Seven Contradictions of Capitalism: A Modern-Day Perspective

written by Leon Damian Leon Damian

In the contemporary world, capitalism, as the predominant economic paradigm, is lauded for its instrumental role in spearheading economic growth and innovation. Yet, it is not without its complex contradictions and dilemmas. These paradoxes have far-reaching effects, influencing societal structures and individual lives in profound ways. In this article, we aim to dissect seven such critical contradictions that lay bare the intricacies of capitalism. Our exploration endeavors to understand their origins and implications in our rapidly evolving socio-economic landscape.

1. Use Value and Exchange Value: The Dilemma of Use Value and Exchange Value

One of the key contradictions in capitalism lies in the duality of use value and exchange value. Use value refers to the practical utility of a commodity, how useful or necessary a product or service is for an individual or society. Exchange value, on the other hand, is the market price of that commodity, how much it can be sold for in a market.

In capitalism, the objective of a business is to maximize profit, and as such, the production of commodities is primarily driven by their exchange value (Appeal, 2014). This implies that goods and services that have a high exchange value are more likely to be produced in larger quantities, irrespective of their use value. Conversely, goods and services with a lower exchange value, despite having a high use value, might be produced in lesser quantities, or not produced at all.

This discrepancy, as Marx theorized, can lead to "commodity fetishism," a situation where the social relationships between people are expressed as, or mediated by, the relationship between things, namely commodities (Purdue.edu, 2019). Commodities, in this context, are valued not for the satisfaction of human needs (their use value), but for their exchange value. This can lead to an overemphasis on producing goods and services that generate high profits rather than those that satisfy basic human needs and societal wellbeing.

Moreover, the capitalist mode of production often leads to instances of market failure. Goods with a high use value but low exchange value—like public goods or services—are often undersupplied because they aren't profitable enough to entice private firms. This has significant social implications because it can lead to inequalities and access issues, especially for disadvantaged sections of society.

A prime example of this contradiction is observed in the global pharmaceutical industry. Here, essential medicines, those that satisfy the priority healthcare needs of a population, often have high use value but comparatively low exchange value, particularly in less affluent markets (Brock and Wikler, 2010). This discrepancy can lead to shortages in the production and distribution of such drugs.

A 2022 report by the Access to Medicine Foundation reveals the scale of this issue. The report indicates that over a billion people worldwide lack access to essential medicines (Access to Medicine Index 2022 2, n.d.). It points to the market dynamics of the pharmaceutical industry, where the potential for profit rather than the potential for societal benefit often drives research, development, and distribution decisions.

Let's consider antimalarial drugs as a specific case. The World Health Organization reports that there were an estimated 229 million cases of malaria worldwide in 2019, primarily in low-income, Sub-Saharan African countries (World Health

Organization, 2019). Despite the high use value of antimalarial drugs, their exchange value is often low due to the limited ability of these countries' citizens to pay for them. As a result, the production of such drugs may be insufficient to meet the demand, resulting in avoidable morbidity and mortality.

In summary, the contradiction between use value and exchange value within capitalism can lead to significant social and public health challenges. Resolving or mitigating this contradiction necessitates reconsidering how we value and incentivize the production of essential but unprofitable goods.

2. Capital and Labor: The Contradiction Fueling Wage Inequality

The bedrock of the capitalist system is the dynamic relationship between capital and labor. Capital, usually embodied in monetary forms or productive assets, falls under the ownership and management of capitalists or business owners (Majumdar, 2018). Labor, on the other hand, is the vital contribution of the workforce. These dual pillars of production are indispensable in wealth creation and the seamless running of businesses. Yet, they highlight a fundamental contradiction within the capitalist system, wherein their often-diverging interests give rise to issues like wage disparity.

Capital owners occupy one side of this dichotomy: their primary objective is to amplify the returns on their investments. This objective typically translates into a minimization of expenditures, including labor costs. Such a focus on cost reduction may give rise to tactics like outsourcing to regions with cheaper labor, the implementation of automation to reduce dependence on human labor, or the deliberate stifling of wage growth (Korinek, Schindler and Stiglitz, 2021).

On the other side of the equation, are the laborers or workers. Their aspiration is to elevate their earnings and enhance their work environment. This objective, however, frequently finds itself in conflict with the capital owners' drive for profit maximization. This tension between the pursuit of profit and the quest for fair wages and improved working conditions epitomizes the struggle and contradictions at the core of capitalism, often leading to wage inequality and social discontent. This structural dichotomy, if left unchecked, can amplify economic disparities, and heighten social tensions within a capitalist society.

This contradiction becomes particularly stark when we consider wage inequality. Data from Forbes in 2020 reveals that the top 1% of Americans earned 15 times more than the bottom 50% (Beer, 2020). This trend is not unique to the United States. According to a report from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the average income of the richest 10% of the population is about nine times that of the poorest 10% across the OECD, up from seven times 25 years prior (Oecd.org, 2011).

For a more specific example, consider the retail industry. In 2021, Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos saw his wealth grow by an estimated $65 billion, according to the Institute for Policy Studies (Picchi, 2021). Meanwhile, Amazon warehouse workers, whose labor contributes directly to the company's success, earn a median wage of around $15 per hour (About Amazon, 2021), despite the risks and demanding nature of the job, particularly during peak shopping periods and the recent pandemic.

In the tech industry, a similar divide exists. While top executives and software engineers at tech giants like Google and Facebook command high salaries and enjoy comfortable working conditions, many of their contract workers, such as content moderators or data center workers, struggle with low pay and challenging working conditions, as reported by the

Washington Post in 2021 (Daniel, 2019).

Thus, the contradiction between capital and labor, one of the key contradictions in capitalism identified by Marx, remains very much relevant today. It’s a driving force behind income inequality and presents significant questions about the fair distribution of wealth within capitalist societies. The challenge lies in resolving or, at least, mitigating this contradiction to work towards a more equitable economic system.

3. Private Property and the Capitalist State: A Contradiction Affecting Public Good

The right to private property is a cornerstone of capitalism. It underpins the system, ensuring that individuals or entities have the authority to own, control, and derive benefits from various types of properties (Smith, 2009). This property can take the form of tangible assets such as land, buildings, or machinery, or it can be intangible, represented by intellectual property like patents, copyrights, or trademarks. The capitalist state, as the governing body, is responsible for safeguarding these rights (Meckstroth, 2000). It does this through a comprehensive legal framework that ensures ownership rights are respected, property can be bought and sold securely, and disputes can be settled fairly.

However, this capitalist arrangement brings with it an inherent contradiction, particularly when viewed from the perspective of the public good (Harvey, 2014). While the protection and assurance of private property rights are indispensable for the smooth operation of a capitalist system, they can, and often do, conflict with the broader societal good.

Private property rights can lead to the concentration of wealth and resources in the hands of a few, exacerbating income inequality. In the pursuit of individual or corporate profit, owners may take actions that are detrimental to wider

society. For instance, a factory owner might disregard environmental regulations, leading to pollution that affects the health and well-being of the local population. Or, a landlord might aggressively increase rents or engage in speculative property buying, thereby contributing to housing unaffordability and displacement of residents.

The role of the capitalist state in these scenarios further deepens the contradiction. On the one hand, the state is tasked with enforcing private property rights, thus facilitating the continuation of capitalist activities. On the other hand, the state also has a responsibility to promote the public good and ensure the welfare of its citizens. Striking a balance between these two can be challenging, and often results in tension.

The state uses public funds to maintain the infrastructure necessary for private enterprise, like roads, utilities, and legal systems, and to enforce laws protecting private property rights. However, these actions often indirectly support activities that undermine the public good, reinforcing the paradox inherent in the capitalist system (Harvey, 2014). Therefore, the delicate interplay between private property, the capitalist state, and the public good embodies an ongoing contradiction within the capitalist system.

The housing market offers a stark illustration of this contradiction. Despite the existence of millions of vacant homes in the US, many people are homeless or precariously housed. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development reported that on a single night in 2022, over half a million people were homeless (US Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2022). The Leeds Building Society has conducted an analysis of government data, revealing that there are presently 676.452 vacant homes in England (www.mpamag.com, n.d). This disparity arises, in part, due to the prioritization of private property rights over the provision of a public good—housing. In a capitalist system, homes are

commodities to be bought, sold, and profited from, rather than merely places to live. Consequently, the housing market may fail to provide adequate housing to those who cannot afford it, even in the presence of a surplus of vacant homes.

Another contemporary example is the global vaccine distribution during the COVID-19 pandemic. Vaccine manufacturers, having invested in the development of their vaccines, naturally hold patents to protect and profit from their investment. While these rights are protected under the capitalist system, they have been criticized for limiting global vaccine access. The World Health Organization reported in February 2023 that while over 70% of people in high-income countries have received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine, the figure is just 10% in low-income countries (Duroseau, Kipshidze and Limaye, 2023). Critics argue that waiving certain patent rights, as proposed in the TRIPS waiver, could improve this situation by enabling wider vaccine production and distribution.

In the realm of natural resources too, the contradiction between private property and public good is evident. Private corporations often hold rights to extract natural resources, yet their operations can result in environmental degradation, impacting public health and well-being. For example, fracking activities by private companies in the US have been linked to pollution of air and water resources, affecting local communities' health (NRDC, 2014).

In sum, the protection of private property, while critical for the operation of capitalist economies, can give rise to significant social and environmental challenges. Resolving or mitigating this contradiction demands innovative policy approaches that strike a balance between upholding property rights and ensuring the provision of public goods.

4. Monopoly and Competition: The Paradox Stifling Innovation and Promoting Inequality

One of the key pillars of capitalism is the principle of competition. This concept is frequently hailed as the driving force of capitalism, triggering innovation, reducing prices, and broadening consumer options. However, an inherent paradox lies within this system. The same competitive mechanisms that power capitalism also drive market concentration, leading to the formation of monopolies. These monopolies, in turn, can suppress innovation, elevate prices, and widen wage disparities, thereby challenging the foundational ideals of competitive capitalism (Harvey, 2014).

In the arena of free-market competition, businesses are motivated to innovate, enhance their efficiency, and decrease their prices in order to entice consumers. This competition can spur economic development and lead to a broad variety of products and services for consumers. As a company becomes more successful, it naturally expands and garners a larger share of the market. This growth, while a sign of individual business success, can have broader implications for the market as a whole. As this process continues, it can result in market concentration, where a handful of companies control the majority of the industry. In extreme cases, a single company may gain such a dominant position that it becomes a monopoly, effectively nullifying competition in the process (McWhinney, 2021).

This market concentration can bring about several detrimental effects. One of the most prominent issues is the potential for price increases. Companies that have achieved significant market dominance can raise prices without the fear of losing customers to competition. This lack of competitive pressure can result in higher prices for consumers.

Another critical issue is the potential suppression of innovation. When a handful of dominant companies control a market, there is less motivation to invest in research and development. With little or no competition, these companies feel less pressure to innovate or improve their products or

services.

Furthermore, this concentration of market power can exacerbate wage inequality (Eeckhout and Barcelona, n.d.). With fewer companies controlling a market, there is less competition for workers, a situation which can suppress wages and lead to increased income inequality. This highlights another aspect of the contradiction within capitalism: the same forces that can lead to innovation and lower prices can, under certain conditions, contribute to economic inequality and stifle further innovation.

A report by the Institute of Labor Economics points out another critical impact of market concentration: wage suppression. The report suggests that rising market concentration could account for the increase in wage inequality since the 1980s (Cortes and Tschopp, 2020). In concentrated markets, fewer employers are competing for workers, reducing the bargaining power of employees, and contributing to stagnant wages and worsening inequality.

For a concrete example of this paradox, consider the tech industry. Giants like Google, Amazon, and Facebook have come to dominate their respective markets. These companies provide innovative products and services and have contributed significantly to economic growth. However, their dominant positions also raise concerns about stifled competition, data privacy, and market power. In 2021, the US House Judiciary Committee proposed a series of antitrust bills aimed at curbing the power of Big Tech and promoting competition (Clifford Chance, n.d.).

Similarly, the telecommunications industry, particularly in the United States, is dominated by a small number of large companies, such as AT&T, Verizon, and Comcast. This concentration led to higher prices and fewer choices for consumers. According to a 2019 report by the Economic Policy Institute, prices for cable and satellite TV and radio

services have risen at more than double the rate of inflation since 1996 (Bivens, 2022).

In conclusion, the paradox between capitalism’s promotion of competition and the trend towards monopoly is a significant contradiction. It raises questions about the optimal level of competition and the most effective ways to regulate market concentration to prevent the stifling of innovation, protect consumers, and safeguard wage growth. Addressing this contradiction is crucial for ensuring a healthy and equitable capitalist system.

5. The Division of Labour: The Paradox of Efficiency and Alienation in Capitalism

The division of labour is a central pillar of capitalist economies, underscoring the segmentation of the production process into discrete tasks, each assigned to distinct individuals or teams. This compartmentalization of tasks promotes efficiency, boosts productivity, and, in theory, maximises profits, as it allows for individual specialisation. Yet, this very economic mechanism concurrently unveils a fundamental paradox within capitalism: while the division of labour is economically beneficial, it can engender feelings of alienation and dissatisfaction among the workforce (Appeal, 2014).

Indeed, the division of labour has proven instrumental in driving economic advancement. It fosters specialisation, promoting the honing of specific skills, catalysing improvements in speed, and facilitating the manufacture of intricate goods that would be virtually impossible to produce without a divided and coordinated labour force. The automobile industry offers a vivid example of this phenomenon, with companies like Ford Motor Company illustrating the immense productivity gains that can be reaped from the assembly line production model, a paradigm of the division of labour (Ford Motor Company, 2020).

However, this compartmentalization of tasks, particularly when they become smaller and increasingly repetitive, can give rise to a profound sense of worker alienation, a notion deeply examined by Karl Marx (www.marxists.org, n.d. This alienation can take root when workers fail to perceive a tangible link between their labour and the final product. The result is a feeling of disconnection and dissatisfaction as workers become mere cogs in a large machine, mechanically performing tasks without understanding or appreciating their contribution to the final product.

Marx's concept of alienation underscores the workers' estrangement from the product of their labour, as they lack any proprietary claim over it – the fruits of their work belong to the capitalist who employs them (Guy-Evans, 2023). This disconnect extends to the production process itself, where repetitive and monotonous tasks offer little scope for creativity or personal growth, fostering a sense of powerlessness and disenchantment.

The manifestation of this paradox – the simultaneous drive towards efficiency through the division of labour and the resultant worker alienation – this presents a critical contradiction within capitalism. This issue carries significant implications for worker morale, productivity, and social harmony, highlighting the need for balance and prompting ongoing discourse on how best to humanise work in a capitalist system.

In the modern global economy, this contradiction is more evident than ever. A 2017 Gallup poll found that 85% of employees worldwide are not engaged or actively disengaged at work (Inc, 2017). This alarming statistic suggests that despite the prosperity and wealth generated through divided labour, many workers do not find fulfilment or satisfaction in their work.

A specific illustration of this issue can be seen in the fast-

food industry. Fast food companies like McDonald's are known for their assembly-line style of food preparation – a clear application of divided labour for maximum efficiency. However, these same jobs are often criticised for being monotonous and offering little room for creativity or skill development. A 2013 report from the Centre for Economic and Policy Research noted that only 2.2% of jobs in the fast-food industry are "managerial, professional, or technical occupations" (Nolan, 2013), indicating a lack of opportunities for career progression and skill development. This lack of growth opportunity can contribute to a high turnover rate. According to a report from Hour Work shared with Restaurant Dive, it was observed in 2022 that merely 54% of employees in Quick Service Restaurants (QSRs) in the USA managed to stay employed for at least 90 days before resigning. This data is derived from surveys conducted at over 8,000 QSR establishments. Interestingly, before the outbreak of the pandemic, the retention rate for the same 90-day period stood slightly higher, at 58% (Restaurant Dive, 2022).

In sum, the division of labour in capitalism, while advantageous for productivity and economic growth, has a significant downside. The challenge moving forward is to find a balance – a system where labour can be efficient without sacrificing worker satisfaction and engagement.

6. Monopoly and Competition: Uneven Geographical Development and the Resulting Disparities

While capitalism encourages competition, which theoretically should lead to an efficient allocation of resources and wealth, it also inevitably results in the unequal geographical distribution of wealth. This inherent contradiction can lead to stark regional disparities, contributing to social and economic inequality on a global scale (Harvey, 2014).

According to an IMF report in 2022, the richest 10 percent today snap up 52 percent of all income, while the poorest half

get just 8,5 percent (Stanley, 2022). This global wealth inequality is mirrored on a geographical level, where wealth and economic development are concentrated in specific regions, often to the detriment of others.

Take, for example, the technology industry, which has greatly contributed to the wealth of regions such as Silicon Valley in the United States and Shenzhen in China. These areas attract significant investment and high-skilled labor, leading to further economic growth. However, this concentration of wealth and opportunities has often left other regions lagging behind, with less investment in infrastructure, education, and other public goods, perpetuating a cycle of economic disparity.

A stark manifestation of this uneven geographical development is the Global North-South divide. According to a 2023 report by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), while the Global North, comprising largely developed countries, controls a disproportionate share of global wealth and resources, the Global South, made up of developing countries, struggles with poverty, insufficient infrastructure, and limited access to education and healthcare (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, 2023).

Moreover, this uneven geographical development is not just confined to global disparities; it also occurs within countries. For example, within the United States, areas like the Rust Belt have seen a decline as manufacturing jobs have moved overseas or to regions with cheaper labor (admin, 2022). On the other hand, coastal cities such as San Francisco and New York have flourished due to the growth of industries like technology and finance.

These geographical disparities in wealth and development can lead to a host of challenges, including social unrest, economic instability, and mass migration. The inherent contradiction in capitalism between competition and monopoly, leading to uneven geographical development, necessitates

careful management and policy intervention to mitigate its impact and foster more balanced and inclusive growth (Harvey, 2014).

7. Technology and the Human Disposition: A Contradiction Leading to Job Displacement and Inequality

Capitalist economies thrive on innovation and technological advancement. These forces drive productivity growth, open up new markets, and offer various benefits, from increased consumer convenience to new ways of connecting people globally. However, this relentless drive for technological progress presents a notable contradiction: while technology can create jobs and opportunities, it can also render certain jobs obsolete, displacing workers and contributing to inequality (Harvey, 2014).

This contradiction is starkly evident in the realm of automation and artificial intelligence (AI). A study by Oxford Economics in 2019 forecasted that up to 20 million manufacturing jobs worldwide could be displaced by robots by 2030 (Cellan-Jones, 2019). The sectors most at risk of automation are those characterized by routine and repetitive tasks, such as manufacturing, transport, and warehousing.

However, job displacement due to technology is not limited to these sectors. The rise of AI and machine learning also poses potential challenges to white-collar jobs. Roles in fields like data analysis, accounting, and even law and medicine, which involve substantial information processing, could be increasingly automated. According to a 2023 report by McKinsey & Company, up to 30% of jobs could be automated by 2030, affecting hundreds of millions of workers worldwide (Manyika et al., 2017).

This technological displacement can contribute to growing income and wealth inequality. As high-skilled workers who can work with advanced technology see demand for their labor rise, low-skilled workers whose jobs are replaced by automation may

face unemployment or be forced into lower-paying jobs.

For example, Amazon's use of robots in its warehouses provides a clear illustration of this trend. While these robots have significantly increased efficiency, their introduction has also led to job losses and has raised concerns about working conditions for the remaining human workers who must keep pace with the machines (Rushe, 2022).

Yet, despite these challenges, technological advancement can also create new jobs and industries. The green energy sector, for example, has been a significant source of job creation. According to the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), the renewable energy industry could employ more than 43 million people globally by 2050, up from around 12 million in 2021 (www.irena.org, n.d.).

The challenge, therefore, is to manage the contradiction between technological progress and its impacts on labor markets. This could involve policies to support workers displaced by technology, such as retraining programs and income support. It could also involve efforts to shape technological development in ways that complement rather than replace human labor. Finally, there's a need for education systems to adapt and equip future generations with the skills needed to thrive in an increasingly automated world.

References:

1. About Amazon. (2021). Study shows Amazon's wage increase to $15 an hour also upped pay for non-Amazon workers. [online] Available at: https://www.aboutamazon.com/news/job-creation-and-investment/study-shows-amazons-wage-increase-to-15-an-hour-also-upped-pay-for-non-amazon-workers.
2. Access to Medicine Index 2022 2. (n.d.). Available at: https://accesstomedicinefoundation.org/medialibrary/2022

-access-to-medicine-index-1668514482.pdf
3. admin (2022). A History of the Rust Belt and Why it's Important. [online] Rust Belt Recruiting. Available at: https://rustbeltrecruiting.com/a-history-of-the-rust-belt-and-why-its-important/.
4. Appeal, S. (2014). Marx's Capital: Chapters 4-8 – Surplus Value. [online] Socialist Appeal. Available at: https://socialist.net/marx-s-capital-chapters-4-8-surplus-value/.
5. Appeal, S. (2014). Marx's Capital: Chapters 12-14 – Productivity, Co-operation, and Division of Labour. [online] Socialist Appeal. Available at: https://socialist.net/marx-s-capital-chapters-12-14-productivity-co-operation-and-division-of-labour/.
6. Beer, T. (2020). Top 1% Of U.S. Households Hold 15 Times More Wealth Than Bottom 50% Combined. [online] Forbes. Available at: https://www.forbes.com/sites/tommybeer/2020/10/08/top-1-of-us-households-hold-15-times-more-wealth-than-bottom-50-combined/.
7. Bivens, J. (2022). Corporate profits have contributed disproportionately to inflation. How should policymakers respond? [online] Economic Policy Institute. Available at: https://www.epi.org/blog/corporate-profits-have-contributed-disproportionately-to-inflation-how-should-policymakers-respond/.
8. Brock, D.W. and Wikler, D. (2010). Ethical Issues in Resource Allocation, Research, and New Product Development. [online] Nih.gov. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK11739/.
9. Cellan-Jones, R. (2019). Robots 'to replace up to 20 million factory jobs' by 2030. BBC News. [online] 26 Jun. Available at: https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-48760799.
10. Clifford Chance. (n.d.). Clifford Chance | House Judiciary Committee Passes Six Antitrust Bills Targeting

Tech Platforms and Large Transactions, Setting Up Vote Before House of Representatives. [online] Available at: https://www.cliffordchance.com/briefings/2021/06/house-judiciary-committee-passes-six-antitrust-bills-targeting-t.html

11. Cortes, G.M. and Tschopp, J. (2020). Rising Concentration and Wage Inequality. SSRN Electronic Journal. doi:https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3665117.
12. Daniel, E. (2019). 56% of tech workers think they are underpaid. [online] Verdict. Available at: https://www.verdict.co.uk/tech-salaries-underpaid/
13. Duroseau, B., Kipshidze, N. and Limaye, R.J. (2023). The impact of delayed access to COVID-19 vaccines in low- and lower-middle-income countries. Frontiers in Public Health, 10. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.1087138.
14. Eeckhout, J. and Barcelona, U. (n.d.). Market power and labour market inequality Market power and labour market inequality. [online] Available at: https://ifs.org.uk/inequality/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Market-power-labour-market-inequality-IFS-Deaton-Review-Inequality.pdf.
15. Ford Motor Company (2020). The Moving Assembly Line. [online] Ford Corporate. Available at: https://corporate.ford.com/articles/history/moving-assembly-line.html
16. Guy-Evans, O. (2023). Marx's Theory of Alienation – Simply Sociology. [online] simplysociology.com. Available at: https://simplysociology.com/marx-alienation.html
17. Harvey, D. (2014). Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism. Profile Books.
18. Inc, G. (2017). Dismal Employee Engagement Is a Sign of Global Mismanagement. [online] Gallup.com. Available at: https://news.gallup.com/opinion/gallup/224012/dismal-employee-engagement-sign-global-mismanagement.aspx.
19. (n.d.). Technological Progress, Artificial Intelligence,

and Inclusive Growth. [online] Available at: https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WP/Issues/2021/06/11/Technological-Progress-Artificial-Intelligence-and-Inclusive-Growth-460695.
20. Majumdar, S.R. (2018). Capital and Capitalism. [online] https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199641994.003.0002.
21. Manyika, J., Lund, S., Chui, M., Bughin, J., Woetzel, J., Batra, P., Ko, R. and Sanghvi, S. (2017). Jobs lost, jobs gained: What the future of work will mean for jobs, skills, and wages. [online] McKinsey & Company. Available at: https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/jobs-lost-jobs-gained-what-the-future-of-work-will-mean-for-jobs-skills-and-wages.
22. McWhinney, J. (2021). How and Why Companies Become Monopolies. [online] Investopedia. Available at: https://www.investopedia.com/articles/investing/071515/how-why-companies-become-monopolies.asp.
23. Meckstroth, T.W. (2000). Marx and the Logic of Social Theory: The Capitalist State. Science & Society, [online] 64(1), pp.55–86. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/40403825.
24. Nolan, H. (2013). The Fast Food Industry Is the Deadest of Dead Ends. [online] Gawker. Available at: https://www.gawker.com/the-fast-food-industry-is-the-deadest-of-dead-ends-914260542#:~:text=A%20new%20study%20quantifies%20just%20how%20unrealistic%20this%20idea%20is.&text=8.7%25%20of%20
25. NRDC (2014). Fracking Fumes: Air Pollution from Hydraulic Fracturing Threatens Public Health and Communities NRDC ISSuE BRIEF. [online] Available at: https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/fracking-air-pollution-IB.pdf.
26. org. (2011). Divided we Stand: Why Inequality Keeps Rising (Speech) – OECD. [online] Available at: https://www.oecd.org/els/soc/dividedwestandwhyinequality

keepsrisingspeech.htm.
27. Ozawa, S., Shankar, R., Leopold, C. and Orubu, S. (2019). Access to medicines through health systems in low- and middle-income countries. Health Policy and Planning, [online] 34(Supplement_3), pp.iii1–iii3. Doi :https://doi.org/10.1093/heapol/czz119.
28. Picchi, A. (2021). Billionaires got 54% richer during pandemic, sparking calls for 'wealth tax'. [online] cbsnews.com. Available at: https://www.cbsnews.com/news/billionaire-wealth-covid-pandemic-12-trillion-jeff-bezos-wealth-tax/.
29. edu. (2019). Introduction to Karl Marx, Module on Fetishism. [online] Available at: https://www.cla.purdue.edu/academic/english/theory/marxism/modules/marxfetishism.html.
30. Restaurant Dive. (n.d.). Study: Only 54% of QSR employees worked 90 days before quitting in 2022. [online] Available at: https://www.restaurantdive.com/news/most-qsr-employees-worked-90-days-before-quitting-202/640826/#:~:text=Only%2054%25%20of%20QSR%20employees%20reached%2090%20days%20of%20working.
31. Rushe, D. (2022). Amazon enters the age of robots. What does that mean for its workers? [online] the Guardian. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2022/nov/11/amazon-robots-jobs.
32. Smith, A. (2009). The Wealth of Nations. Lexington, Ky.: Seven Treasures Publications.
33. Stanley, A. (2022). Global Inequalities. [online] International Monetary Fund. Available at: https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/fandd/issues/2022/03/Global-inequalities-Stanley.
34. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (2022). HUD Releases 2022 Annual Homeless Assessment Report. [online] HUD.gov / U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Available at:

https://www.hud.gov/press/press_releases_media_advisories/HUD_No_22_253.
35. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2023). Trade and Development Report Update (April 2023). [online] Available at: https://unctad.org/publication/trade-and-development-report-update-april-2023.
36. World Health Organisation (2019). World malaria report 2019. [online] Who.int. Available at: https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/world-malaria-report-2019.
37. irena.org. (n.d.). Renewable Energy Jobs Reach 12 Million Globally. [online] Available at: https://www.irena.org/news/pressreleases/2021/Oct/Renewable-Energy-Jobs-Reach-12-Million-Globally.
38. marxists.org. (n.d.). The Alienation of Modern Man by Fritz Pappenheim. [online] Available at: https://www.marxists.org/subject/alienation/pappenheim.htm.
39. mpamag.com. (n.d.). How many empty homes are there in England? [online] Available at: https://www.mpamag.com/uk/mortgage-types/residential/how-many-empty-homes-are-there-in-england/437584.