/the-revolution-need-not-be-automated/

33 34 53 Generative AI: A Turning Point for Labor's Share? - San Francisco Fed
https://www.frbsf.org/research-and-insights/publications/system-research-philadelphia-fed/2025/03/generative-ai-a-turning-point-for-labors-share/

35 Estimating the U.S. labor share : Monthly Labor Review: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics
https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2017/article/estimating-the-us-labor-share.htm

37 69 70 71 Dead-end relationship? • Resolution Foundation
https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/publications/dead-end-relationship/

49 50 ssa.gov
https://www.ssa.gov/oact/TR/2024/2024_Long-Range_Economic_Assumptions.pdf

51 Fiscal Policy Can Help Broaden the Gains of AI to Humanity
https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2024/06/17/fiscal-policy-can-help-broaden-the-gains-of-ai-to-humanity

52 Generative AI: A Turning Point for Labor's Share?
https://www.philadelphiafed.org/the-economy/generative-ai-a-turning-point-for-labors-share

55 91 97 103 The economic and social consequences of robotization
https://blogs.worldbank.org/en/jobs/economic-and-social-consequences-robotization

73 Labour market - Office for Budget Responsibility - OBR
https://obr.uk/forecasts-in-depth/the-economy-forecast/labour-market/

74 Analysis of the Spring 2025 OBR forecast | PolicyEngine UK
https://policyengine.org/uk/research/obr-forecast-2025

75 76 [PDF] Follow the money - Resolution Foundation
https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/app/uploads/2019/09/Follow-the-money-report.pdf

79 [PDF] Robots and the Rise of European Superstar Firms
https://economy-finance.ec.europa.eu/system/files/2019-10/dp118_en.pdf

84 Don't believe the World Bank – robots will steal our wages
https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/oct/14/dont-believe-world-bank-robots-inequality-growth

85 Labour market effects of robots: evidence from Turkey
https://theforum.erf.org.eg/2024/03/04/labour-market-effects-of-robots-evidence-from-turkey/

92 Workforce Automation: Better Data Needed to Assess and Plan for ...
https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-19-257

96 [PDF] Policy measures to address inequalities and increase the labour ...
https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/2025-04/G20_TechnicalPaper%232_Policy%20measures%20to%20address%20inequalities%20and%20increase%20the%20labour%20income%20share.pdf

99 100 Production Technology, Market Power, and the Decline of the Labor Share
https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2023/02/10/Production-Technology-Market-Power-and-the-Decline-of-the-Labor-Share-529699