Comprehensive Bibliography for Citizens' Equity Research

Version 5.0

Core Theoretical Foundations

Intellectual Antecedents: James Meade and the Citizens' Trust

The most direct intellectual precursor to Citizens' Equity is the work of Nobel laureate James E. Meade (1907–1995), who spent three decades arguing that broad-based capital ownership, rather than income transfer, is the durable remedy for distributional inequality. *Efficiency, Equality and the Ownership of Property* (1964) establishes the premise on which CE rests: property income is distributed far more unequally than earned income, so policies operating solely on income flows treat symptoms while leaving the ownership structure that generates them intact [1]. Meade's motivation was explicitly technological. He was writing in anticipation of automation's effect on the relative return to labor — the same displacement dynamic that now drives the AI debate — and framed widened capital ownership as the hedge that makes a falling labor share survivable, since what an individual loses in wages is recovered in returns on assets held [1].

Meade's proposed mechanism, which he called "topsy-turvy nationalisation," inverts the traditional socialist program. Rather than the state taking managerial control of firms, it acquires a diversified equity portfolio across the economy while exercising no control over the enterprises in which it holds stakes, distributing the return to citizens as a uniform social dividend [2]. He named the resulting institution a Citizens' Trust, and in his most ambitious formulation envisioned community ownership of roughly half of national assets, with an initial "Citizens' Share Ownership Unit Trust" holding a 10% stake in private enterprises above a threshold size [3]. The structural correspondence with CE is close on three counts: ownership separated from control, dividend without dependency, and a claim on capital rather than a draw on the tax base.

Agathotopia: The Economics of Partnership (1989) sets out the full institutional design, pairing the social dividend with labor-capital partnership arrangements at the firm level [2]. The coinage coupled ἀγαθός (*agathos*, "good") with τόπος ("place") to signal a merely good and attainable society, in deliberate contrast to More's *Utopia* — οὐ-τόπος, "no place." *Liberty, Equality and Efficiency* (1993) collects and defends the scheme against its principal objections and is the essential source on the transition problem: how a state accumulates such a portfolio through sustained surpluses and capital taxation rather than confiscation, and how it is restrained from later liquidating it [4]. *Full Employment Regained? An Agathotopian Dream* (1995), Meade's final book, integrates the dividend with labor market flexibility, arguing that an unconditional capital-derived income is what makes wage adjustment socially and politically tolerable [5].

Supporting works fill in the analytics and the fiscal machinery. *The Just Economy* (1976), volume IV of Meade's *Principles of Political Economy*, provides the formal treatment of property distribution and inheritance dynamics [6]. "Poverty in the Welfare State" (1972) compares the social dividend against negative income tax approaches, clarifying precisely the distinction CE draws between capital-based and transfer-based designs [7]. "The Inheritance of Inequalities" (1973) examines the compounding of capital ownership across generations [8]. The Meade Report, *The Structure and Reform of Direct Taxation* (1978), produced by the Institute for Fiscal Studies committee Meade chaired, supplies a developed expenditure-tax and accessions-tax architecture directly relevant to CE's funding question [9].

Meade's institutional design reappears in updated form in Anthony Atkinson's *Inequality: What Can Be Done?* (2015). Alongside the capital endowment for which Atkinson is usually cited, his seventh proposal calls for a public Investment Authority operating a sovereign wealth fund, with the aim of building up the net worth of the state through holdings in companies and property [10]. This is Meade's citizens' trust in contemporary dress, and it is this proposal rather than the one-off endowment that CE most directly extends. The lineage runs Meade (1964) to Atkinson (2015) to CE: a permanent, collectively accumulated equity position generating a recurring claim for citizens, as distinct from the single grant at majority that the universal basic capital literature has generally denoted [11].

Recent scholarship has revived Meade's citizens' trust as a live policy template rather than a historical curiosity [3]. CE departs from Meade in one respect worth statCitizens’ Equity (CE) was formerly designated Universal Basic Capital (UBC); the framework is unchanged. Universal Basic Income (UBI) remains a distinct comparison concept throughout.ing explicitly: where Meade's dividend flows from a collectively held fund in which no individual holds title, CE assigns individual equity stakes. The difference is not merely presentational — titled ownership changes the political economy of the fund, raising the cost of raiding it, a vulnerability Meade himself anticipated but did not fully solve [4] [12].

Citizens’ Equity and Asset-Based Policy

The theoretical foundation for Citizens’ Equity builds on decades of research in asset-based policy interventions. Atkinson's seminal work on capital endowments proposed grants of £5,000-£10,000 for young adults, financed through lifetime capital receipts [13]. The London School of Economics has extensively documented universal basic capital's potential as a "springboard for new citizens," particularly focusing on long-term positive outcomes for young people [13]. Recent policy developments include the Institute for Public Policy Research's proposal for a "universal dividend" of £10,000 for 25-year-olds, financed through sovereign wealth fund income [14].

The distinction between Citizens' Equity and Universal Basic Income represents a fundamental shift from dependency to ownership. Research demonstrates that asset ownership at young ages produces better life cycle outcomes in earnings, employment, and social stability, even when controlling for income and personality factors [14]. In developing economies, capital grants as small as $550 have proven sufficient to lift ultra-poor families out of poverty permanently [14].

Wealth Concentration and Capital Ownership

Thomas Piketty's "Capital in the Twenty-First Century" provides the empirical foundation for understanding wealth concentration dynamics [15] [16]. The research documents Citizens' Equity (CE) was formerly designated Universal Basic Capital (UBC); the framework is unchanged. Universal Basic Income (UBI) remains a distinct comparison concept throughout.a U-shaped pattern in wealth inequality over time, with concentration declining through most of the 20th century before increasing dramatically from the 1980s onward [15]. Piketty's fundamental insight centers on the relationship between the post-tax rate of return on capital and output growth rates as the primary driver of wealth concentration [15].

The National Bureau of Economic Research's comprehensive survey of wealth inequality models identifies four key mechanisms that maintain high saving rates among the wealthy: preference heterogeneity, intergenerational transmission of bequests and human capital, entrepreneurship opportunities, and high earnings risk for top earners [17]. These mechanisms explain why wealth remains concentrated despite policy interventions focused solely on income redistribution [17].

Oxfam International's analysis of the pandemic and cost-of-living crisis years since 2020 documents that the richest 1% captured 63% of all new wealth ($26 trillion), while the rest of the world shared just 37% [12]. Billionaire fortunes increased by $2.7 billion per day during this period, while at least 1.7 billion workers lived in countries where inflation outpaced wage growth.

Labor Share Decline and Automation

Historical Trends in Labor-Capital Distribution

The stability of labor's share of national income, once considered "one of the most surprising, yet best-established facts in the whole range of economic statistics," began declining sharply in the late 20th century [18]. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics data shows the labor share fell from 54% in 1980 to 50.5% by 2014, with acceleration since 2000 [19] [18]. This decline represents a fundamental shift from labor-based to capital-based wealth creation [19].

Research from the Philadelphia Federal Reserve demonstrates that automation in manufacturing has contributed significantly to this trend, with automating firms experiencing labor share declines of 20.8 percentage points [20]. The decline affects different skill levels asymmetrically, with robots serving as better substitutes for low-skilled than high-skilled workers [21].Citizens' Equity (CE) was formerly designated Universal Basic Capital (UBC); the framework is unchanged. Universal Basic Income (UBI) remains a distinct comparison concept throughout.

AI and Future Employment Displacement

McKinsey Global Institute projections estimate that activities accounting for up to 30% of hours currently worked across the U.S. economy could be automated by 2030, accelerated by generative AI [22]. More recent analysis projects 50% of work activities automated between 2030 and 2060, with a midpoint in 2045—a full decade sooner than previously estimated [12].

The International Monetary Fund finds that almost 40% of global employment is exposed to AI, with a key distinction from previous automation: AI's ability to impact high-skilled cognitive jobs—legal research, medical diagnosis, financial analysis—previously thought safe from technological displacement [23]. Goldman Sachs economists predict that advances in automation could affect 300 million full-time jobs, with up to half the workload of affected occupations potentially automated [24].

The International Labour Organization estimates that 2.3% of global jobs face automation risk, with effects concentrated among clerical workers, employees with low digital competence, and older workers [25]. However, research using search and matching models suggests that while automation destroys low-skilled jobs, it may create more high-skilled positions, with net effects varying by country [21].

Universal Basic Income Research and Limitations

Empirical Evidence from UBI Pilots

The United States has become the world's largest laboratory for guaranteed income experiments, with more than 150 pilot programs across the country and at least 70 currently active in 25 states, investing over $2.35 billion in testing direct cash payments [12]. The University of Chicago's Inclusive Economy Lab has conducted one of the most comprehensive analyses [26]. The OpenResearch Unconditional Income Study (ORUS) provided $1,000 monthly for three years to participants across Illinois and Texas, representing the first large-scale randomized trial of guaranteed income in America [26].

Results from recent UBI experiments reveal significant limitations alongside benefits. Recipients and household members reduced work by 4-5%, translating to 2.2 fewer hours per week and $2,500 in reduced annual household income excluding transfers [27]. However, Stockton's SEED program and similar pilots showed responsible spending patterns: 36% on retail/services, 32% on food/groceries, 18% on transport and housing, with only 4% on leisure [12].

Stanford's comprehensive review of 16 UBI studies identifies positive effects on poverty alleviation and health outcomes, but notes that impacts are not uniform across groups and that truly universal programs may produce significantly different results [28]. Political sustainability remains elusive—Arkansas banned UBI programs entirely in 2023 [29], and Finland ended its experiment early, while Switzerland rejected basic income in a 2016 referendum by 77% [30].

Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend as Precedent

The Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend provides the longest-running example of universal asset-based distribution [31] [32]. Established in 1976, the fund has distributed annual dividends to all residents since 1982, with payments of $1,702 per resident in 2024 [12]. The fund has grown from initial deposits of $734,000 in 1977 to over $80 billion today, demonstrating how patient capital investment compounds over decades.

Research on the Alaska model shows broad public support, with 81% of Alaskans considering the program beneficial, and the dividend has reduced Alaska's poverty rate by 20-40% without significant negative employment effects [32] [33]. The University of Chicago's labor market analysis found minimal negative employment effects, contradicting concerns about work disincentives [34]. Research on substance use effects found drug overdoses climbed 14% the day after payments, though the vast majority of funds are used responsibly for food, housing, and transportation [35].

Tariffs, Trade Policy, and CE as Alternative

The Empirical Case Against Tariffs

A growing body of rigorous empirical research demonstrates that tariffs function primarily as taxes on domestic consumers rather than penalties on foreign exporters. Amiti, Redding, and Weinstein's analysis of the 2018 U.S. tariffs found near-complete pass-through to American import prices, with virtually no reduction in foreign export prices [36]. This finding overturned the political framing of tariffs as costs borne by foreign countries.

Cavallo, Llamas, and Vázquez's daily retail price tracking of the 2025 tariff measures confirmed the pattern's persistence, showing 6.2% increases in imported goods prices and 3.6% increases in domestic goods prices following tariff announcements, with cumulative CPI contribution of 0.7 percentage points [37]. Critically, the cheapest product varieties experienced price increases roughly double those of premium products, confirming tariffs' regressive distributional impact [37].

The Richmond Federal Reserve's comprehensive review of the empirical literature summarized the consensus: pass-through rates are generally near 100%, meaning the burden falls on domestic consumers and firms rather than foreign exporters [38]. Fajgelbaum, Goldberg, Kennedy, and Khandelwal estimated $51 billion in consumer and firm losses from the 2018 tariffs, with net economic losses of approximately $7.2 billion after accounting for protected-sector job gains, and approximately 220,000 jobs lost in import-dependent industries [39].

CE's Equity-Based Alternative to Border Taxes

The CE monograph develops the theoretical framework for replacing tariffs with equity-based market access fees. Under this approach, companies contribute capital liabilities (rather than cash taxes at the border) proportional to their domestic sales footprint. The economic distinction is fundamental: tariff costs flow through supply chains to consumer prices, while equity dilution remains a capital-level phenomenon within the firm's ownership structure, leaving product prices undisturbed.

This approach draws on the economic concept of "strategic rent shifting"—using the bargaining power of large consumer markets to extract a share of corporate rents for citizens' benefit, without the deadweight losses and retaliatory dynamics inherent in tariff systems. The European Coal and Steel Community's founding insight—that intertwining economic interests reduces conflict—provides historical precedent for the "entangled interests" that CE creates between national populations [12].

Income Inequality and Democratic Stability

Empirical Evidence on Inequality-Democracy Relationships

Recent research published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences establishes economic inequality as one of the strongest predictors of democratic erosion [40] [41]. The study analyzed cross-national data to demonstrate that even wealthy, longstanding democracies become vulnerable when highly unequal [40]. This research helps explain why 21st-century threats to democracy more often come from elected officials rather than military coups [41].

U.S. Census Bureau data documents the severity of current inequality, with the Gini coefficient reaching 0.494 in 2021 before declining slightly to 0.485 in 2023—still among the highest levels in 50 years [42]. Since 1993, the Gini index has increased 7.6%, with the top 1% of income earners capturing 23% of total income in 2023 while the bottom 50% earned just 10.7% [12] [42].

Wealth Concentration and Political Economy

The Levy Institute's analysis using NIPA and Piketty-Saez data estimates that the bottom 99% labor share has fallen 15 percentage points since 1980, equivalent to an annual transfer of $1-2.25 trillion from labor to capital [43]. This represents a more dramatic shift than aggregate statistics suggest, as top income earners' wage income masks the broader decline in labor's share [43].

Research demonstrates that 59% of Americans cannot cover a $1,000 emergency expense using savings, while 53% live paycheck to paycheck, including 32.3% of those earning over $100,000 annually [12]. These conditions create the economic grievances that fuel political polarization and democratic backsliding [40] [41].

Employee Ownership and Stakeholder Models

ESOP Performance Evidence

Employee Stock Ownership Plans provide important empirical precedent for CE's ownership-based approach. As of 2025, approximately 6,358 companies operate ESOPs covering 14.9 million participants and holding over $1.8 trillion in assets [44]. A Rutgers University longitudinal study found ESOP companies grow 2.3% to 2.4% faster annually after establishing their ownership plans [45]. Companies combining employee ownership with participative management grow 8% to 11% per year faster than they would without ownership plans.

A meta-analysis of 102 studies representing 56,984 firms found that employee ownership significantly improves firm performance, with the effect strengthening as ownership participation increases [46]. These findings support CE's core premise that broad-based ownership creates stakeholder psychology with measurable economic benefits.

Policy Alternatives and Implementation Models

Sovereign Wealth Fund Structures

The International Monetary Fund's analysis of sovereign wealth funds provides frameworks for understanding different approaches to collective asset ownership [47] [48]. Funds operate across three categories: conservative passive investors focused on principal preservation, yield-seeking passive investors with diversified portfolios, and strategic active investors with narrower mandates [47].

Norway's Government Pension Fund Global, the world's largest sovereign wealth fund, demonstrates transparent governance with professional management, diversified international investment, clear ethical guidelines, and public reporting with democratic oversight [12]. Singapore's dual fund structure (GIC and Temasek) demonstrates the importance of clear mandates and performance metrics.

Social wealth funds represent a variation specifically designed for socially beneficial purposes, using diverse funding mechanisms including share levies on corporations, wealth taxes, carbon taxes, or new money creation [49]. These funds embrace collective ownership to provide universal services and democratically distribute resources [49].

Asset-Building Policy Innovations

The Aspen Institute identifies three practical approaches for expanding asset ownership: rewarding businesses that offer profit and equity shares, incentivizing business sales to employees, and promoting public-private citizens trusts [50]. Federal procurement spending of over $500 billion annually could prioritize companies with meaningful employee equity participation [50].

Research shows that the top quartile of employees with equity participation plans held approximately $175,000 in ownership assets in 2014, with these companies demonstrating better performance and providing superior pay and benefits [50]. Iowa's successful state-level policy reducing corporate income taxes for business owners who sell to employees through employee share ownership plans provides a replicable model [50].

International Coordination Frameworks

The OECD's Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) initiative, ongoing since 2013, provides the institutional precedent for multilateral cooperation on corporate obligations [51]. The framework includes country-by-country reporting requirements for multinational corporations with revenues above €750 million, information sharing agreements, and dispute resolution mechanisms—all of which serve as models for CE's international coordination architecture.

Gabriel Zucman's analysis of multinational profit-shifting strategies documents the extensive manipulation of profit allocation through transfer pricing and complex international structures, reinforcing CE's design choice to base contributions on revenue (which is harder to misrepresent) rather than profits [52].

International Perspectives and Comparative Analysis

The Earth4All project proposes Universal Basic Dividend models based on common resource exploitation, with fees collected into Citizen's Funds for dividend distribution [53]. This approach builds on Alaska's precedent while expanding to encompass broader resource commons [53].

Universal Basic Compute proposals for AI entities provide parallel frameworks for understanding resource distribution in automated economies, though these focus on computational rather than financial assets [54]. These models highlight the importance of governance structures and fair distribution mechanisms in technology-driven economies [54].

Contemporary Policy Debates

Automation and Employment Policy

Mark Cuban's critique of Universal Basic Income emphasizes implementation challenges and suggests alternatives like expanded AmeriCorps programs that create jobs in community service sectors [55]. This perspective highlights ongoing debates about whether to focus on job creation versus income support in response to automation [55].

The Heritage Foundation's analysis of recent UBI experiments emphasizes work reduction effects and enormous costs, estimating that providing $1,000 monthly to eligible Americans would cost approximately $1.1 trillion annually [27]. These critiques underscore the importance of designing sustainable, work-preserving alternatives like CE [27].

Supply Chain Analysis and Economic Measurement

The CE monograph develops a novel application of Markov Chain analysis to determine multinational companies' geographic revenue allocation through complex supply chains. The mathematical framework treats companies as transient states and countries as absorbing states, using transition probability matrices to compute Y% allocations even in the presence of circular supply chain relationships. This approach draws on Leontief's input-output analysis tradition while extending it to the specific requirements of equity-based contribution systems [12].

Emerging Research Directions

Current research gaps include evaluation of long-lasting universal programs, equity implications of different policy designs, and economic spillover effects in communities [28]. The Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis calls for "systemically adjusted" investment models that value assets in the context of wider portfolio impact [56].

This comprehensive bibliography provides the academic foundation for the CE monograph while supporting the central argument that Citizens' Equity offers a more sustainable and democratic approach to managing AI-driven economic transformation than traditional welfare, UBI, or tariff-based trade policies. The sources span peer-reviewed research, government analysis, and policy institution studies, aiming toward both academic rigor and practical relevance for a policy-oriented audience.

⁂

Full documentation and detailed implementation frameworks are available at the complete Citizens' Equity website, citizensequity.org.

(c) Mark B. Garman, 2025-26 ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2542-8750
Licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

---

1. J. E. Meade, *Efficiency, Equality and the Ownership of Property*, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1964. Reissued Routledge Revivals, 2012. ↩ ↩

2. J. E. Meade, *Agathotopia: The Economics of Partnership*, Hume Paper No. 16, Aberdeen University Press for the David Hume Institute, 1989. ↩ ↩

3. Martin O'Neill and Stuart White, "James Meade, Public Ownership, and the Idea of a Citizens' Trust," *International Journal of Public Policy*, Vol. 15, Nos. 1/2, 2019, pp. 21–37. ↩ ↩

4. J. E. Meade, *Liberty, Equality and Efficiency: Apologia pro Agathotopia Mea*, Macmillan, London, and New York University Press, 1993. ↩ ↩

5. J. E. Meade, *Full Employment Regained? An Agathotopian Dream*, University of Cambridge Department of Applied Economics Occasional Paper 61, Cambridge University Press, 1995. ↩

6. J. E. Meade, *The Just Economy* (Principles of Political Economy, Volume IV), George Allen & Unwin, London, 1976. ↩

7. J. E. Meade, "Poverty in the Welfare State," 1972. Reprinted in *The Collected Papers of James Meade*, Volume II, ed. Susan Howson, Routledge, 2004. ↩

8. J. E. Meade, "The Inheritance of Inequalities: Some Biological, Demographic, Social, and Economic Factors," Keynes Lecture in Economics, British Academy, 1973. Reprinted in *The Collected Papers of James Meade*, Volume II, ed. Susan Howson, Routledge, 2004. ↩

9. Institute for Fiscal Studies, *The Structure and Reform of Direct Taxation*, Report of a Committee chaired by Professor J. E. Meade, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1978. ↩

10. Anthony B. Atkinson, *Inequality: What Can Be Done?*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2015. Proposal 6 (capital endowment / minimum inheritance) and Proposal 7 (public Investment Authority and sovereign wealth fund). ↩

11. https://acss.org.uk/a-springboard-for-new-citizens-universal-basic-capital-and-a-citizens-day/ ↩

12. Garman, Mark B., "Citizens' Equity — A Plan to Manage the AI Revolution Better Than We Managed the Industrial Revolution," Version 5.0, 2025-26. https://citizensequity.org ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩

13. https://ppr.lse.ac.uk/articles/10.31389/lseppr.8 ↩ ↩

14. https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/covid19/2021/01/22/the-case-for-universal-basic-capital-a-10k-grant-for-every-18-year-old/ ↩ ↩ ↩

15. https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/pikettys-book-and-macro-models-wealth-inequality ↩ ↩ ↩

16. https://www.vox.com/2014/4/8/5592198/the-short-guide-to-capital-in-the-21st-century ↩

17. https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w21106/w21106.pdf ↩ ↩

18. https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2017/article/estimating-the-us-labor-share.htm ↩ ↩

19. https://fnce.wharton.upenn.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/BarkaiDecliningLaborCapital-update_2-20180908.pdf ↩ ↩

20. https://www.philadelphiafed.org/-/media/frbp/assets/working-papers/2021/wp21-11.pdf ↩

21. https://academic.oup.com/oep/article/74/1/115/6301191 ↩ ↩

22. https://technologymagazine.com/ai-and-machine-learning/375mn-jobs-be-displaced-automation-2030-mckinsey ↩

23. International Monetary Fund, "AI Will Transform the Global Economy: Let's Make Sure It Benefits Humanity," January 2024. https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2024/01/14/ai-will-transform-the-global-economy-lets-make-sure-it-benefits-humanity ↩

24. Goldman Sachs Economics Research, "The Potentially Large Effects of Artificial Intelligence on Economic Growth," March 2023. ↩

25. https://www.smartforum.org/ai-and-the-future-of-work-impact-on-job-displacement/ ↩

26. https://urbanlabs.uchicago.edu/attachments/5ff88f36218ed7d9bee03d8b2e3f5e87998b51c9/store/71b4d2b6c98f6d7d0e4b8e5ac62db72a0139a748a1dc59ee192309d9e7cf/092024+IEL+GI+Literature+Review.pdf ↩ ↩

27. https://www.heritage.org/taxes/commentary/universal-basic-income-not-the-panacea-its-advertised ↩ ↩ ↩

28. https://basicincome.stanford.edu/uploads/Umbrella Review BI_final.pdf ↩ ↩

29. Arkansas Act 841 (2023), prohibiting state and local government guaranteed income programs. ↩

30. Swiss Federal Statistical Office, "Federal Vote on Unconditional Basic Income," June 2016. ↩

31. https://webapps.ilo.org/public/english/protection/ses/download/docs/gold.pdf ↩

32. https://www.akleg.gov/basis/get_documents.asp?docid=41050 ↩ ↩

33. Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, "Alaska's Permanent Fund Dividend," 2016; Scott Goldsmith, "The Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend: A Case Study," University of Alaska Anchorage, 2010. ↩

34. https://home.uchicago.edu/j1s/Jones_Alaska.pdf ↩

35. Aparna Soni and Jeffrey Haspel, "The Effects of the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend on Substance Use," NBER Working Paper No. 29862, March 2022. ↩

36. Mary Amiti, Stephen J. Redding, and David E. Weinstein, "The Impact of the 2018 Tariffs on Prices and Welfare," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 33, No. 4, 2019, pp. 187–210. https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/jep.33.4.187 ↩

37. Alberto Cavallo, Agustín Llamas, and José Vázquez, "Tracking the Short-Run Price Impact of U.S. Tariffs," NBER Working Paper No. 34496, 2025. https://www.nber.org/papers/w34496 ↩ ↩

38. Richmond Federal Reserve, "Tariffs: Estimating the Economic Impact of the 2025 Measures and Proposals," *Economic Brief* No. 25-12, June 2025. https://www.richmondfed.org/publications/research/economic_brief/2025/eb_25-12 ↩

39. Pablo D. Fajgelbaum, Pinelopi K. Goldberg, Patrick J. Kennedy, and Amit K. Khandelwal, "The Return to Protectionism," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 135, No. 1, 2020, pp. 1–55. https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/135/1/1/5626442 ↩

40. https://socialsciences.uchicago.edu/news/income-inequality-has-led-erosion-democracy-countries-around-world ↩ ↩ ↩

41. https://news.uchicago.edu/story/economic-inequality-leads-democratic-erosion-study-finds ↩ ↩ ↩

42. https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2023/09/income-inequality.html ↩ ↩

43. https://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/wp_805.pdf ↩ ↩

44. National Center for Employee Ownership, "Employee Ownership by the Numbers," 2025. ↩

45. Douglas Kruse, "Research Evidence on Prevalence and Effects of Employee Ownership," Rutgers University School of Management and Labor Relations, 2002. ↩

46. Virginie Pérotin, "What Do We Really Know About Worker Cooperatives?" Co-operatives UK, 2016. ↩

47. https://www.elibrary.imf.org/display/book/9781589069275/CH001.xml ↩ ↩

48. https://www.elibrary.imf.org/view/book/9781589069275/CH012.xml ↩

49. https://thenextsystem.org/learn/stories/social-wealth-fund ↩ ↩

50. https://www.aspeninstitute.org/blog-posts/better-way-share-wealth/ ↩ ↩ ↩ ↩

51. OECD, "Base Erosion and Profit Shifting (BEPS) Project," ongoing initiative since 2013. ↩

52. Gabriel Zucman, "The Hidden Wealth of Nations: The Scourge of Tax Havens," University of Chicago Press, 2015. ↩

53. https://earth4all.life/views/the-alaska-permanent-fund/ ↩ ↩

54. https://coinpaprika.com/storage/cdn/whitepapers/11351361.pdf ↩ ↩

55. https://www.businessinsider.com/mark-cuban-criticizes-basic-income-as-response-to-robot-automation-2017-2 ↩ ↩

56. https://ieefa.org/sites/default/files/2024-05/Universal Ownership Practical Implementation_May%202024.pdf ↩