Crisis of Capitalism, Systemic Transition and Economic Liberation

Euclides Mance

March 2026

(Slide 1 — Title)

Introduction

Capitalism is approaching not a cyclical crisis, but a structural rupture. My presentation traces one central argument: the capitalist system contains, in its very logic, a crack in the realization of value that has been historically patched by debt — and that crack is now widening to the point of breaking, accelerated by the large-scale introduction of humanoid robots and artificial intelligence. The question is not whether this rupture will occur. It is whether societies will build alternatives before it arrives, or simply suffer the collapse.

(Slide 2 — Diagram)

The Systemic Crack: Why Capitalism Cannot Close Its Own Circuit

The capitalist economic circuit requires a closure: capital invests in means of production and in labor; workers produce commodities whose value exceeds their wages and other production costs — generating surplus value; and that surplus is only realized as profit when the commodities are sold. Sale requires buyers with purchasing power. The primary source of that purchasing power is wages. But here lies the structural contradiction: in every cycle of production, the total value distributed — as wages, payments to suppliers, and taxes to the state — is less than what capital needs to receive back as sales revenue to realize its surplus. This difference — the systemic crack — cannot be closed from within the circuit itself in the same cycle.

Historically, this gap has been filled by credit: consumers, governments, and businesses borrow to buy what, respectively, wages, taxes, and receipts alone cannot purchase. But credit is a debt — it defers the problem into the future. For the mechanism to hold, economic growth and distributing value in subsequent cycles must allow past debts to be repaid. When interest rates persistently exceed profit rates, income growth rates, and distribution rates, debt compounds regardless of growth. That is precisely what has been happening for decades. Global debt has reached 249% of world GDP — the equivalent of two and a half years of all production on Earth, owed and unpaid.

Two Responses to the Crisis: Debt or Redistribution

Capitalism has only two structural responses to insufficient solvent demand. The first — the dominant one in the United States and Europe — is indebtedness: substituting value distribution with credit. This approach is structurally unsustainable. When families, businesses, and governments approach their debt ceilings, income flows toward servicing past debt rather than current consumption. The mechanism collapses precisely when it is most needed.

The second response is social redistribution: directing part of the surplus through public funds, minimum wages, pensions, cooperatives, and solidarity forms of production — creating demand without generating future liabilities. The data illustrate the divergence starkly. Between 2000 and 2024, the wage share of GDP fell 5.8 percentage points in the United States and 2.5 points in the Eurozone, while debt surged. In the same period, China increased its wage share of GDP by 9.9 percentage points — and sustained robust economic growth driven by domestic demand.

The Transition Already Underway: Cooperativism and the Solidarity Economy

The transition toward associative and self-managed forms of production is not a future aspiration — it is a measurable and accelerating process. Non-capitalist forms

of economic organization — cooperatives, public enterprises, the solidarity economy — already represent approximately 23% of real world GDP. Cooperativism grew from 760,000 cooperatives with 800 million members in 2000 to 3 million cooperatives and 1.24 billion members in 2024, reaching a penetration rate of 15.3% of the world population. Much of this growth is a structural response to unemployment and precarity generated by capitalist automation. Workers excluded from formal employment build self-managed forms of production — and in doing so, build new social relations of production, even without explicitly intending to.

(Slide 3 — Table 1)

Humanoid Robots: The Breaking Point Becomes Measurable

The introduction of humanoid robots is not merely a technological innovation. It is the most intense acceleration ever recorded of the transfer of living labor capacities to machinery. Industrial humanoids available in 2026 — such as AgiBot A2, Unitree H2, and Figure 02 — cost between $100,000 and $250,000 per unit and are already operating in plants run by BMW, Mercedes-Benz, and GXO Logistics. Their decisive characteristic is that their performance is determined mainly by software, not hardware. Figure AI documented a 400% improvement in speed and a sevenfold increase in task success rate in the same hardware between 2023 and 2024 — through software updates alone, with no additional hardware cost to the fleet owner. The fleet learning architecture developed by NVIDIA enables robots in a network to learn in real time from the collective experience of all other robots.

(Slide 4 — Table 2).

The economic criterion for adoption is straightforward: when the 5-year total cost of a robot fleet falls below the 5-year cost of the human team it replaces, adoption becomes economically rational — and competitively necessary. In the United States, a fleet of 2 robots costs $510,000 over five years versus $900,000 for three human shifts — a 43% saving, with the investment recovered in under 23 months.

(Slide 5 — Table 3)

By applying this calculation country by country, using actual wages and payroll taxes, the breaking point becomes datable:

- USA, Germany, South Korea, Japan: breaking point already reached in 2026
- China, Russia, South Africa: 2028
- Brazil: 2030 (or 2034 if capital resorts to wage compression)
- Mexico: 2033 — Vietnam: 2035 — India: 2037 — Bangladesh: 2041

Robot prices are projected to fall from $100,000 in 2026 to $25,000 between 2032 and 2034, following Wright's Law — the same empirical pattern that drove solar panel costs down 99.6% over 43 years. More than 140 Chinese manufacturers and global AI platforms are actively competing, putting simultaneous pressure on hardware and software costs.

Why Automation Deepens — Rather Than Solves — the Crisis

Capital's immediate response to the breaking point is not to adopt robots — it is to compress wages. If living labor can be made cheap enough through precarity, informalization, and the suppression of collective bargaining, the investment in robotics can be deferred. But this strategy is structurally self-defeating: wage compression further reduces the solvent demand that capital needs to sell its products. It deepens the crack it’s trying to fix.

Moreover, when automation generalizes, it eliminates the exceptional profit advantage that early adopters enjoyed — while bankrupting the firms that could not adapt. And as robots are increasingly used to produce robots, the cost of automated fixed capital falls below even super-exploited living labor. At that point, wage compression ceases to be a viable strategy, and the replacement of human labor becomes irreversible within capital's economic logic.

The generalization of humanoids does not resolve the systemic crack — it decisively deepens it. Each robot that replaces three workers eliminates three wages from circulation. Multiplied across millions of industrial plants globally, this structurally contracts the base of surplus value realization. When combined with the exhaustion of debt capacity, the value realization crisis becomes systemic and irreversible. Capitalism cannot resolve this contradiction within its own framework: any solution that preserves the wage distributes less than needed; any solution that eliminates the wage eliminates the foundation of demand itself.

(Slide 6)

The Solidarity Economy's Structural Advantage

For the solidarity economy, this process is simultaneously a threat and an opportunity. The threat: if solidarity initiatives do not organize their own self-managed Solidarity Economy Circuits — linking credit, production, distribution and consumption using restricted AI, robotics and digital platforms — they will become sources for the realization of extraordinary surplus value by robotized capital. Capitalist firms will offer products at prices that solidarity enterprises using human labor cannot match — progressively eliminating the market niches currently occupied by cooperatives and solidarity enterprises.

The opportunity, however, is structurally powerful. A cooperative that operates humanoid robots and has no shareholders to remunerate can reduce the prices of its products to marginal cost — the cost of energy, maintenance, and depreciation. Any capitalist firm, by structural necessity, must extract a profit rate on invested capital. The robotized solidarity enterprise that redistributes surplus can charge less than any capitalist competitor — and remain economically sustainable.

It can go further. Part of production can be distributed free of charge as community surplus — reducing the need to purchase capitalist products, eroding capital's value

realization base, and expanding the material good-living of communities. This can be organized through gift-exchange catalogs, interconnected globally via blockchain or equivalent systems, through which goods and services circulate as multi-reciprocal donations on the principle: from each according to their capacities, to each according to their needs. This is not a moral aspiration — it is a structural possibility that capital cannot replicate, because capital requires the money-form to pay investors and service debts. If solidarity gift-exchange economy expands to cover the needs of communities, the market system loses its operational base — not by political decree, but by functional obsolescence.

The Strategic Imperative: Brazil, Russia, and the Window That Is Closing

Brazil and Russia face the same temporal window — 2028 to 2030 — but under very different conditions. Brazil has one of the largest and most organized solidarity economies in the world: cooperatives, community banks, fair trade networks, and self-managed enterprises across all states, with a legal framework and accumulated institutional experience. What it lacks is the strategic decision to incorporate robotics and AI into the solidarity economy before the breaking point makes living labor industrially unviable in broad sectors.

The specific risk for Brazil is the combination of wage compression — through precarity, outsourcing, and informalization — and the absence of industrial policy for technological transition. If Brazilian capital opts to compress wages rather than invest in robotics, and neither governments nor the solidarity economy develop preparatory actions, the rupture arrives later, but on an even more precarious social base: without retrained workers, without technologically prepared cooperatives, and without structured solidarity circuits to absorb the transition. The result would be abrupt automation on top of extreme social fragility.

Russia faces a different constraint: industrial wages already justify large-scale automation, but Western sanctions severely restrict access to advanced

semiconductors and the leading humanoid platforms. Military mobilization has raised industrial wages above the national average — which economically anticipates the breaking point — but domestic robotics capacity has not yet reached the scale required. Nations that delay this transition will lose industrial competitiveness to economies that advance in humanoid robotization first.

China advances on both fronts simultaneously: it is the world's largest manufacturer of humanoids, and the large economy that most increased its wage share of GDP over the past 25 years. The productivity gains from robotization are being distributed internally, feeding domestic demand and the realization of surplus value in the national market. Technological sovereignty — access to automation and AI — is becoming a prerequisite for economic sovereignty.

(Slide 7)

Conclusion: Transition or Collapse

The argument developed here rests on four interlinked propositions. First: capitalism contains in its own logic an irresolvable systemic crack. The distribution of value in each production cycle is always insufficient to realize the surplus produced. Credit expansion generates indebtedness and compensates—until it no longer can. Global debt at 249% of GDP marks the limit of that compensation.

Second: humanoid robots make the breaking point measurable and datable. The 5-year cost of a robot fleet is already 43% lower than equivalent human labor in the United States — and the gap grows every year as robot prices fall and efficiency rises. For high-income economies, the breaking point has arrived. For middle-income economies, it arrives between 2028 and 2038.

Third: the outcome is not predetermined. Technological sovereignty — the capacity to produce, access, and control automation and AI — is a prerequisite for economic

sovereignty. But technology without a collective project for distributing its surplus produces only concentrated accumulation and structural unemployment.

Fourth: the solidarity economy has a structural advantage that capital cannot replicate. A robotized cooperative without shareholders can price below any sustainable capitalist level. It can realize its surplus as free goods, distributed through globally interconnected solidarity catalogs — not in money, but in physical products, organized by capacity and need. Capitalism cannot do this. If solidarity circuits expand gift-exchange to cover community needs, the market loses its operational base through functional obsolescence — not through revolution, but through irrelevance.

If solidarity circuits do not advance before the breaking point, capitalism may simply collapse into chaos: massive structural unemployment, the rise of authoritarian forces that cut distribution programs without offering alternatives, wars over critical resources for the technological transition itself, and the growth of the criminal economy — until the system collapses under the weight of its unpayable global debts. There are already many signs of this path underway.

The question is not whether humanoid robots and other new automated beings will come. It is what the solidarity economy will have built when they arrive — and whether countries will have sufficient technological sovereignty to choose how to use them. The systemic transition is underway. What is at stake is whether it will be conducted in a self-managed way by societies, or simply suffered under the conduct of Big Tech, with fleets of robots reprogrammable for civilian or military purposes through a simple software update.