Ferris State University

Defending Economic Freedom: Addressing Concerns of AI-Induced Inequality

Paper by: Pedro Saltini

Professor: Mark Brandly

01/08/2025

I. Introduction: AI Fears and Calls for Government Regulation

In recent months, various media outlets have raised concerns that the rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) could lead to widespread job losses and increase wealth inequality. For example, a Brookings Institution article claims that AI might worsen income gaps in the United States, and similar worries have been expressed by the Trades Union Congress (TUC) in the United Kingdom. According to these sources, governments should implement stricter regulations on AI to protect workers. While these arguments seem plausible at first, it is important to remember that, anxiety about new technologies often leads to laws and policies that restrict economic freedom instead of promoting progress.

II. The Austrian School Perspective: Markets Adapt to Innovation

From the viewpoint of the Austrian School of Economics—especially the ideas advanced by Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich Hayek, and Murray Rothbard—the market has a remarkable ability to adapt to new technologies. Throughout history, each major technological breakthrough—whether it was the invention of the power loom or the spread of personal computers—did not permanently destroy jobs. Instead, these advances led to the creation of entirely new industries and job opportunities. Hayek cautioned that when governments interfere too heavily, they risk traveling down what he famously called the "road to serfdom," where political power grows at the expense of individual liberty. Nowadays, many suggested "solutions" to AI's potential negative impacts rely on giving governments more control, which might stifle innovation rather than encourage it.

III. Historical Parallels: The "AI Stealing Jobs" Debate

To illustrate this, the Foundation for Economic Education (FEE) has argued in a recent video that the idea of "AI stealing jobs" is similar to the early fears of the Luddites in 19th-century

England. Those textile workers destroyed machinery because they believed it would replace human labor, but the market eventually showed that new technologies can boost overall wealth and create new kinds of work. Following the tradition of Austrian economists such as Carl Menger and Eugen von Böhm-Bawerk, one can see that economic progress is most likely when societies welcome new inventions under conditions of free trade, voluntary exchange, and open competition. Therefore, it is crucial not to hinder AI but to protect individual choice in a way that stimulates both entrepreneurship and technological growth.

IV. Thesis and Roadmap

In the rest of this essay, I aim to discuss how exaggerated fears regarding AI and inequality could prompt restrictive government measures. By comparing the AI era to earlier industrial revolutions, it will become clear that embracing technology—while holding firmly to economic freedom—often results in widespread benefits rather than worsening social divisions.

V. Entrepreneurship and "Human Action": Mises's Core Insights

A central insight within the Austrian School of Economics is that innovation—whether in the form of steam engines, personal computers, or advanced robotics—acts as a powerful catalyst for entrepreneurship. Ludwig von Mises, in his seminal work Human Action, emphasizes that the market system relies on individuals who recognize and act upon new profit opportunities. These individuals, often called entrepreneurs, navigate changing circumstances—like the emergence of automation—to reallocate resources in ways that serve consumer demands more effectively.

When automation reduces the cost of performing certain tasks, it reveals fresh possibilities for both producers and consumers. Some lines of work might diminish or even disappear, but these very disruptions make room for novel products and services. As machines take over repetitive jobs,

there is increased scope for human labor in roles that involve creativity, problem-solving, and interpersonal skills. Individuals who analyze unsatisfied needs in these areas often form new ventures, develop specialized services, or design innovative products. The entrepreneur's "alertness"—a concept frequently referenced by Austrian economists—turns these disruptions into profits, creating opportunities that did not exist before.

VI. Prices, Profits, and New Opportunities

Moreover, Human Action underlines how prices and profits communicate vital information in a market unhampered by excessive controls. If consumer demand shifts toward higher-quality AI-driven tools, profit signals will guide entrepreneurs toward producing or investing in that sector. Even as some traditional jobs become less necessary, new businesses arise around selling, servicing, and refining these emerging technologies. In other words, the same process that appears disruptive to specific workers or industries can become the foundation of tomorrow's growth and prosperity.

Beyond the creation of new businesses, automation can spur a reorganization of existing industries. Firms that successfully adapt to AI enjoy a competitive advantage; those that do not risk falling behind. This pressure encourages a constant evolution, one that refines production methods and opens new consumer markets. As Mises observes, this dynamism rests on the principle that entrepreneurs must remain free to experiment, invest, and fail without being overly constrained by regulation or state intervention. When legal and institutional frameworks protect property rights and limit artificial barriers to entry, aspiring entrepreneurs can more easily capitalize on the opportunities automation reveals.

VII. Incentives, Opportunity Cost, and the Microsoft Case

In this context, flexible social structures—such as a system of voluntary exchange, clear contract enforcement, and minimal bureaucratic hurdles—strengthen the link between technological innovation and job creation. Excessive licensing requirements or intricate regulations, on the other hand, can deter new firms from entering the market, effectively shielding larger incumbents and slowing progress. Austrian economists have long argued that prosperity emerges when the market system can respond organically to changes in consumer needs and production possibilities.

Expanding on the idea that automation and entrepreneurial ventures thrive best in a flexible and open market environment, it is essential to remember that, as the economist Tyler Watts often emphasized, “Economics is about two things: Incentives and opportunity cost!” Regulatory interventions, especially if they are heavy-handed, can skew these incentives by raising the cost of innovation or constraining the freedom to respond to consumer preferences.

A brief look at the Microsoft antitrust case in the late 1990s illustrates these concerns. Authorities argued that the company’s bundling strategies were stifling competition, yet the rapid emergence of new technologies—smartphones, open-source platforms, and cloud services—quickly demonstrated that entrenched market dominance is rarely permanent in an evolving tech sector. From an Austrian perspective, such legal actions risk shifting entrepreneurial attention away from innovation toward regulatory compliance, potentially dampening the creative drive that leads to new industries and job opportunities.

VIII. Balancing Government Roles and Market Dynamism

Governments do have a role in enforcing transparency and property rights. Austrian economists caution that overreach can undermine the very market dynamism that yields widespread prosperity. By respecting incentives and being mindful of opportunity costs, policymakers can foster an environment in which AI, automation, and human ingenuity combine to fuel economic growth and individual liberty.

Building on the idea that government-led interventions can undermine the market's natural capacity to adapt, it is worth examining how apprehensions over AI-driven unemployment and inequality have prompted renewed calls for tighter labor regulations. Many policymakers and commentators assert that if robots and algorithms replace routine jobs, the state must step in to protect workers from job losses, precarious employment, or allegedly unfair hiring practices. Prescriptive measures like this frequently impose rigidities that exacerbate precisely the problems they were meant to solve.

IX. Overzealous Regulations and AI: Emerging Calls for Stricter Labor Laws

From an Austrian perspective, the crux of the issue lies in how labor rules often distort the very incentives that guide healthy economic adjustment. If firms are restricted in their ability to hire, reassign, or even substitute labor with technology, they may scale back investment in AI-related projects to avoid potential legal risks or heavy compliance costs. This aversion to risk not only weakens productivity growth but also deprives workers of the new job opportunities that emerging industries could generate. When regulation constrains the entrepreneurial discovery process—an essential concept in Ludwig von Mises's and Friedrich Hayek's work—society misses

out on creative solutions that could transform short-term displacements into pathways toward more specialized, higher-value employment.

Historically, many well-intentioned labor policies have revealed unintended consequences. Minimum wage laws, rigid occupational licensing, and stringent collective bargaining mandates can all raise hiring costs. Ironically, this dynamic may accelerate job displacement rather than mitigate it. In other cases, firms might choose to leave certain markets entirely, eliminating roles that could have been redefined or upgraded by a more natural, innovation-friendly process.

Moreover, targeting AI with special regulations assumes that policymakers can accurately predict how advances in machine learning will unfold across different sectors. The Austrian caution against central planning emerges here: no government authority can fully grasp the myriad ways AI might integrate into activities as diverse as logistics, healthcare, education, and creative industries. Overregulating AI to prevent purported inequality risks cementing outdated job structures and stifling the entrepreneurial flexibility needed to invent entirely new products and services. As a result, the workforce may become even less prepared for future disruptions, inadvertently deepening social stratification.

X. Short-Term Unemployment, Inequality, and Historical Precedents

Despite the optimistic view that automation and AI can ultimately spur new industries and improve living standards, valid concerns persist about short-term unemployment and rising inequality. Critics worry that workers replaced by machines might lack the resources or skill sets to transition promptly, while the gains from AI might disproportionately flow to tech giants like Meta, OpenAI, Google, and Microsoft. Acknowledging these fears is critical to crafting a nuanced perspective on technological change.

Julian Jacobs, in a talk discussing AI's labor-market implications, highlights the psychological and societal strains that can arise when entire job categories become obsolete seemingly overnight. He compares this phenomenon to earlier upheavals, such as the Industrial Revolution, noting that while these historical shifts eventually led to large-scale improvements in productivity and living standards, they also produced considerable short-term dislocation. In Jacobs's view, the key challenge is mitigating transitional pain through education, retraining, and supportive community structures.

Historical examples support the idea that, over time, societies have successfully adapted to new technologies. During the First Industrial Revolution, many textile workers initially lost their livelihoods to mechanized looms. However, as markets expanded, those same mechanized processes paved the way for a flourishing textile sector that offered myriad new roles—from machine operation to distribution and retail. Drawing on the insights of Richard Cantillon and Turgot, Austrian economists emphasize that while friction is inevitable in the short run, human ingenuity tends to discover or create fresh opportunities for work, supported by entrepreneurial experimentation.

Contemporary economists like Daron Acemoglu have underscored another important aspect: the concentration of AI's development within major tech companies can magnify inequality if the rest of the economy cannot compete or innovate at a comparable rate. Yet Acemoglu also reminds us that the global market is not defined exclusively by a few giants. Thousands of small to medium-sized firms, along with entirely new ventures, have the potential to incorporate AI in ways tailored to niche markets or local demands. This multiplicity of firms dilutes the influence of big players and helps prevent a permanent, tech-driven underclass.

XI. Austrian Economics on Balancing Disruption and Freedom

From the Austrian standpoint, the lesson is twofold. First, short-term disruptions are not trivial and ignoring them overlooks the real hardships workers face. Second, free markets, left flexible enough to respond, have historically proven adept at steering displaced labor into fields where it can be more productive. Innovations introduced by large corporations often filter down to smaller enterprises, generating unforeseen products and services along the way. By preserving conditions that allow for rapid entrepreneurial discovery—rather than erecting barriers through strict labor regulation society can adapt to AI's changes with minimal damage and maximum opportunity.

In sum, while apprehensions about short-term unemployment and inequality should not be dismissed, they do not justify halting technological progress or severely restricting the flexibility of the labor market. Instead, a balanced approach acknowledges both the historical evidence of successful adaptation and the crucial role of maintaining an environment where businesses of all sizes can experiment, hire, and reposition themselves in response to ever-evolving consumer and technological demands.

XII. Conclusion: Embracing AI for Global Advancement

From an international economics perspective, it is evident that societies around the world have repeatedly adapted to transformative technologies—from mechanized looms in 18th-century Britain to the personal computer revolution spanning multiple continents. As demonstrated by Austrian economists such as Ludwig von Mises, Friedrich Hayek, and Murray Rothbard, this process of creative destruction is not merely a local or historical curiosity; rather, it reflects a global market mechanism capable of reallocating labor and capital toward their most productive uses.

Even though technological shifts can temporarily displace workers, history shows that open, competitive markets—driven by profit incentives—are remarkably effective at absorbing these shocks and ultimately raising living standards.

Over the course of this discussion, we have examined the widespread concerns that AI-driven automation may worsen inequality and erode employment opportunities. While well-intentioned, governmental attempts to regulate AI or control labor markets often introduce inefficiencies and deprive industries of the very dynamism they need to respond to consumer demands. This pattern can be seen in high-profile antitrust interventions—such as the Microsoft case—and in proposals for restrictive labor policies meant to "protect" workers from automation. Both approaches risk stifling entrepreneurial discovery, a theme central to Austrian thought, and can undermine international competitiveness by locking in outdated business models.

By contrast, upholding economic freedom—whether through transparent legal frameworks, limited state intervention, or protection of property rights—encourages entrepreneurs to innovate and scale their solutions worldwide. Ludwig von Mises's insight, presented in Human Action, that knowledge and profit signals drive efficient resource allocation, applies just as powerfully at the international level, where businesses compete to deliver valuable goods and services across borders. Likewise, Hayek's caution in The Road to Serfdom reminds us that excessive control hinders the decentralized decision-making essential for global technological progress.

Ultimately, rather than viewing AI as a looming threat, policymakers and the global community would benefit from recognizing its potential to catalyze future growth. This calls for preserving open markets, allowing labor to shift toward new opportunities, and letting cross-border trade and investment guide the adoption of cutting-edge technologies. By following this path,

societies across the globe can ensure that AI and automation serve as engines of progress, enabling individuals to create, adapt, and prosper in an ever-evolving international economy.

Works Cited:

Acemoglu, Daron. “Various Works on Technology, Inequality, and Labor Markets.” N.p., n.d.

Brookings Institution. “AI’s Impact on Income Inequality in the US.” Brookings, 2023, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/ais-impact-on-income-inequality-in-the-us/.

“Could AI Replace the Workforce?” YouTube, uploaded by N.p., n.d., https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-eDCDLdt30k.

Foundation for Economic Education. “FEE Commentary on AI and Labor Market Parallels to the Luddites.” YouTube, n.d., https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gu4dPVkEjOw&t=154s.

Foundation for Economic Education. “Why We Shouldn’t Be Concerned about AI Replacing Jobs.” FEE.org, 3 May 2023, https://fee.org/articles/why-we-shouldnt-be-concerned-about-ai-replacing-jobs/.

Hayek, Friedrich. The Road to Serfdom. University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Jacobs, Julian. “Talk on AI’s Labor-Market Implications.” YouTube, n.d., https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FLzgjCAXoks.

Mises, Ludwig von. Human Action. Ludwig von Mises Institute, 1949.

Trades Union Congress. “Statements on AI’s Impact on Labor.” TUC, n.d.

Watts, Tyler. “Commentary on Incentives and Opportunity Cost.” N.p., n.d.