OXFORD JOURNAL
OF STUDENT
SCHOLARSHIP

The Political Tension of Concentrated Economic Power in Contemporary American Representative Democracy

Jane Holbrook
janeholbrook9@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper will examine the political problem created by the concentration of economic power prevalent in modern American representative democracy. The majority of prior research in this field has focused on lobbying and unequal political influence; however, this paper argues that those issues do not fully explain how economic concentration shapes democratic governance. Rather, this paper identifies structural dependence as a more complete explanation for how the American government has become constrained by its reliance on large private firms for employment and economic stability.

To develop this argument, the paper combines contemporary scholarship on political economy with the political theories of John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Locke's literature is examined to explain why governments become closely tied to the preservation of property and economic stability, and Rousseau's literature highlights how unequal ownership of resources can limit political equality despite the presence of a formal democracy.

Together, these accounts demonstrate how the concentration of economic power can narrow the range of policies that governments view as politically feasible without completely eliminating democracy. The paper concludes that the central democratic challenge lies not in capitalism itself, but in the degree to which structural dependence can limit the capacity of democratic governments to respond to citizens and pursue collective political goals.

INTRODUCTION

In modern representative democracies, large corporations tend to play significant roles in employment and overall economic stability. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, private sector employment accounts for roughly 85 percent of total U.S. employment; however, government employment comprises a significantly smaller share. This distribution highlights how closely the U.S. labor market and household incomes are tied to private firms. In addition, e-commerce has become a significant component of the U.S. economy, accounting for approximately 16.1 percent of total retail sales in 2024 (U.S. Census Bureau, *Quarterly Retail E-Commerce Sales*). Within this expanding market,

Amazon alone accounts for roughly 37–38% of U.S. e-commerce sales, positioning the company at the center of retail logistics and digital infrastructure in America (Davis). Firms of this scale shape labor markets and supply chains while providing goods and services that millions of Americans rely on every day. When governments consider regulating firms of this scale, concerns about unemployment, supply chain disruption, or rising consumer prices quickly become part of the political debate. Large firms and their supporters frequently argue that aggressive regulation could produce these outcomes, regardless of whether such predictions prove to be true. As a result, decisions surrounding concentrated economic power can begin influencing which forms of regulation, reform, or political action governments view as realistically possible to pursue.

Past empirical research in political science has demonstrated that large firms and economically influential individuals exercise a disproportionate influence over public policy. In a widely cited study, Gilens and Page analyzed nearly 2,000 policy decisions in America over the course of several decades and compared shifts in public opinions across income groups. Based on this analysis, they found that economic elites and organized business interests have a substantial influence on U.S. policy outcomes, while average citizens exert much less measurable influence (Gilens and Page 576–581). In this context, 'measurable influence' can be defined as the extent to which changes in a group's preferences are reflected in which policies are put in place. While this finding by itself does not establish a violation of democracy, it suggests that concentrated economic power may shape political outcomes beyond formal electoral processes. Therefore, the concern is that concentrated economic power may shape the boundaries of what policies democratic governments can pursue. This raises a deeper issue about the relationship between economic power and representative democracy: specifically, what political problem is created by the concentration of economic power prevalent in modern American representative democracy?

To address this concern, it is necessary to examine how democratic governments become dependent on private firms for economic stability, such as employment and tax revenue. Many modern representative democracies have adopted capitalist economies where the majority of economic activity is organized into private ownership and private enterprise. These systems generate significant economic benefits, but they also create conditions where governments rely heavily on major economic actors to sustain the economy. It is important to note that this paper does not treat capitalism itself as the problem. Instead, it focuses on how certain structural dynamics can constrain decision making within a democracy. One possible concern is that dependence on concentrated economic power may influence what policies governments view as realistically possible, potentially affecting political outcomes.

Accordingly, the present analysis will proceed in five stages. It will begin by examining the historical development of economic power in the United States and how it has become increasingly concentrated over time. It then examines existing scholarship on corporate influence before introducing structural dependence as a more complete explanation of how concentrated economic power can constrain democratic government. From there, the analysis turns to the political theories of John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau to examine the relationship between property, dependence, and political authority. These empirical and theoretical perspectives are then brought together to explain the broader political

problem posed by the concentration of economic power within contemporary American democracy. Finally, the conclusion highlights the implications of these findings and identifies possible directions for future research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Prior research on corporate power within a democratic country has largely examined how firms influence political outcomes. For example, Gilens and Page found that economic elites and organized business interests shape policy outcomes (Gilens and Page 564–81). Hacker and Pierson further argued that this power often operates through anticipation and agenda-setting rather than solely direct lobbying (Hacker and Pierson). Furthermore, Baumgartner and his colleagues found that business lobbying groups are, dollar for dollar, more effective than any other type of interest group (Baumgartner et al. 233). Similarly, research from the American Economic Liberties Project found that as corporations gain market power, they increase their lobbying activity, which thereby reinforces their political position (American Economic Liberties Project). Taken together, these findings reveal a pattern where concentrated economic power is closely linked to political influence; however, this finding doesn't address the full picture. By focusing on how firms shape policy decisions, prior research does not fully explain why these conditions persist and if their influence violates democracy.

These broader questions can be examined most clearly in the United States. Among Western democracies, the United States has the largest national economy and some of the most globally influential corporations (World Bank). Additionally, healthcare and retirement security in the United States are closely tied to private employment. Employment-based health insurance covered 53.8 percent of the U.S. population in 2024 (U.S. Census Bureau, *Health Insurance Coverage*). Retirement savings for millions of Americans also depend upon employer-sponsored 401(k)s, with approximately 70 million U.S. workers participating in these plans (U.S. Department of Labor). Because these accounts are commonly invested in financial assets such as stocks and pooled investment funds, their value can also depend on market performance (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System). Under those conditions, policymakers must weigh how instability within major industries could affect the financial security of citizens and the economy. Therefore, concentrated economic power becomes politically significant because governments may become cautious about instating policies that threaten dominant firms. Altogether, this paper examines how those conditions shape the limits of democratic governance within the contemporary United States.

To understand how these conditions emerged, it is necessary to examine their historical development and the reasons they continue to shape politics today. According to Harvard business historian Alfred Chandler, economic concentration grew out of industrialization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when new technologies and economies of scale allowed companies to expand rapidly. As a result, companies such as Standard Oil and U.S. Steel dominated their industries, while railroad networks were consolidated under business tycoons like Cornelius Vanderbilt. As these companies grew, they reduced costs and used vertical and horizontal integration to control supply chains, which made further consolidation both possible and profitable (Chandler 315–372). Chandler treated this primarily as an

economic and organizational transformation. However, this economic transformation also changed the relationship between governments and private firms. As economic activity became increasingly concentrated, democratic governments grew more dependent on major firms.

At the time that these dynamics emerged, many concerns arose about this concentration and continued to evolve over the twentieth century. Progressive Era reformers, one of the most outspoken groups, warned that monopolies and "robber barons" would exploit consumers with high prices, stifle competition, and have detrimental impacts on the U.S. democracy (Sklar). While early antitrust laws sought to address these issues and limit this concentration, enforcement weakened during the Reagan administration due to the belief that antitrust laws reduce economic efficiency. As American legal scholar Tim Wu explains, regulators began to rely on the "consumer welfare" standard, which prioritizes prices and efficiency over concerns about political power (Wu). In recent years, scholars Lina Khan and Zephyr Teachout have returned to these earlier critiques, arguing that today's concentration of economic power presents many of the same democratic concerns. These scholars emphasize that dominant firms shape which policy options are treated as viable, influence electoral outcomes through concentrated spending, and hold key roles in employment and infrastructure (Teachout and Khan; Khan 710–805).

Even so, while their work illustrates how concentrated firms shape political outcomes, it fails to answer why certain policies never become politically viable in the first place. As Gilens and Page show, policy outcomes have consistently aligned with the preferences of economic elites when those preferences differ or diverge from those of average citizens (Gilens and Page 564–81). While this finding demonstrates disparities in political responsiveness, it leaves the question: why are some policy options treated as politically unrealistic before a formal debate occurs?

Charles Lindblom addresses this gap by shifting the attention from influence to constraint. In "The Market as Prison," he argues that policymakers operate within economic systems where business activity highly influences employment and growth. Because of this, governments anticipate how firms will respond to policy decisions and adjust their decisions accordingly. As a result, policymakers begin weighing the economic consequences of regulation alongside the goals the regulation is intended to achieve. For example, efforts to regulate major industries have often raised concerns about job loss or reduced investment, which in turn limit the scope of policies governments are willing to pursue (Lindblom 326–28). The same pattern extends from labor law to environmental regulation, where the economic consequences of disrupting a major industry can discourage governments from acting.

The 2008 financial crisis illustrates this dynamic at a national level. When major financial institutions began to collapse, the federal government intervened through the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) and committed hundreds of billions of dollars to stabilize the financial system. Many policymakers justified this intervention by pointing to the possibility of economic collapse and unemployment that would result from the bankruptcy of these businesses (U.S. Department of the Treasury). Although the government could have allowed those firms to fail, policymakers concluded that the potential

consequences were too severe. This reflects Lindblom's argument that when economic stability depends on large firms, policy options narrow, even in moments of crisis.

At the same time, governments have strong incentives to support the growth of these firms because they drive economic activity. Companies like Amazon invest billions in warehouses and data centers, while firms such as NVIDIA and Apple fuel technological innovation across multiple industries (Amazon;). Additionally, Walmart remains the largest private employer in the United States, with approximately 1.6 million U.S. associates (Walmart).When firms become this central to jobs and innovation, governments often have reason to avoid policies that could threaten their success. From this perspective, the constraints Lindblom describes are part of a tradeoff between economic stability and policy flexibility. However, this framing obscures a key issue: which economic concerns are prioritized and whose interests are taken into account. The debate surrounding the Clean Power Plan highlights this tension. Although the policy aimed to reduce carbon emissions from power plants (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency), opponents argued that it would increase energy costs, eliminate jobs, and weaken economic competition (U.S. Chamber of Commerce). Whether those concerns ultimately outweighed the environmental benefits is a separate question; what matters here is that the anticipated consequences became central to determining what policies were considered.

Taken together, these examples suggest that concentrated economic power shapes democratic governance through more than direct influence alone. The evidence throughout this section also suggests why structural dependence may pose a distinct political concern. To understand the political significance of those constraints, it is necessary to examine how earlier political thinkers viewed the relationship between property, dependence, and legitimate political authority. Through that lens, we can acquire a better understanding of political power itself. In this paper, political power refers not only to formal authority, but to the ability to shape which policy options are considered by decision-makers. Additionally, structural dependence itself does not eliminate democratic institutions, but it narrows the range of choices available within them. Elections continue and laws are passed, yet the set of policies that can realistically be pursued becomes more limited over time. This narrowing is not always the result of unavoidable economic constraints; in some cases, it reflects the accumulated power of firms that shape public policy and regulation.

Altogether, two related problems result from this dynamic. First, concentrated economic power shapes not only which policies are adopted, but which are ever considered viable. Second, as structural dependence narrows the scope of political action, it reduces the ability for citizens to meaningfully advocate for change, since policies can be excluded before entering democratic deliberation.

DEPENDENCE, PROPERTY, AND CONSENT THROUGH THE LENS OF CLASSICAL POLITICAL THEORY

Introduction

The structural and empirical accounts that have been examined established that concentrated economic power shapes the boundaries of democratic decision-making in measurable ways. When viewed in this light, concentrated economic power is not just a lobbying, corruption or political influence problem. It signals something which has been deeper since the birth of property relations in their modern sense: democratic governments can be created on a basis of mass consent, and at the same time operate within economic systems that are both dependent on and distorted by unequal power relationships. Locke, followed by Rousseau, yearned towards this tension in different directions, both acknowledging the practical limits of political power as built into property and dependence. Their work is therefore useful in explaining how concentrated economic power can limit democratic self-government even in formally legitimate governments. Before turning to their arguments, it is useful to place this tension within the framework of the wider historical evolution of capitalism itself.

The most complete historical account is in Ellen Meiksins Wood, *The Origin of Capitalism*. Wood maintains that capitalism is not just the inevitable or natural consequence of commerce or unequal wealth. As she explains, "markets, trade, and unequal wealth" existed long before capitalism emerged (Wood 37). What distinguishes capitalism, according to Wood, is the development of a social system in which both individuals and governments become dependent upon market relations and private economic activity for material survival and social stability (Wood 19–23). To summarize, this conception of capitalism provides a basis for a political reading of the works of thinkers like Locke and Rousseau.

Locke: Consent, Property, and Political Authority

John Locke, a leading figure in liberal political theory, argued that political authority is based on the protection of property. In *The Second Treatise of Government*, Locke argues that individuals are born free and equal and that no person has an inherent right to rule another (Locke II.4). Therefore, political authority cannot be created through force, conquest, or simple inheritance. Furthermore, governments are legitimate when individuals agree to enter into civil society so as to defend their "lives, liberties, and estates," which Locke refers to in the aggregate as property (Locke II.123). Thus, property is central to Locke's conception of legitimate government, as it gives people a degree of personal stability and independence that governments are meant to protect.

For Locke, in order to protect their property more effectively than they could in the state of nature, individuals consent to the authority of civil government. Individuals do not enter political society in order to abandon freedom entirely. Instead, they accept the authority of civil government because settled law, impartial judgment, and consistent enforcement provide greater stability than the insecurity of the state of nature (Locke II.124–126). Individuals therefore consent to constraints within the public sphere because political authority helps protect activity within the private sphere, including labor and ownership. Locke's theory depends upon this relationship between the two spheres. The government gains legitimacy through its ability to preserve the conditions under which private individuals can securely exercise their rights and maintain their property.

This connection between protection and authority is particularly important in Locke's treatment of political power. The legislature, despite being the ultimate power in the commonwealth, is frequently reminded by Locke that political power is limited by the ends for which it was created (Locke II.134). Laws must be executed by known and established rules, and not by arbitrary will; and the government cannot go beyond the preservation of society and property, without violating its own validity. This limitation is one side of a bigger divide between public and private. In Chapter 5, Locke explains that individuals acquire private property via labor and that governments arise in order to stabilize those holdings and protect individuals from arbitrary interference (Locke II.27). Political authority thus exists to secure the conditions in which individuals can exercise their rights and maintain their property, rather than to dominate those activities itself. Locke contends that rulers who do rule outside the law effectively put themselves into a "state of war" with the people, because they replace legitimate authority with force (Locke II.222). Political power is therefore conditional rather than absolute. The government is legitimate only as long as the political power continues to pursue the purposes for which men consented to it: preservation of society and of property.

This relationship becomes more complex as systems of exchange expand. Locke's discussion of money suggests that individuals tacitly consent to unequal economic holdings through participation in systems of exchange and accumulation (Locke II.50). Inequality itself is not necessarily illegitimate within Locke's framework because it develops through voluntary economic activity rather than direct political domination. This interpretation is reflected in later scholarship as well. As Lorenzo Uberti notes, Locke treats consent to systems of exchange and money as a basis for justifying the economic inequalities that emerge from them (Uberti 50–52). At the same time, Locke's theory creates a tension between the preservation of private property and the exercise of public political authority. If governments derive legitimacy from securing the private sphere, political authority may become increasingly tied to maintaining the stability of broader systems of property and exchange. John Dunn similarly argues that Locke's theory is fundamentally concerned with the conditions under which the government possesses a rightful claim to rule. As Dunn explains, government becomes legitimate because individuals consent to it for the preservation of their rights and property, not because rulers possess natural superiority or unlimited authority. Locke therefore presents government as "an instrument for the preservation of property" (Dunn 220).

At the same time, Locke's account has been the subject of some critique, specifically feminist critique. Lorenne Clark argues that Locke's theory of property and self-ownership relies upon principles of equality and consent that are not always applied consistently to women, particularly within the family and household (Clark 699–703). From this perspective, Locke's account leaves unresolved questions about who can truly be considered an independent owner of property and of oneself. Despite these criticisms, Locke's central contribution remains his argument that political authority derives its legitimacy from consent and the protection of property. Locke's theory ultimately grounds legitimate government in the preservation of property and the consent of individuals who accept political authority in exchange for stability and protection.

Rousseau: Dependence and the Limits of the General Will

While Locke focuses on the legitimacy of political authority and the preservation of property, Jean-Jacques Rousseau shifts attention toward the social conditions that shape the individuals giving consent within political society. In Rousseau's framework, people do not enter political life as abstract equals detached from society. Rather, relationships of property, inequality, and social recognition shape how individuals exist within political communities long before formal governments are established. Rousseau therefore becomes less concerned with limiting arbitrary political power alone and more concerned with how unequal social conditions influence participation within political society (Rousseau, pt. 2).

In the *Discourse on the Origin and Basis of Inequality Among Men*, Rousseau argues that inequality develops gradually as social and economic life becomes more complex. In the dawn of humanity, human beings lived in a state of relative independence, led mainly by self-preservation and natural compassion. However, as families, agriculture, systems of labor, and permanent dwellings were created by humans, a greater dependence on others became necessary. Rousseau says that developments like agriculture and metallurgy are particularly notable because they demanded cooperation and systems of exchange (Rousseau, pt. 2). As people accumulated different amounts of resources, labor, and influence, property became more secure and inequality became more entrenched. Rousseau famously describes the birth of property as the moment when someone fenced off a piece of land and said, "This is mine" (Rousseau, pt. 2). From that point on, society became increasingly organized on the basis of relations of ownership, labor and dependence, rather than of relative independence and equality.

For Rousseau, this transformation affects more than material conditions alone. As inequality deepens, it begins shaping how individuals see themselves and relate to one another within society. Rousseau argues that people increasingly measure themselves through social comparison and public recognition, causing status and esteem to take on greater importance. Inequality therefore becomes embedded within broader relationships of influence and dependence, as individuals no longer participate from relatively equal positions (Rousseau, pt. 2).

This connection between property and political power also helps to explain Rousseau's larger critique of modern society. C. B. Macpherson, in *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*, contends that Locke's stress on property develops into a social system of viewing people in terms of their ability to own and accumulate (Macpherson 3–5). Economic and political relations are therefore closely related and inequalities of property begin to influence the exercise of power throughout society. Rousseau's analysis shows many of these same concerns. With the expansion of material inequality, relations of dependence also expand, making it more difficult to maintain equal participation within political life (Rousseau, pt. 2).

Political theorist Christopher Bertram makes a similar point, arguing that Rousseau's central concern is not inequality per se, but the forms of dependence that inequality creates within society. Bertram explains

that Rousseau believes freedom is increasingly difficult to maintain as individuals become dependent on each other in an unequal society. Dependence impacts how people engage in politics because unequal relationships determine who has security, influence, and independence (Bertram).

This concern is especially important in Rousseau's critique of government and political authority. According to Rousseau, governments are frequently created in the name of security and freedom, but at the same time they defend the property inequalities that were the source of social divisions from the start. For example, in the *Discourse on Inequality*, Rousseau discusses political society as arising in part from the efforts of the wealthy to guarantee their property and to stabilize existing inequalities under the guise of public order (Rousseau, pt. 2). As inequality deepens, political institutions may begin reflecting unequal social interests rather than the general will of each citizen. Rousseau therefore treats political authority with skepticism because systems of property and dependence can shape the state itself. Equal political participation becomes difficult to sustain when large inequalities in property influence the conditions under which citizens participate in public life. At the same time, Rousseau's critique does not reject the government entirely. His broader concern remains the preservation of freedom and the protection of individuals from relationships of domination and dependence. Rousseau's framework therefore raises questions about whether societies shaped by deep economic inequality can fully maintain the equal civic participation required for self-government (Rousseau, pt. 2).

SYNTHESIS: THE DEMOCRATIC TENSION OF CONCENTRATED ECONOMIC POWER

Altogether, Locke and Rousseau approach political authority from very different angles, but together they expose a tension still deeply ingrained in modern democratic government. Locke bases legitimate political authority on the preservation of property, security, and social stability (Locke II.123–134). Rousseau, by contrast, criticizes the ways governments can preserve unequal systems of property and dependence while still claiming to represent the collective interests of citizens (Rousseau, pt. 2). Taken together, their theories reveal a deeper tension within modern democratic government. Democratic government depends upon the idea that citizens should possess meaningful influence over collective political decisions through equal participation and representation (Macpherson). Yet those political systems often operate alongside economic arrangements that produce large inequalities in wealth and private influence. Locke helps explain why governments become tied to preserving economic stability, while Rousseau highlights how unequal private conditions can gradually undermine meaningful political equality within public life.

This contradiction becomes more evident the more economic power is concentrated. Moreover, Locke's framework helps to explain why democratic governments come to be committed to the preservation of the private sphere in the first place. If the legitimacy of governing bodies is achieved through the protection of property and the conditions for economic life, political leaders have strong incentives to protect the institutions and firms that economic order depends upon. Rousseau's critique, however, suggests that governments may gradually begin protecting unequal systems of dependence while continuing to claim legitimacy through equal political representation. In modern democratic societies, this dynamic emerges

when governments become heavily reliant upon major private firms for employment, investment, technological infrastructure, and broader economic stability. This tension is evident in the recent controversy over the proposal to let Medicare negotiate prescription drug prices. Although reducing prescription drug costs consistently attracted broad public support, proposals repeatedly raised warnings that more aggressive government intervention could dampen pharmaceutical innovation and future investment (KFF; PhRMA). Whether or not those predictions ultimately will prove accurate, they became part of the political calculation, illustrating how the expected economic consequences can influence the policy options governments are willing to pursue.

The tension identified by Locke and Rousseau, therefore, goes beyond the individual policies or even isolated instances of corporate influence. More fundamentally, it is about the relationship between formally equivalent political systems and unequal private economic arrangements. Citizens can still be equal in terms of legal rights and constitutional protections, while at the same time they are in economic systems in which access to wealth, security and influence is deeply unequal. Here Rousseau's critique is particularly apt, for unequal private conditions can gradually reshape the public sphere itself. Economic dependence affects the relative independence individuals possess when participating in political life. When citizens' access to jobs, financial security, or social progress is closely tied to dominant economic actors, they may have less practical freedom to resist the systems in which they are embedded. Meanwhile, Locke's emphasis on the preservation of property and stability helps to explain why governments might be reluctant to interfere with economic arrangements that preserve social order.

Nevertheless, this tension should not be understood as evidence that capitalism itself is inherently incompatible with democratic government. Capitalism is not a single, uniform system, and democratic countries have developed different ways of organizing the relationship between governments, markets, and private firms (Hall and Soskice). Countries such as Germany, Sweden, and France continue to operate within capitalist economies, yet they have developed different relationships between the state and concentrated private power. The American system is therefore only one example of how a capitalist democracy can develop. The dynamics explored throughout this paper are not an inevitable feature of capitalism itself, but rather reflect the particular political and economic institutions that have developed in the United States.

Such structural differences also impact the very nature of democratic governance. When fewer dimensions of social stability are directly dependent on large private employers, governments may have more leeway to regulate dominant firms and deal with social problems without expecting the same level of disruption. In the United States, however, health care, retirement benefits, and many other forms of economic security are more closely linked to private employment (U.S. Census Bureau, *Health Insurance Coverage*; U.S. Department of Labor). This is important because the country's economy is shaped by the decisions made over time about how much power different economic actors should have. In the American case, those decisions mean that citizens and governments are more directly exposed to the stability of major private firms. The political implications of concentrated economic power depend not just on the existence of markets, but on how a democratic society has chosen to organize them.

Recognizing this tension, democratic societies have repeatedly sought institutional reforms to mitigate the political consequences of concentrated economic power while preserving democratic accountability. Enforcement of antitrust laws, regulation of campaign finance, protection of workers, requirements for disclosure, and the existence of independent regulatory agencies are all efforts to prevent democratic decision-making from being too severely narrowed by concentrated private power. Historically, measures such as Progressive Era trust-busting and the Sherman Antitrust Act emerged from similar concerns about the relationship between concentrated economic power and democratic governance (Sklar; Sherman Antitrust Act). More recently, debates about the power of major technology companies, environmental issues, and artificial intelligence have echoed ongoing concerns about the ways in which private power dictates the shape of public life and political decision-making.

However, none of these mechanisms can eliminate the underlying tension entirely. Democratic governments will likely continue depending upon market systems and private economic activity in some capacity. Nevertheless, institutional reforms may help reduce the degree to which concentrated economic power constrains democratic self-government. Future research could therefore explore which institutional arrangements most effectively preserve meaningful democratic participation under conditions of economic inequality and market dependence. A comparative analysis across democratic capitalist systems may be particularly useful in identifying whether stronger labor institutions, more decentralized markets, greater public investment or more rigorous antitrust enforcement allow democratic governments more leeway to pursue a wider array of policy choices. The problem with democratic governments is not to separate political authority from the economic sphere altogether, but to prevent concentrated private economic power from constraining the ability of democratic institutions to make meaningful political decisions.

LIMITATIONS

At the same time, there are several limitations to consider. Because this paper focuses on the United States, its conclusions may not apply in the same way to other democratic capitalist systems, where the relationship between government and private firms can look quite different. The analysis also relies on existing scholarship rather than original quantitative data, so while it can show how structural dependence may shape political decision-making, it cannot measure exactly how much influence that dependence has on a given policy outcome. It is also difficult to separate structural dependence entirely from other forms of corporate influence, since lobbying, campaign spending, and economic dependence can all shape the same policy debate. As a result, this paper cannot always determine which form of influence is most significant in shaping a particular policy outcome. Future research could build on this analysis by collecting more quantitative evidence within the United States and examining whether the same patterns of structural dependence appear in other countries throughout the world.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the objective of this paper was to examine the political issue of concentrated economic power in contemporary American democratic government. The historical and theoretical approaches discussed in this paper indicate that the issue emerges when democratic institutions become highly dependent on concentrated private economic power to maintain employment, investment, infrastructure, and wider social stability. Locke helps to explain why governments become tightly bound to the preservation of economic order and the protection of the private sphere. Rousseau shows how unequal systems of dependence can slowly shape the conditions that shape the political life in which citizens are involved. These perspectives together help explain how concentrated economic power becomes politically salient beyond formal lobbying or campaign finance alone.

As demonstrated, this tension becomes especially important within the United States because major private firms occupy such central roles within economic and social life. Americans rely on large corporations and financial markets for everything from jobs and healthcare to retirement savings and technology. This dependence can make policymakers hesitant to pursue policies that might threaten major industries or create broader economic instability. The government still has the power to regulate markets and respond to voters, but the findings of this paper show that concentrated economic power can influence what policymakers view as realistically possible in the first place. Some reforms may be dismissed as too disruptive or impractical before they ever become the subject of serious political debate. The challenge for American democracy, then, is ensuring that economic dependence on powerful private firms does not give those firms greater influence over political decisions than the citizens those decisions are meant to serve.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my research mentor, Carl Pierer, for his guidance and thoughtful feedback throughout this project. His support was especially helpful as I deepened my understanding of political theory and political philosophy and applied those ideas to my analysis.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jane Holbrook is a high school senior at Indian Hill High School in Cincinnati, Ohio. She plans to study public policy and international affairs in college, with a minor in French. Outside of academics, she leads a national public speaking non-profit, serves as the Editor-in-Chief of her school's newspaper, and plays clarinet in regional and state wind ensembles.

REFERENCES

Amazon. 2024 *Amazon Sustainability Report.* Amazon, 2025.

American Economic Liberties Project. *Democracy for Sale: How Concentrated Corporate Power Has Corrupted Public Policy and Undermined the Public Interest.* American Economic Liberties Project, 2021, www.economicliberties.us/our-work/democracy-for-sale.

Baumgartner, Frank R., et al. *Lobbying and Policy Change: Who Wins, Who Loses, and Why.* University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Bertram, Christopher. "Jean-Jacques Rousseau." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Stanford University, 2010.

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. *Changes in U.S. Family Finances from 2019 to 2022: Evidence from the Survey of Consumer Finances.* Oct. 2023, www.federalreserve.gov/publications/changes-in-us-family-finances-from-2019-to-2022.htm.

Bureau of Labor Statistics. "The Employment Situation — 2024." *U.S. Department of Labor*, www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm.

Chandler, Alfred D. *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business.* Harvard University Press, 1977.

Clark, Lorenne M. G. "Women and John Locke; Or, Who Owns the Apples in the Garden of Eden?" *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 7, no. 4, 1977, pp. 699–724.

Davis, Lauren. "Ecommerce Statistics (2024)." *Forbes Advisor*, 2024, www.forbes.com/advisor/business/ecommerce-statistics/.

Dunn, John. The Political Thought of John Locke: *An Historical Account of the Argument of the "Two Treatises of Government."* Cambridge University Press, 1969, https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511558436.

Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin I. Page. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2014, pp. 564–581.

Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. *Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer—and Turned Its Back on the Middle Class.* Simon & Schuster, 2010.

Hall, Peter A., and David Soskice, editors. *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage.* Oxford UP, 2001.

James, David. "Rousseau on Dependence and the Formation of Political Society." *European Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2013, pp. 386–409.

KFF. "The Public Weighs In On Medicare Drug Negotiations." *KFF*, 12 Oct. 2021, https://www.kff.org/health-costs/public-weighs-in-on-medicare-drug-negotiations/

Khan, Lina M. "Amazon's Antitrust Paradox." *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 126, no. 3, 2017, pp. 710–805.

Lindblom, Charles E. "The Market as Prison." *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 44, no. 2, 1982, pp. 324–336, https://doi.org/10.2307/2130588.

Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Government.* 1689. *Project Gutenberg*, www.gutenberg.org/files/7370/7370-h/7370-h.htm.

Macpherson, C. B. *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke.* Clarendon Press, 1962, archive.org/details/dli.scoerat.5299thepoliticaltheoryofpossessiveindividualism.

PhRMA. "The Inflation Reduction Act and Medicare Drug Price 'Negotiation.'" *PhRMA*, https://www.phrma.org/policy-issues/government-price-setting/inflation-reduction-act.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality.* 1755. Translated by G. D. H. Cole, *Project Gutenberg*, 2004, www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/11136.

Sherman Antitrust Act. 1890. *National Archives*, www.archives.gov/milestone-documents/sherman-anti-trust-act.

Sklar, Martin J. *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890–1916.* Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey v. United States. 221 U.S. 1. Supreme Court of the United States, 1911.

Teachout, Zephyr, and Lina M. Khan. "Market Structure and Political Law: A Taxonomy of Power." *Duke Journal of Constitutional Law & Public Policy*, vol. 9, 2014.

Uberti, Lorenzo J. "By 'Fancy or Agreement': Locke's Theory of Money and the Justice of the Global Monetary System." *Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2013, pp. 49–81.

U.S. Census Bureau. *Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2024.* By Lisa N. Bunch and Halelujha Ketema, Sept. 2025, report no. P60-288, www.census.gov/library/publications/2025/demo/p60-288.html.

U.S. Census Bureau. *Quarterly Retail E-Commerce Sales: 4th Quarter 2024.* U.S. Department of Commerce, 2024, www.census.gov/retail/ecommerce.html.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce. "Chamber of Commerce, et al. v. EPA (ESPS Rule)." *U.S. Chamber of Commerce*, 2015.

U.S. Department of Labor. "Choosing a Retirement Solution for Your Small Business." *U.S. Department of Labor*, www.dol.gov/agencies/ebsa/about-ebsa/our-activities/resource-center/publications/choosing-a-retirement-solution-for-your-small-business.

U.S. Department of the Treasury. "Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP)." *U.S. Department of the Treasury*, home.treasury.gov/data/troubled-assets-relief-program.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. "The Final Clean Power Plan: More Ambitious, More Achievable for States." *U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*, 3 Aug. 2015.

Walmart. "Walmart in the United States." *Walmart Corporate*, 2026.

Wood, Ellen Meiksins. *The Origin of Capitalism: A Longer View.* Verso, 2002.

World Bank. *Gross Domestic Product 2024. World Development Indicators*, 2025, datacatalogfiles.worldbank.org/ddh-published/0038130/DR0046441/GDP.pdf.

Wu, Tim. *The Curse of Bigness: Antitrust in the New Gilded Age.* Columbia Global Reports, 2018, econ.utah.edu/antitrust-conference/session_material/Curse%20of%20the%20Bigness.pdf.