

## EDITORIAL

### *Revolution 5.0 and Social Security: challenges of reconciling new technologies with the centrality of the human person*

Periods of rapid societal change can surpass the adaptive capacity of existing institutions. Nevertheless, as institutions are fundamentally composed of individuals, the primacy of the human person remains essential.

Technological acceleration, artificial intelligence, automation, the platformization of work, and the increasing digitalization of public services signal a new phase in social life. This phase is intrinsically linked to the primacy of human dignity, the recognition of work as a means of emancipation, and solidarity as a foundational element of democracy.

The emerging era, often termed the 5.0 Revolution, should not be viewed merely as a technological advancement beyond the 4.0 Revolution. Instead, it shifts the emphasis from efficiency as an isolated objective to efficiency that integrates protection, inclusion, and dignity for all citizens.

Within the domain of Social Security, this debate assumes particular significance. Health, social security, and social assistance are not simply discrete administrative sectors or government initiatives. Rather, they represent constitutional manifestations of a societal agreement that acknowledges human vulnerability as an intrinsic aspect of collective life (Lima, 2024).

This perspective aligns with the view that social rights should not be considered as fragmented state provisions, but rather as institutional practices designed to realize citizenship and human dignity, with notable implications for their effective implementation (Asensi, 2013).

Old age, illness, unemployment, motherhood, work disability, poverty, and exclusion constitute risks inherent to complex societies (Resende Zuba, 2023) and necessitate social protection. These are not deficiencies to be addressed solely by automated systems, but social realities that demand nuanced public policies, accountable institutions, and decisions that balance technical rationality with social justice.

The 5.0 Revolution thus presents dual challenges for public social security policies. It provides robust tools to enhance the state's ability to identify needs, organize information, reduce wait times, improve management, prevent fraud, elevate the quality of administrative decisions, and foster closer engagement between citizens and public administration.

Research on artificial intelligence and administrative efficiency demonstrates that the adoption of new technologies can streamline workflows, decrease decision-making time, and enhance the state's responsiveness (Desordi; Della Bona, 2020).

Experiences with automation in the justice system further indicate that technology can facilitate the screening and processing of substantial volumes of information, provided that the institutional boundaries of human decision-making are maintained (Andrade; Prado, 2022; Araújo; Zullo; Torres, 2020).

Conversely, this transformation exposes significant risks, including digital exclusion, algorithmic opacity, impersonal handling of complex human circumstances, the perpetuation of biases, the erosion of administrative due process, and the inappropriate substitution of institutional prudence with automated decision-making models. Studies on artificial intelligence in the public sector emphasize that technological innovation must be constrained by fundamental rights, transparency, proportionality, and mechanisms of democratic oversight (Acevedo, 2022).

Ethical analyses of artificial intelligence regulation further demonstrate that technology is not a neutral phenomenon, as its institutional applications entail choices, risks, and public responsibilities (Alegría, 2023).

The current challenge is not merely to accept or reject technology, but to govern it effectively. For Social Security, the central issue involves determining the conditions, limitations, controls, and public values that should guide the application of artificial intelligence (Lima, 2025).

Technological tools that accelerate administrative analysis can serve as instruments of justice by reducing unnecessary delays and enabling more rapid recognition of rights. However, they may also create barriers when they obscure the unique aspects of individual cases, hindering their recognition, explanation, and review by responsible authorities.

Digital Public Administration must therefore maintain the rationale, revisability, and public comprehensibility of decisions, as algorithmic efficiency cannot substitute for administrative legitimacy (Del Cerro, 2022).

This tension is especially significant in complex and unequal societies. Individuals seeking social security benefits, welfare assistance, or access to public health policies often lack the informational, economic, and technological resources available to public administration (Venturini, 2025).

The asymmetry between the state and the citizen, already present in traditional administrative processes, may be exacerbated by opaque digital platforms, overly standardized forms, or automated decisions that lack sufficient transparency regarding their rationale.

Digital exclusion, particularly among vulnerable populations, can transform innovation into a barrier to access. Therefore, digitization must be accompanied by inclusive policies, adequate support mechanisms, and effective avenues for contestation.

In the context of the 5.0 Revolution, the Social Security system must pursue efficiency without neglecting empathy, adopt digitalization without sacrificing human considerations, and employ data without reducing individuals to statistical abstractions. Importantly, the responsible use of artificial intelligence precludes categorization for any purpose involving sensitive personal data.

Within this context, Public Administration is tasked with developing a new institutional framework. The experience of Litigation 5.0 in the Federal Attorney General's Office demonstrates that digital transformation in Public Advocacy represents a shift toward strategic organization, data management, consensus-building, and institutional capacity-building, rather than simply the adoption of technological tools (Alves; Suriani, 2024).

Similarly, digital public governance should integrate transparency, sound administration, and institutional trust (Banchio, 2024).

Public social security policies are increasingly influenced by changes in the labor market. Automation, platform-based work, digital informality, telework, the fragmentation of employment relationships, and productive reorganization challenge traditional models of financing and coverage. As the nature of work evolves, social protection frameworks must also be reconsidered, recognizing that such protection requires sustainable sources of funding. This underscores the importance of examining finance, encompassing both financial law and tax law. The social security system must not remain constrained by categories suited to an outdated economic context.

The experience of mandatory telework during the pandemic demonstrated that technological reorganization of work encompasses not only productivity, but also institutional rationality, communication, subjectivity, organizational cohesion, and the potential intensification of instrumental rationality (Lima, 2025). Simultaneously, adaptation must not be mistaken for regression. The modernization of public policies in response to the 5.0 Revolution must safeguard the Constitution's protective core. Innovation should not serve as justification for diminishing rights, obscuring vulnerabilities, or shifting all social risks onto individuals.

By fostering this debate, the ANPPREV Journal of Social Security — RASS reaffirms its role as a forum for scientific, legal, and institutional reflection on the future of social protection in Brazil. RASS maintains that Social Security should not be analyzed exclusively through rigid normative frameworks or economic rationality lacking constitutional depth. Addressing this topic requires interdisciplinarity and dialogue among law, public administration, technology, economics, data science, public policy, and democratic theory.

The articles in this edition invite readers to consider the 5.0 Revolution not simply as a celebration of technological progress, but as an opportunity to reaffirm the centrality of the human person in public policy. Technology achieves greater legitimacy when it expands rights, strengthens institutions, reduces inequalities, increases transparency, promotes social oversight, and enhances the delivery of public value. In the context of Social Security, innovation must also contribute to improved protection.

Enjoy your reading.

Alicante, Spain, May 31, 2026.

**Fábio Lucas de Albuquerque Lima**  
**Editor-in-Chief**

**REFERENCES**

ACEVEDO, M. E. S. La inteligencia artificial en el sector público y su límite respecto de los derechos fundamentales. **Estudios Constitucionales**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 257-284, 2022.

ALEGRIA, J. Anotaciones iniciales para una reflexión ética sobre la regulación de la Inteligencia Artificial en la Unión Europea. **Revista de Derecho**, v. 28, p. 1-34, 2023.

ALVES, Adler Anaximandro da Cruz e; SURIANI, Fernanda Mattar Furtado. A construção do Contencioso 5.0 na Procuradoria-Geral Federal. In: LIMA, Fábio Lucas de Albuquerque et al. **Direito Administrativo 4.0: desafios na era das novas tecnologias**. Deerfield Beach: Pembroke Collins, 2024. p. 92-130.

ANDRADE, M. D.; PRADO, D. A. Inteligência artificial para a redução do tempo de análise dos recursos extraordinários: o impacto do Projeto Victor no Supremo Tribunal Federal. **Revista Quaestio Iuris**, v. 15, n. 1, p. 53-78, 2022.

ARAÚJO, Valter Shuenquener de; ZULLO, Bruno Almeida; TORRES, Maurílio. Big Data, algoritmos e inteligência artificial na Administração Pública: reflexões para a sua utilização em um ambiente democrático. **A&C Revista de Direito Administrativo e Constitucional**, v. 20, n. 80, p. 241-261, 2020.

ASENSI, Felipe Dutra. *Direito à saúde: práticas sociais reivindicatórias e sua efetivação*. Curitiba: Juruá, 2013.

BANCHIO, Pablo Rafael. Gobierno electrónico para la transparencia y buena gobernanza en la Administración Pública. In: LIMA, Fábio Lucas de Albuquerque et al. **Direito Administrativo 4.0: desafios na era das novas tecnologias**. Deerfield Beach: Pembroke Collins, 2024. p. 33-46.

DEL CERRO, M. Transparencia y eficiencia algorítmica en un escenario de “IA fuerte”. **Arts Iuris Salmanticensis**, v. 10, p. 11-26, 2022.

DESORDI, D.; DELLA BONA, C. A inteligência artificial e a eficiência na Administração Pública. **Revista de Direito**, v. 12, n. 2, p. 1-22, 2020.

LIMA, Fábio Lucas de Albuquerque. A aposentadoria por idade rural: o direito às políticas públicas igualitárias no âmbito da previdência social brasileira. In: SANTOS, Antocléia de Sousa; LIMA, Fábio Lucas de Albuquerque; CORREA, Maria José; MOULIN, Darlan Alves (org.). **Limiares do direito à saúde e envelhecimento**. 1. ed. Deerfield Beach, FL: Pembroke Collins, 2024. v. 1, p. 49-65.

LIMA, Fabio Lucas de Albuquerque. O teletrabalho como um direito social: limites e possibilidades no ordenamento jurídico brasileiro. **Opinión Jurídica**, [S. l.], v. 24, n. 52, p. 1–21, 2025. DOI: [10.22395/ojum.a4604](https://doi.org/10.22395/ojum.a4604). Disponível em: <https://revistas.udem.edu.co/index.php/opinion/article/view/4604>

RESENDE ZUBA, Thais Maria Riedel de. **A (in)seguridade social no Brasil. Desafios para uma Seguridade 4.0.** Curitiba: Juruá Editora, 2023.

VENTURINI, Adriana. A Remodelação da Política Social do Benefício de Prestação Continuada pelo Judiciário. **Revista ANPPREV de Seguridade Social**, Brasília, DF, v. 2, n. 1, p. 1–30, 2025. DOI: [10.70444/2966-330X.v2.n1.002](https://doi.org/10.70444/2966-330X.v2.n1.002). Disponível em: <https://rass.anpprev.org.br/index.php/RASS/article/view/45>

ZOCKUN, M.; ZOCKUN, C. Z. Limites éticos e jurídicos à produção do ato jurídico estatal com base em inteligência artificial: o ato jurídico produzido sem consciência ou vontade. **Cardenos de Direito Actual**, 20, 2023.

#### AI USAGE NOTE

This text was partially composed with the assistance of ChatGPT and subsequently reviewed using the same tool. Following its initial formulation, informed by the AI's familiarity with the author's style, it was further refined through dialogue with Claude AI, which contributed additional improvements. The final version was polished, corrected, and verified by the author.