

The Wrong Question: Why Asking Whether Bezos Is Guilty Forecloses the More Important Inquiry

MU Chenrui

Jinling High School Hexi Campus, Nanjing, China

This essay argues that the familiar question—whether Jeff Bezos grew rich at someone’s expense—is the wrong one, because it treats a great modern fortune as a sum of individual transactions rather than as the product of a structural position. A per-transaction audit fails: Amazon’s posted prices are typically below the retail alternative and its warehouse wages sit at or above local equivalents, so the counterparties consented. Yet it does not follow that no one was harmed. Drawing on the classical distinction between profit and rent, the essay contends that Amazon’s early returns were predominantly profit—the reward for genuine infrastructural creation—while its recent returns increasingly capitalise rent: a toll on the channel through which other people’s commerce must pass. Because economics addresses profit and rent with different policy instruments, the verdict turns on which narrative one adopts. The essay proposes a frame that holds value creation and structural position-capture within a single account, and derives policy implications—contestability, interoperability, and structural remedies—that guard against the quiet conversion of profit into permanent rent.

Keywords: Jeff Bezos, Amazon, profit and rent, economic rent, market concentration, platform economy, antitrust

Three Stories, One Paradox

Why does the question of whether Jeff Bezos grew rich at someone’s expense refuse to resolve, no matter how carefully one assembles the numbers?

Three stories circulate in American life about Amazon, and each is told with conviction by people who know what they are talking about. The first is the customer’s: My life is measurably easier since this company existed—I find what I need, I pay less than I used to, it arrives tomorrow, and the occasional unease I feel at checkout is outweighed by the relief of things simply working. The second is the warehouse worker’s: The job is hard, the metrics are exhausting, the injury rate is real, but the wage clears the local labour market, the insurance starts on day one, and when I quit in September I reapplied in November. The third is the third-party seller’s: I built a business on this platform that I could not have built anywhere else, I cannot leave, and every year the platform takes a little more of what I earn.

Each account is internally coherent; each refuses to be refuted by the others; and taken together they will not collapse into a single distributional verdict. That refusal is not a failure of evidence. It is the defining feature of modern fortunes built on large infrastructure, and it is where the analysis has to begin (Shiller, 2019).

The standard framing of the question—the one most likely to appear in an op-ed or a classroom—treats the Bezos fortune as if it were accumulated one transaction at a time, a dollar overcharged here or underpaid there.

It does not add up arithmetically. Amazon's posted prices across most categories are below the retail alternative, and its warehouse wages, disputed as they are, typically sit at or above local equivalents. A per-transaction theory of exploitation therefore has to concede that the counterparties consented, and often reconsented, to the exchange.

Some then conclude that nobody was harmed. That is too quick. What the per-transaction audit misses is that a great modern fortune is not built transaction by transaction; it is built by occupying the structural position through which the transactions must flow. The "expense" being argued about is not a dollar subtracted from a specific buyer on a specific day; it is the asymmetry of power over the conditions under which transactions can happen at all—an asymmetry invisible on any receipt, but decisive for the fortune it produces (Khan, 2017). That shift, from who overpaid to who is bound into the structure, changes which of the three stories can be told truthfully, and which cannot.

The Honest Concession, and What It Presupposes

The next step is harder than it looks, because it requires granting to Amazon something many critics refuse to grant.

The company did, in fact, build something real. The pre-Amazon American consumer economy was fragmented and information-poor; local retail margins were high, search costs were substantial, and the long tail of products was effectively invisible to most buyers. A logistics network capable of delivering several hundred million items to any address within forty-eight hours was not a reshuffling of existing capacity but an act of infrastructural creation, and its welfare consequences—consumer surplus expanded across categories, disproportionately for lower-income households for whom convenience and price transparency matter most—cannot be erased by any honest accounting (Autor et al., 2020). Work at Amazon is hard, but for many warehouse employees it remains the best formal-sector option within commuting distance. Small sellers, for their part, gained access to a demand pool they could not have reached any other way. These are not talking points; they are the reasons the customer keeps clicking and the worker keeps reapplying.

This is the point at which the Schumpeterian tradition acquires real weight. A temporarily dominant firm that delivers genuine innovation is, on that account, not the enemy of long-run welfare but its engine, because its extraordinary returns are what induce the next wave of creative destruction (Schumpeter, 1942). Concentration, on this reading, is an intermediate phase—a rent collected from an economy that is about to be liberated from the conditions that made the rent possible. Short-term inequality is then the price of long-term diffusion.

The concession, however, is conditional. Schumpeter's defence rests on a single unstated clause: The dominant firm's rent must remain contestable by the next innovator. If it is not—if the incumbent's advantage lies not in a product a rival can out-innovate but in the ownership of the channel through which the rival would have to reach the market—then the defence evaporates. The rent is no longer a reward for transient brilliance; it becomes a toll on commerce itself.

That is why the customer who knows she is getting a better deal than she used to also feels the faint unease at checkout she cannot quite articulate. She is not wrong. She is responding, without the vocabulary, to the difference between a firm that earned its returns by outrunning its rivals and a firm that earns them by owning the road. Popular psychology has detected what the welfare calculus has not yet named.

From Profit to Rent: The Concept That Does the Work

The central analytical move in the argument is the distinction between profit and rent, and popular debate about large fortunes routinely blurs it to the fortune's advantage.

Profit in its ordinary sense is the residual left to an entrepreneur after costs are paid, and it is the reward for deploying scarce capital into productive use more skilfully than rivals would have done. Rent in its Ricardian sense is the return to the ownership of a scarce resource whose supply cannot be easily expanded—land was the original example, but any asset with the same structural property qualifies. The two returns are indistinguishable on an income statement; their economic meaning is entirely different. Profit disciplines an economy by directing capital toward productive use; rent redirects income without requiring further productive effort, and has been the standard object of suspicion in political economy from Smith and Ricardo through the modern treatment of monopoly and patent (Stiglitz, 2012).

The relevant question for Bezos's fortune is therefore which of these it mainly is, and the answer shifts over time. In Amazon's early decades the returns were predominantly profit—reward for building logistics and software nobody else had built. Over the past decade, as the firm has consolidated its position at the matchmaking layer of US consumer commerce, the composition has changed. What the fortune now mostly capitalises is rent: a toll on the channel through which other people's transactions must pass.

The self-reinforcement of the matchmaking position is what converts profit into rent and locks the conversion in. Scale produces data; data sharpens ranking; sharper ranking attracts buyers; more buyers attract sellers; more sellers deepen inventory; deeper inventory attracts buyers again. The loop has no internal stopping point, and antitrust scholarship has spent the past decade rewriting its doctrinal categories around it (Khan, 2017; Philippon, 2019). At the operational level the rent is collected through a menu of fees—referral, fulfilment, advertising, storage—that together now commonly exceed 40 percent of a third-party seller's gross revenue, a threshold at which the “independent” seller is better described as a contractor inside the platform's revenue envelope than as a principal trading on it. At the labour level, turnover rates are engineered, whether by design or by drift, to prevent the accumulation of tenure-based bargaining power. At the consumer level, Prime's subscription logic and the cognitive cost of relearning an interface produce a form of lock-in that does not require the next-best option to be inferior—only switching to be attritional (Zuboff, 2019).

The fortune, read this way, is the capitalised present value of a rent stream. It is not a theft from any identifiable counterparty; it is the price of a structural position that the rest of the economy has come to need.

The Narrative That Decides the Verdict

Economics handles profit and rent with different policy instruments, and the public conversation about Bezos has not caught up to that fact—partly because the stories it tells itself do not leave room for the distinction (Akerlof & Shiller, 2015).

Two narratives organise most public discussion. The founder-as-creator narrative treats the fortune as a measure of value created: A visionary built what the world did not have, consumers and workers were free to accept or decline, and the size of the fortune reports the scale of the innovation. The extraction narrative treats the fortune as a measure of surplus diverted: A billionaire grew rich by squeezing customers on transparency and workers on intensity. Each narrative captures a real element; each fails where the other begins. The founder story cannot explain why the market around the consumer has narrowed even as her prices have fallen; the extraction story cannot explain why those said to be exploited continue to reapply. A narrative adequate to the evidence has to hold genuine value creation and structural position-capture inside the same frame—which is precisely the combination the rent-versus-profit distinction was invented to describe.

The policy implications follow once the right story is told. Profit should be lightly taxed and broadly encouraged, because it is the mechanism by which capital is directed toward productive use; rent should be taxed more heavily, regulated where it cannot be taxed, and, where it arises from essential infrastructure, made contestable through structural remedies—interoperability, data portability, separation between marketplace and retailer roles, and the willingness to treat platform neutrality as a public-utility question rather than a first-best market one (Rajan & Zingales, 2003; Tirole, 2017). These are not punishments for success; they are the means by which an economy prevents the quiet conversion of profit into permanent rent.

Returned to the original prompt: Neither “customers” nor “employees” names the expense accurately, and “neither” concedes too much. The honest answer is both—and a third party, the counterfactual economy in which the concentration did not become permanent. The customers paid in dependence; the workers paid in replaceability; and the rest of us paid in foreclosed alternatives, the businesses that were not started, the wages that were not bargained, the bottlenecks that did not remain public (Piketty, 2014). Whether that counts as scandal or as the tolerable cost of a useful innovation depends, in the end, on the story one believes about how an economy is supposed to grow—and on whether one believes it is acceptable, in the late phase of an innovation cycle, to collect a permanent toll on commerce in the name of the innovation that first made the toll possible.

References

- Akerlof, G. A., & Shiller, R. J. (2015). *Phishing for phools: The economics of manipulation and deception*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Autor, D., Dorn, D., Katz, L. F., Patterson, C., & Van Reenen, J. (2020). The fall of the labor share and the rise of superstar firms. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 135(2), 645-709.
- Khan, L. M. (2017). Amazon’s antitrust paradox. *Yale Law Journal*, 126(3), 710-805.
- Philippon, T. (2019). *The great reversal: How America gave up on free markets*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rajan, R. G., & Zingales, L. (2003). *Saving capitalism from the capitalists*. Hong Kong: Crown Business.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Shiller, R. J. (2019). *Narrative economics: How stories go viral and drive major economic events*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Stiglitz, J. E. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today’s divided society endangers our future*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Tirole, J. (2017). *Economics for the common good*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. New York: PublicAffairs.