The No-Exit Ecosystem: How Financial Oligarchy Turned Capitalism into a System That Produces Subjectlessness

Igor Kaminnyk ORCID: 0009-0008-0981-965X
Think Tank "Dor Moriah" | contact: executive@dor-moriah.org

Alexey Vilents ORCID: 0009-0003-6554-1780
Think Tank "Dor Moriah" | contact: avvilents@gmail.com

Working Paper, 2026

Abstract
This paper examines how contemporary financial capitalism constrains the emergence of transformative political subjects. We identify three interlocking mechanisms: the concentration of capital in the "Big Three" asset management complex (BlackRock, Vanguard, State Street), which controls approximately $24 trillion and holds dominant positions across much of the S&P 500; the oligopolistic consolidation of corporate sectors; and the capture of democratic institutions through revolving-door flows and campaign finance. We further analyze a co-optation ecosystem through which alternatives — including the analytical frameworks used to critique the system — are neutralized through integration rather than repression. The paper theorizes a dialectic of subjectlessness: the ecosystem persists partly because no organized collective subject exists to dismantle it, while the conditions for such a subject's emergence are progressively undermined by the ecosystem itself. The argument is theoretical and diagnostic; empirical cases are illustrative rather than statistically exhaustive.

Keywords: financial oligarchy, capital concentration, corporate consolidation, co-optation, subjectlessness, collective action, political economy, passive investing, institutional capture, capitalist realism

1. Introduction

Consider a structural paradox at the heart of contemporary financial capitalism. A schoolteacher with a pension fund and a billionaire with an eight-figure portfolio both invest in Vanguard index funds. Both, in doing so, transfer their voting rights to Vanguard's management. Vanguard then uses those rights — aggregated across millions of investors — to vote at shareholder meetings of the 88% of S&P 500 companies in which it holds dominant stakes. There is no visible oppressor and no passive victim in this arrangement. The mechanism of subordination is not spatially removed from those it subordinates, and it needs no identifiable agent to operate. The schoolteacher's retirement savings and the billionaire's accumulated capital function together to concentrate corporate governance in the hands of three private entities — BlackRock, Vanguard, and State Street — that control $24 trillion and operate without democratic mandate or substantive regulatory oversight.

This is not merely an observation about inequality. The literature documenting wealth concentration is well established (Piketty, 2014; Saez & Zucman, 2019; Oxfam International, 2024). Our claim is different and stronger: the post-1991 configuration of financial capitalism has developed a qualitatively distinctive capacity for self-reproduction — one that works by simultaneously building a co-optation ecosystem and progressively dismantling the material, cognitive, epistemic, and psychological conditions under which a transformative collective subject could emerge.

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

This paper is the second in a related pair of studies. The first (Finkel & Kaminnyk, 2026) examined how global systems modeling — specifically the World3 model underlying *The Limits to Growth* — embeds ideological commitments under the guise of technical neutrality. By abstracting from ownership structures and class relations, that model reframed structural problems as universal management challenges, keeping the systemic causes of those problems analytically out of view. The present paper extends this finding to the conditions of collective action: if the analytical tools available for critiquing the system are themselves co-opted, the conditions for acting against the system are correspondingly constrained. Together, the two papers amount to a single argument: the instruments the system produces are adequate neither for seeing it clearly nor for acting against it.

This paper maps three interlocking mechanisms: the architecture of wealth concentration (Section 2), the co-optation ecosystem that neutralizes both practical alternatives and the analytical frameworks used to critique the system (Section 3), and the production of subjectlessness that forecloses systemic transformation (Section 4). Section 5 theorizes the dialectical relationship between these mechanisms, and Section 6 offers conclusions about what an honest political diagnosis requires.

1.1 Methodological Note

This paper is a theory-building and diagnostic intervention in political economy. It combines secondary literature, public datasets, and illustrative cases to identify three interlocking mechanisms that, we argue, constitute a distinctive mode of systemic self-reproduction. The paper does not test a falsifiable hypothesis; it constructs a conceptual framework and evaluates its explanatory reach against available evidence. The cases discussed — organic agriculture, Fair Trade, cryptocurrency, ESG investing, Mondragon — are offered as illustrative instances of a broader pattern, not as a statistically representative sample. The argument is developed primarily with reference to the United States and advanced capitalist democracies; its applicability to other political-economic contexts would require separate analysis.

1.2 Scope and Limitations

Several limitations should be noted. First, the three pillars we identify are analytically central but not necessarily exhaustive; other mechanisms may contribute to the described configuration. Second, the co-optation argument applies most clearly to reform projects that target core capital accumulation dynamics; movements operating in less directly contested domains may face different pressures. Third, "subjectlessness" is offered as a diagnostic category, not as a claim that collective action is impossible — rather, that its structural preconditions have been significantly weakened. Fourth, the paper does not systematically engage the Global South, where different configurations of capital, labor, and political mobilization may yield different dynamics.

2. The Architecture of Capital Concentration

2.1 Accelerating Inequality

The empirical record shows a degree of concentration with few precedents in modern history. The top 1% in the United States controls 30.8% of national wealth, compared with 22.8% in 1989 (Federal Reserve, 2024). The top 0.1% holds 13.8% of all U.S. wealth. For the ultra-wealthy 0.01%, the entry threshold rose from $7.8 million in 1995 to $21.9 million in 2022 in real terms (Chancel et al., 2022).

The trend is global. In Europe, the top 1% appropriates approximately 12% of national income annually, up from 10% in 1980. In the United States, the same cohort captures roughly 20% of all income (World Inequality Database, 2024). Billionaire wealth grew by an estimated $2 trillion in 2024 alone — approximately $5.7 billion per day — at a rate three times faster than in 2023 (Oxfam International, 2025). The number of billionaires increased from 423 with a combined $1.9 trillion

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

in 1996 to 2,781 with $14.2 trillion by 2024, while median American household incomes grew only 49% across 48 years.
Piketty's (2014) foundational formula **r > g** — the rate of return on capital tends to exceed economic growth — predicts a return toward patrimonial capitalism. At current trajectories, by 2050 the top 0.1% may control roughly 25% of global wealth, driven by compound accumulation, inheritance, and rent extraction rather than linear extrapolation. These are projections rather than certainties, but the directional dynamics are supported across multiple independent datasets.

2.2 The Big Three: Concentrated Ownership and Corporate Governance

Wealth concentration extends beyond individual fortunes to a distinctive structural feature of contemporary financial markets. Three asset management companies — BlackRock, Vanguard, and State Street — manage approximately $24 trillion in assets. BlackRock manages $11.5 trillion, Vanguard $10.4 trillion, and State Street $4.34 trillion (Bebchuk & Hirst, 2019; figures updated for 2024). Using these resources, they have become among the largest shareholders across much of the S&P 500, holding significant positions in 88% of its constituent companies.

These funds belong to millions of investors — from modest pension savers to wealthy individuals. But regardless of contribution size, voting rights at shareholder meetings pass to the management companies. This produces what might be called a triple concentration of influence: wealthy individuals hold large direct stakes and also invest through index funds, while three companies cast the accumulated votes — with little democratic accountability for how that power is actually used. Structurally, the schoolteacher's pension and the billionaire's portfolio serve the same function: both channel governance power to the same three institutions.

In 2000, index funds controlled less than 5% of the American stock market; by 2024, this share exceeded 50% and continues growing. Industry projections suggest that by 2030, passive funds may manage roughly 80% of all U.S. assets under management — a trajectory consistent with the annual growth rates observed since 2010 (Moody's Investors Service, 2022). The Big Three vote approximately 25% of shares in S&P 500 companies, with their influence amplified by low participation from retail investors. Bebchuk and Hirst's (2019) projections suggest Big Three managers could account for 34% of votes in S&P 500 companies by 2028 and 41% by 2038.

Research by Azar et al. (2018) finds that common ownership of this kind is associated with reduced competition: when the same funds hold shares in competing airlines, ticket prices are 3–11% higher than they would be with different owners. This result has generated scholarly debate: Dennis et al. (2022), reanalyzing the same industry with updated data and methods, find no significant anticompetitive effect. The causal relationship between common ownership and market outcomes thus remains an active area of empirical inquiry, though the governance concentration itself is not in dispute.

2.3 Corporate Consolidation: The Elimination of Competition

The merger-and-acquisition wave since 1991 has substantially increased market concentration across major sectors. Since 2000, more than 790,000 M&A transactions worth $57 trillion have been announced globally — approximately 90 independent companies per day over a quarter century.
The sectoral pattern is consistent. In U.S. banking, four institutions control approximately 70% of deposits. In technology, a small number of firms have absorbed hundreds of competitors through acquisition: Google more than 200 companies; Facebook, Instagram and WhatsApp; Microsoft, LinkedIn, GitHub, and Activision. In media, five conglomerates own what once belonged to hundreds of independent publications (Bagdikian, 2004; Noam, 2016). In healthcare, more than

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

2,000 hospital mergers occurred between 1998 and 2023; by 2023, 68% of community hospitals belong to large systems.

This consolidation has progressively narrowed competitive space. Scale constitutes structural power, and alternatives face systematic disadvantages in reaching it. AWS, Azure, and Google Cloud control approximately 65% of cloud hosting; independent alternatives carry costs roughly ten times higher. Mondragon (80,000 workers, $12 billion in turnover) cannot match Amazon's delivery infrastructure — not because it is less well organized, but because Amazon has built proprietary logistics capacity over decades. Where major institutional investors finance dominant platforms at near-zero borrowing cost, cooperatives typically obtain credit at 6–8%, when they can obtain it at all.

2.4 The Capture of Democratic Institutions

The political dimension of this architecture rests on deeply unequal access to public institutions. $4.2 billion was spent on lobbying in the United States in 2023 (OpenSecrets, 2024). The pharmaceutical lobby spends approximately $350 million annually; the financial sector approximately $600 million; oil and gas approximately $150 million (OpenSecrets, 2024).

The revolving door — the movement of personnel between corporations and government — converts this access into policy influence. Research on congressional career patterns documents that approximately 27% of departing House members and 31% of departing senators subsequently register as lobbyists, with corresponding salary increases (LaPira & Thomas, 2014). The Goldman Sachs network illustrates the pattern across administrations: Robert Rubin (Clinton Treasury Secretary) oversaw repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act before returning to Citigroup; Henry Paulson (Bush Treasury Secretary) organized the 2008 bank bailouts; Steven Mnuchin (Trump Treasury Secretary) implemented tax reform disproportionately benefiting upper-income households. BlackRock's accumulation of former regulatory officials and its lobbying expenditure of over $30 million since 2009 illustrate the same mechanism operating within the asset management sector (OpenSecrets, 2024).

The *Citizens United* decision (2010) — treating corporate spending on elections as a form of protected speech — removed most limits on campaign finance through Super PACs. $6.9 billion was spent on the 2024 elections — roughly ten times the 2000 figure.

The ideological infrastructure mirrors the financial one. In 1983, 90% of American media belonged to approximately 50 companies; by 2024, the same 90% is controlled by five conglomerates (Bagdikian, 2004; Noam, 2016). The advertising model creates structural incentives against critical coverage: 80% of traditional media revenues derive from advertising, with pharmaceutical companies, the financial sector, and energy corporations among the largest spenders. Major policy research institutions produce work that consistently favors their corporate and ideological funders, circulating in media and political discourse under the framing of independent expertise.

A critical distinction is warranted here. The crude form of this ideological production — donors fund institutions whose conclusions favor donors — is relatively legible and thus relatively limited in its epistemic power. A more effective and less visible form operates not through predetermined conclusions but through the architecture of the analytical framework itself. As Finkel and Kaminnyk (2026) demonstrate in their analysis of the World3 model, a framework can embed ideological commitments — specifically, the abstraction from ownership structures and class relations — while appearing to offer neutral technical analysis. The result is not propaganda but a narrowed analytical horizon: problems are visible, but ownership-based explanations of them are structurally excluded

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

from view. This epistemic mechanism is more durable than direct funding influence precisely because it is not identifiable as bias.

Organized labor faces a parallel dynamic of institutional suppression. Amazon's expenditures on labor-relations consulting reached $14.2 million in 2022 alone, as documented in persuader activity reports filed with the U.S. Department of Labor under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Labor-Management Standards [OLMS], 2023) — a systematic corporate investment in the prevention of collective organization rather than its accommodation.

3. The Co-Optation Ecosystem

3.1 Three Stages of Co-Optation

The preceding analysis raises a question: why do alternative projects — cooperatives, Fair Trade, organic agriculture, even cryptocurrencies — tend not to become systemic threats to the system they were designed to challenge? The answer we propose is that the system does not primarily suppress alternatives by force — it integrates them.

The co-optation process follows three characteristic stages. In the first stage — isolation — new alternative projects are marginalized through underfunding, limited media access, and regulatory barriers. Most alternatives do not survive this stage. In the second stage — exoticization — if a project survives, it is transformed into an "interesting case study" for conferences and profiles. Its radical dimension is neutralized through admiration: the project is celebrated as proof of pluralism rather than engaged as a challenge to the system. In the third stage — commodification — the idea is transformed into a brand, scaled through capitalist mechanisms, and progressively loses its original mission. It becomes a niche product available at a premium to those who can afford it.

3.2 Case Studies in Material Co-Optation

Organic agriculture illustrates the full trajectory. In the 1970s, organic farming was associated with a structural critique of agrochemistry — communes, collectives, a vision of decentralized ecological food systems. By 2024, the organic market exceeds $200 billion. Whole Foods belongs to Amazon. Walmart and Nestlé sell organic lines. Large agricultural operations have purchased organic farms. The result is not the transformation of industrial agriculture but the creation of a premium niche that legitimizes the general system by demonstrating consumer choice — conditional, as always, on purchasing power.

Fair Trade follows a similar trajectory. The original idea centered on direct producer relationships bypassing exploitative supply chains. In practice, the Fair Trade certification has largely become a marketing instrument: major corporations sell Fair Trade lines while maintaining conventional sourcing elsewhere. Research by Dragusanu et al. (2014) indicates that the benefits of Fair Trade certification accrue predominantly to producers who are already better positioned within existing supply chains, while the price premium flows largely to intermediaries rather than to the most disadvantaged farmers. The result is consumer credentialing without structural change in the underlying relations of production.

Cryptocurrency was conceived as a challenge to state monetary systems and financial intermediaries. By 2024, Bitcoin functions primarily as a speculative asset rather than a medium of exchange. Major asset managers have launched cryptocurrency financial products. Traditional finance has absorbed the asset class into its portfolio logic. The technological architecture of decentralization has been integrated into the institutions it was designed to replace.

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

ESG investing is the most systematic example of financial co-optation. Ecological and social critique was transformed into a profit center: the ESG market reached approximately $35 trillion by 2023. Major asset managers sell ESG funds whose holdings include prominent fossil fuel producers. The carbon credit market enables companies to purchase accounting offsets rather than reduce emissions. This is not to claim that ESG produces no effects — incremental pressure on corporate behavior is plausible. But its structural limitations as a vehicle for systemic transformation are significant: the ecological critique of capitalism has been converted into a financial instrument that generates returns for the same institutions whose portfolio holdings drive the underlying problem.

3.3 The Co-Optation of Analytical Frameworks

Material alternatives are not the only target of co-optation. The analytical frameworks used to understand and critique the system are subject to the same dynamic — and this dimension of co-optation is both more consequential and less examined.

Finkel and Kaminnyk (2026) document the paradigmatic case. *The Limits to Growth* (1972) constituted a potentially radical intervention: the first systematic, data-driven argument that the logic of unlimited capitalist growth was incompatible with finite ecological systems. This was, in principle, a structural critique of accumulation as such. What the World3 model produced instead was a management framework: the problem was rendered as the optimization of variables — population, capital investment, pollution, resource consumption — amenable to coordinated technocratic governance. Ownership structures, class relations, and the political economy of accumulation were abstracted out of the model. The result, as subsequent empirical assessments confirm (Herrington, 2021; Turner, 2008), was a model of considerable predictive accuracy — but one whose prescriptions systematically excluded the structural transformations that would most directly address the dynamics it identified.

This is the epistemic form of co-optation: not the suppression of critical knowledge but its transformation into a framework that keeps structural causation out of view. The ecological critique of capitalism becomes a call for better global governance of capitalism. This pattern has recurred across multiple cycles of intellectual challenge to the system — from development economics to climate science — and represents a more durable form of neutralization than direct ideological suppression, precisely because it operates through the architecture of knowledge production itself.

3.4 The Structural Advantage of Scale and Permitted Dissent

The fundamental problem facing alternatives — both material and analytical — is not that they fail in organizational terms. It is that scale constitutes structural power, and alternatives face systematic disadvantages in achieving it. Network effects, logistics infrastructure, near-zero-cost financing, and regulatory capture all compound to make it structurally impossible for alternative organizations to achieve dominant-scale operations.

The systemic function of what might be termed "permitted dissent" represents the subtlest mechanism: the more successful an alternative becomes on the system's own terms, the less it tends to threaten the system. Mondragon's $12 billion turnover is cited routinely as evidence of capitalism's pluralism — but it represents 0.04% of Fortune 500 aggregate turnover. To reach its current scale, Mondragon hired management consultants, opened non-cooperative subsidiaries, and competed by capital's rules. The Zapatistas have maintained themselves for three decades because they do not attempt to scale beyond Chiapas. NGOs operating with elite foundation grants do so under implicit constraints about what forms of critique are acceptable: governance reform and inclusivity are permissible; challenges to property relations are not. The landscape of alternatives is

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

systematically sorted: those that grow are absorbed; those that refuse absorption remain marginal; those that attempt neither are celebrated as inspiring but strategically irrelevant.

4. The Production of Subjectlessness

4.1 The Historical Rupture

Twentieth-century transformative politics presupposed a collective subject — the organized proletariat — whose concentration in shared physical and temporal spaces provided structural conditions for coordination. The question for the twenty-first century is different: can a subject capable of significantly transforming capitalism emerge at all, or has the system developed ways of reproducing itself that progressively erode the conditions under which such a subject could form?

Four mutually reinforcing paralyses — material, cognitive, epistemic, and psychological — appear to constrain this emergence.

4.2 Material Paralysis

Transformative collective action has historically been associated with actors who have limited stakes in the system's continuation. Contemporary debt structures significantly alter this calculus. A student carrying $100,000 in educational debt enters the labor market under structural pressure toward employment in existing institutions. The $1.7 trillion in U.S. student debt involves 43 million borrowers (Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 2024). Aggregate household debt reached $17.5 trillion in 2024 — encompassing mortgages, student debt, auto loans, and credit card balances — implying that a substantial share of the workforce carries financial obligations that make occupational and political risk-taking structurally costly.

The gig economy structurally impedes collective action. Platform-mediated workers do not share physical space; the algorithm distributes tasks individually; any individual's withdrawal is largely invisible; coordination is extremely difficult. This contrasts with the classical factory setting where shared space and simultaneous labor made collective action structurally available. Union density has fallen from roughly 35% of the workforce in the 1950s to approximately 10% today, with private sector density at approximately 6%.

The housing market compounds material precarity further. Median home prices rose from $177,900 in 2000 to $495,100 in 2024 — a 178% increase against 49% income growth over the same period (U.S. Census Bureau, 2024). The price-to-income ratio has risen from approximately 3x in the 1970s to approximately 7x in 2024, making homeownership mathematically inaccessible without substantial prior wealth. Institutional investors have entered the single-family residential market at scale, purchasing entire neighborhoods at above-market prices and converting them to rental units, concentrating the gains from housing appreciation with financial institutions rather than with resident-owners.

4.3 Cognitive Paralysis

Mark Fisher's (2009) concept of capitalist realism — "it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism" — describes a structural condition with identifiable mechanisms. When a single asset manager holds stakes in 18,000 companies across competing sectors, identifying a target for collective action becomes genuinely difficult. When ownership is dispersed through index funds and exploitation is mediated by algorithms, the structural legibility that historically made collective action possible — an identifiable workplace, an identifiable owner, an identifiable injury — dissolves.

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

Information saturation appears to compound rather than relieve this. Continuous exposure to documentation of large-scale harm may produce what researchers call psychic numbing (Slovic & Västfjäll, 2010): a generalized awareness of the scale of problems that does not translate into action and may actively inhibit it. When the system is present everywhere and its harms are documented continuously, the conditions for the focused, targeted action that historical collective movements required are degraded.

4.4 Epistemic Paralysis

The cognitive paralysis described by Fisher is compounded by a deeper epistemic dimension. The analytical tools through which one might identify the system's structure — economic models, policy research, institutional expertise — are themselves shaped by the system they purport to describe. When global models abstract ownership structures and class relations from their architecture (Finkel & Kaminnyk, 2026), the result is not merely the absence of structural analysis but the active presence of a management framework that forecloses it. The problem is not that systemic analysis is suppressed; it is that the tools available for analysis have been shaped — through the dynamics described in Section 3.3 — to keep structural causation out of view.

This represents a fourth level of paralysis, distinct from the material constraints of Section 4.2 and the cognitive limitations of Section 4.3. Even if material conditions permitted collective action, and even if the cognitive barriers of complexity and information saturation were overcome, the available analytical frameworks would direct attention toward variable optimization rather than structural transformation. The subject capable of systemic change needs not only the material and cognitive conditions for action but a framework in which systemic transformation is a conceivable goal — and that framework is precisely what the co-optation of critical knowledge production systematically forecloses.

4.5 Psychological Paralysis

Collective action requires trust, and trust requires social connection. Meta-analytic evidence across 148 studies indicates that social isolation and loneliness are associated with substantially elevated mortality risk — by 26% and 29% respectively relative to socially connected individuals (Holt-Lunstad et al., 2015). The average number of close friends reported by Americans has declined from approximately three in 1990 to approximately one in 2020 (Survey Center on American Life, 2021). Without dense social networks, the coordination that collective action demands becomes structurally unavailable.

The structural conditions for such networks have been systematically degraded. The decline of "third places" — social environments outside home and work — has removed the physical infrastructure of community formation (Oldenburg, 1989). More than 2,500 local newspapers have closed since 2000, removing an institutional substrate for local civic identity and shared public information (Abernathy, 2020). The long-term decline of associational life documented by Putnam (2000) has reduced the organizational density through which collective action is possible. Civic institution membership has declined by roughly 60% since the 1970s.

The individualization of collective problems completes the structural circuit. Ecological crisis is reframed as a personal recycling responsibility. Labor exploitation is reframed as a time-management challenge. Structural problems are converted into personal deficiencies requiring therapeutic rather than political response. Shame replaces anger as the primary affective response to systemic conditions. Consumer identity — defined by what one buys — substitutes for political identity defined by what one refuses or demands collectively. The system accommodates these

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

substitutions readily: consumption patterns, however ethically motivated, do not threaten production relations.

5. The Dialectic of No-Exit

5.1 The Closed Circle

These mechanisms are not analytically separate problems that happen to coincide. The co-optation ecosystem is sustained partly because no sufficiently organized subject exists to dismantle it. A sufficiently organized subject is unlikely to emerge partly because the ecosystem progressively undermines the conditions for its formation. These two dynamics are mutually constitutive.

This circularity is not incidental but structural. The ecosystem tends to prevent the emergence of the very subject whose existence would be necessary to dismantle it. The subject's absence is not merely a precondition that enables the ecosystem; it is something the ecosystem actively reproduces.

This configuration differs qualitatively from earlier analyses of capitalist resilience. Previous accounts — from Gramsci's analysis of hegemony to Poulantzas's theory of the capitalist state — presupposed the existence of a subject whose consciousness and organization were the terrain of struggle, even if that subject was always already partly shaped by ruling-class ideology. What distinguishes the present configuration is that producing subjectlessness has become a primary structural function of the system itself, operating not primarily through ideology but through material debt, spatial atomization, narrowed analytical horizons, and the systematic dismantling of the organizational infrastructure through which collective life is sustained.

5.2 The Inadequacy of Existing Strategies

Electoral left politics has tended to function as a pressure-release mechanism rather than a transformative force. Progressive electoral movements — Syriza, the Corbyn project, the Sanders campaigns — channeled systemic discontent into electoral competition, with results ranging from capitulation under financial pressure (Syriza in 2015) to institutional blocking (Corbyn) to coercive removal (Allende). The pattern suggests structural constraints on what electoral left politics can achieve within existing institutional arrangements.

The precariat, while increasingly numerous, is geographically dispersed, temporally fragmented, and economically precarious — and lacks the organizational density that constituted the industrial working class as a collective actor. Environmental movements have achieved visibility but limited structural change: 28 COP conferences have produced emissions trajectories that remain far above what the physics of the problem requires. The intelligentsia has academicized dissent. The production of critical scholarship — including the present paper — generates careers and citations within the institutions of a system it claims to analyze critically, and at worst serves the exoticization function described in Section 3.1: critical analysis of the system is absorbed as evidence of the system's tolerance for critique.

5.3 Structural Conditions for Subject Formation

The classical proletariat emerged from three conditions: shared place (the factory), shared time (the shift), and a legible opponent (the identifiable owner). These conditions are largely absent today in the sectors where the most precarious labor is concentrated. Remote work and gig platforms break up the spatial concentration that historically gave rise to collective consciousness. Fragmented schedules make simultaneity — a precondition for the strike form — structurally difficult. And when exploitation operates through algorithms and ownership is dispersed through index funds, identifying a coherent target for organized opposition becomes genuinely complex.

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

The repressive infrastructure reinforces these conditions: surveillance of communications, algorithmic content moderation, and legal frameworks that have expanded the definition of actionable disruption are all structural features of the contemporary environment. The organizational infrastructure of collective action — unions, local media, civic associations, third places — has been systematically degraded. The institutional memory of how collective action works has been attenuated across a generation.

5.4 On Honest Diagnosis

The dominant strain of progressive politics has sustained itself through a series of deferring optimisms: cooperatives will eventually outcompete capitalist firms; the masses will eventually reach a threshold of consciousness; ecological crisis will eventually mobilize transformative action. The evidence after several decades is not encouraging. Mondragon represents 0.04% of Fortune 500 aggregate turnover after 70 years. Social atomization has intensified rather than reversed. Ecological crisis has produced policy adjustments compatible with continued accumulation — and, at the level of affective response, more despair than mobilization.

We do not propose this assessment as a counsel of resignation. Capitalism progressively degrades the ecological and social conditions of its own reproduction (O'Connor, 1998; Moore, 2015), and systemic stress — ecological, financial, geopolitical — may create openings that current analysis cannot anticipate. The Global South may develop political configurations not legible within the framework of this paper. Technological shifts may alter the organizational possibilities available to collective actors.

What honest diagnosis requires is resistance to consoling teleology — the assumption that the arc of political history bends toward transformation, that mass mobilization is imminent, that the next crisis will catalyze what previous crises have not. A clearer-eyed assessment of structural obstacles is a precondition for identifying strategies that are actually adequate to the conditions. Acknowledging what we do not know is not a failure of political will; it is the beginning of analysis that corresponds to the situation rather than to frameworks designed for structurally different ones.

6. Conclusion

This paper has mapped an architecture of contemporary financial capitalism that differs qualitatively from earlier configurations in its systemic self-reproduction. Three findings warrant emphasis.

First, the concentration of capital in the Big Three asset management complex constitutes a form of corporate influence with few historical precedents: three private entities, with limited democratic accountability, exercise substantial governance authority across the dominant corporations of the world's largest economy — and this authority is on a trajectory of further concentration. The mechanism through which this operates — passive index investing — turns the retirement savings of wage earners into instruments of their own governance subordination.

Second, the co-optation ecosystem operates primarily through integration rather than repression — a more efficient mechanism that simultaneously neutralizes alternatives and provides legitimating evidence of systemic pluralism. This ecosystem operates at two levels: the material level, where alternative economic projects are absorbed into capitalist market logic; and the epistemic level, where alternative analytical frameworks are absorbed into management discourse that abstracts from structural causes. The success of co-opted alternatives tends to legitimate the system rather than demonstrate its openness to structural challenge.

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

Third, the production of subjectlessness through material, cognitive, epistemic, and psychological paralysis represents a qualitative shift in the conditions of transformative politics. When exploitation is algorithmic and ownership dispersed through index funds; when debtors face strong incentives against occupational risk; when the isolated lack the social infrastructure for coordination; and when the available analytical tools have been shaped to exclude structural causation — the preconditions for collective subject formation have been significantly weakened.

The central theoretical contribution is to analyze this configuration — the no-exit ecosystem — as a closed dialectical circuit rather than as two independent problems. The ecosystem's capacity for self-reproduction lies precisely in this mutual constitution: it progressively undermines the subject who could dismantle it, while the subject's absence sustains the ecosystem's operation.

This analysis has implications for political strategy: approaches premised on gradually scaling alternatives within the system, on electoral pressure, or on consciousness-raising alone face structural anticipation and neutralization by the system itself. It does not follow that no adequate responses exist — but it does suggest that adequate responses will need to be developed at a level of structural analysis that most contemporary progressive politics has not yet reached. The contribution of this paper is to make the stakes and obstacles of that task more legible.

References

Abernathy, P. M. (2020). *News deserts and ghost newspapers: Will local news survive?* Hussman School of Journalism and Media, University of North Carolina. https://www.usnewsdeserts.com/reports/news-deserts-and-ghost-newspapers-will-local-news-survive/

Azar, J., Schmalz, M. C., & Tecu, I. (2018). Anticompetitive effects of common ownership. *Journal of Finance, 73*(4), 1513–1565. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12698

Bagdikian, B. H. (2004). *The new media monopoly*. Beacon Press.

Bebchuk, L. A., & Hirst, S. (2019). The specter of the giant three. *Boston University Law Review, 99*(3), 721–741. https://scholarship.law.bu.edu/faculty_scholarship/602

Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2022). *World inequality report 2022*. World Inequality Lab. https://wir2022.wid.world/

Dennis, P., Gerardi, K., & Schenone, C. (2022). Common ownership does not have anticompetitive effects in the airline industry. *Journal of Finance, 77*(5), 2765–2798. https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13176

Dragusanu, R., Giovannucci, D., & Nunn, N. (2014). The economics of fair trade. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 28*(3), 217–236. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.28.3.217

Federal Reserve. (2024). *Distribution of household wealth in the U.S. since 1989*. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. https://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/z1/dataviz/dfa/distribute/chart/

Federal Reserve Bank of New York. (2024). *Student loan debt*. Center for Microeconomic Data. https://www.newyorkfed.org/microeconomics/hhdc

Finkel, M., & Kaminnyk, I. (2026). The limits to growth and Cold War political economy: Normative structure in global systems modeling. *APSA Preprints*. https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-cj8z1

Fisher, M. (2009). *Capitalist realism: Is there no alternative?* Zero Books.

Herrington, G. (2021). Update to limits to growth: Comparing the World3 model with empirical data. *Journal of Industrial Ecology, 25*(3), 614–626. https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.13084

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., Baker, M., Harris, T., & Stephenson, D. (2015). Loneliness and social isolation as risk factors for mortality: A meta-analytic review. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10*(2), 227–237. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691614568352

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0

LaPira, T. M., & Thomas, H. F. (2014). Revolving door lobbyists and interest representation. *Interest Groups & Advocacy, 3*(1), 4–29. https://doi.org/10.1057/iga.2013.16
Moody's Investors Service. (2022). *Passive investing 2030: Implications for markets and issuers*. Moody's Investors Service. (Proprietary report; available through institutional subscription. Cited for industry growth projection; the underlying annual growth rate data are independently observable in public market data.)
Moore, J. W. (2015). *Capitalism in the web of life: Ecology and the accumulation of capital*. Verso.
Noam, E. M. (2016). *Who owns the world's media? Media concentration and ownership around the world*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199987238.001.0001
O'Connor, J. (1998). *Natural causes: Essays in ecological Marxism*. Guilford Press.
Oldenburg, R. (1989). *The great good place*. Paragon House.
OpenSecrets. (2024). *Lobbying database*. Center for Responsive Politics. https://www.opensecrets.org
Oxfam International. (2024). *Inequality Inc.: How corporate power divides our world and the need for a new era of public action*. Oxfam Briefing Paper. https://doi.org/10.21201/2024.000007
Oxfam International. (2025). *Takers not makers: The unjust profits driving the inequality crisis*. Oxfam Briefing Paper. https://www.oxfam.org/en/research/takers-not-makers
Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century* (A. Goldhammer, Trans.). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 2013)
Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster.
Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2019). *The triumph of injustice: How the rich dodge taxes and how to make them pay*. W. W. Norton & Company.
Slovic, P., & Västfjäll, D. (2010). The more who die, the less we care. In S. Roeser (Ed.), *Emotions and risky technologies* (pp. 9–18). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-8647-1_2
Survey Center on American Life. (2021). *The state of American friendship: Change, challenges, and loss*. American Enterprise Institute. https://www.americansurveycenter.org/research/the-state-of-american-friendship-change-challenges-and-loss/
Turner, G. M. (2008). A comparison of *The Limits to Growth* with 30 years of reality. *Global Environmental Change, 18*(3), 397–411. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.05.001
U.S. Census Bureau. (2024). *American community survey 1-year estimates: Selected housing characteristics* (Table DP04). United States Census Bureau. https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDP1Y2023.DP04
U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Labor-Management Standards. (2023). *Persuader activity reports filed by Amazon.com Services LLC* [Form LM-20/LM-21 public filings, reporting year 2022]. https://olmsapps.dol.gov/query/orgReport.do
World Inequality Database. (2024). *Top income and wealth shares* [Data series]. World Inequality Lab. https://wid.world/data/

Competing Interests
The authors declare no competing interests.

Ethics
This study is based on publicly available sources and did not involve human participants or identifiable personal data. Ethics/IRB approval was therefore not required.

License
This content is available under CC BY 4.0.

Correspondence: Igor Kaminnyk, Alexey Vilents/ Think tank "Dor Moriah", 2026

https://doi.org/10.33774/apsa-2026-439vq **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0981-965X Content not peer-reviewed by APSA. **License:** CC BY 4.0