

## **Are we entering in a Winner-takes-all economy? Why and what can we do about it?**

We are in and are entering in a Winner-takes-all economy.

In our society, as a general rule, some groups of people will be more successful than others. The so-called "winners" are those who have the first position in a certain field. They are the most successful, for a multitude of reasons. They have the best qualifications in their field, having the chance to go to the most prestigious schools.

On the market, a winning company is the one that innovates meaning that presents something different from its competitors. In today's world, where technology is constantly advancing and innovation is in a constant state of flux, it is very important for the success of an organisation that it adapts. The one that is not conservative and that knows how to adapt to the new society to evolve with the times, will be the one that outperforms the others and is most likely to succeed.

The evolution of the economic market is increasingly bipolarized. There are those who are going to acquire recognised skills and diplomas, which will enable them to constantly adapt, and these are the winners. Using the same vocabulary, those who have not benefited from the same education are therefore the least qualified, who therefore have less opportunity to innovate, they are the losers. The latter have not acquired state-recognised diplomas, they will have low productivity in the market.

For decades, the middle class economy had average qualifications that allowed them to keep a good balance and not to sink in front of the winners. Only in the face of the latest crises, climatic, ecological but especially since the global pandemic of COVID 19, they have had less and less recognition and are gradually joining the losers. Even the developing countries find themselves back on the ground again, with inequalities that are growing ever more acute. This phenomenon has created new social movements such as the "Les gilets jaunes" demonstrated in France.

In an economy where capitalism dominates, inequalities have always been present, and a poor distribution of wealth has always been a major problem within societies. More colloquially, in other words "money attracts money". The richest get richer and the poorest get poorer.

The differences between countries are staggering. The developing or rich countries are the ones in which the GAFAMs rule. GAFAMs are the most powerful organisations on the internet: Google, Apple, Facebook, Amazon and Microsoft. One of the transnational corporations can have more wealth than a state because its economic and financial power is so great, revealing a lot about the inequalities in the world. But then again, the reason GAFAMs are so powerful is because they are the elites of the new digital economies. Moreover, because the internet is global, they have the potential to capture the most wealth and expand everywhere. It's a huge phenomenon of the Winner takes all economy. Speaking of the internet, social networks have been a big turning point for members of the economic market, because power is acquired in a slightly different way. It's the particular gear where the actor proves his performance in a field, moves up the ladder, and makes connections on a larger scale. Connections are very important to the prosperity of a company, and with social networks it becomes easier and easier. As the Internet is global, being known on the networks becomes necessary.

The possibility of being able to have such a wide range also means taking over a large part of the wealth and thus evolving exponentially.

In short, winning in today's economic market also means winning an image and thus ensuring one's breadth and career prosperity.

And it is important to note that today even politics is influenced by the economy.

Indeed, in a famous interview with Mark Zuckerberg, the CEO of Facebook, where the biggest personal data scandal took place concerning the social network in question. This scandal had a considerable effect on the 2016 presidential elections in the United States. Facebook agreed to be paid by political members to run false advertisements on the network. Oddly enough, these ads appeared for the black population of the United States and focused on the dates of the presidential elections in which Donald Trump. Symbol of a capitalism that is harmful to its people.

If the gaps between countries are so wide, those with the least power are the least wealthy. These countries do not invest in the same way as other developing countries. It is noticeable that African countries like Niger do not invest in education as a priority, far from it. They invest much less in research or universities than countries in the United States of America. In fact, these countries, known as winners, invest a lot to attract brains to their countries. They have the best universities such as Harvard and the Ivy leagues, which defy all competition. Indeed, the concentration of resources is very uneven.

Some people from disadvantaged countries decide to study in rich countries and work there in order to have a chance of success. But it is still complicated for them. People who move from one country to another must have more courage. Once he arrives in the host country, he has to learn the language, adapt to a new country and must in any case prove more. Because yes, a man of colour from a modest family will always have more to prove in order to enter an economic market than a white man from a wealthy family, it is a fact. The INSEE does not allow ethnic statistics, but it is easy to see from the media that people of colour have little to show for occupying important positions in the economic market. This amounts to discrimination.

Moreover, the majority of the winners of transnational firms have a miserable ethic. On the one hand, subcontracting as labour is miserably treated and paid. Major clothing brands such as Zara or Nike are currently causing controversy. Their workforce are Muslims who are exploited in China, the Uyghurs. This shows the greed of the big firms considered Winners, and the bad actions they take to stay at the top.

So these are the Winners of today? the firms run by famous men, whom so many people revere and are inspired to succeed?

A civilian born in a democratic country has a part to play in addressing these growing inequalities. I believe that social inequalities must be fought against, just as the rise in power of certain brands with disastrous morals must be calmed down, just to achieve maximum profit.

It would then be necessary to reform, to fight against these firms through legislation, to regulate their activity. But this will only be possible when the government agrees to put in place certain laws.

But also at the individual level, each consumer should manage his consumption better. But this represents a real reversal of today's society, a great social change. Beyond moderate reformism, the important thing is to stop the massacre that these economic Winners are causing. Because in a winner takes all economy, winners also take lives. This process leads to fighting and demolishing the capitalism in which we live, but this is neither good for the world nor the right way to proceed.

We should then use a progressive policy, which consists of several small impacts that accumulate and move things in the right direction. We have a place to raise our voice, especially with the emergence of social networks.

Indeed, thanks to social networks, it is possible today to make known a good quality brand that is not sufficiently recognised, yet innovative and has revolutionary ideas. For example, the invention of organic and reusable sanitary napkins is an incredible innovation. Brands are therefore adapting to their society, which is gradually discovering the chemicals contained in basic sanitary pads and the pollution that this produces. However, these brands with bad ethics are still dominant over those that are trying to adapt.

But in recent months, social networks have helped these brands gain the value they almost deserve and finally enter the economic market fully.

In conclusion, significantly reducing the growing inequalities in the world by repressing the winners of this economy is for the time being only an idealistic vision of what would be good for this world. In the meantime, I believe that in a distant future, the players of the Winner-takes-all economy would win economically and in the eyes of justice.