ChatGPT

Global Wealth Concentration and Inequality: A Comprehensive Analysis

Introduction

Global wealth and resources are highly concentrated in the hands of a small elite. Roughly the top 4% of wealthy individuals, families, and corporations today own a disproportionate share of the world's assets and productive resources. This disparity is evident in global wealth distribution data: for example, the richest 1% of adults alone own around 40–45% of global wealth [1] [2]. As of 2024, Oxfam reports that the wealthiest 1% have more wealth than the *remaining 95%* of humanity combined [3]. In contrast, the poorer half of the world's population owns only a tiny fraction (on the order of 1–2%) of global wealth [4]. Such extreme inequality in economic power has profound implications across sectors and societies. This report provides a deep analysis of how this elite minority – the "global oligarchy" – dominates key sectors of the economy, and contrasts their position with the struggles and impacts experienced by the broader population. It also examines how institutional forces (like organized religion) and a widespread denial of mortality can influence human consciousness and perpetuate a lower level of collective awareness in the face of these inequalities.

Wealth Concentration Among the Global Elite

Scale of the Inequality: The global wealth gap is staggering and growing. Over the past few decades, wealth has been accumulating at the top at an accelerating rate. By 2012, the top 5% of the world's population controlled roughly **71%** of all wealth, leaving just 29% for the bottom 95% [5]. The trend has continued such that now the *top 1%* (a subset of that elite) own about **43–45%** of global wealth [2] [6]. For further perspective, a 2021 analysis found that the ten richest men in the world owned more wealth than the bottom 3.1 billion people (nearly half of humanity), and those ten billionaires doubled their combined wealth during the COVID-19 pandemic [7]. In tangible terms, a small handful of multi-billionaires now have fortunes exceeding the total wealth of hundreds of millions of the poorest people. Meanwhile, the bottom half of the world's population – over 4 billion people – collectively own *less than 2%* of global wealth [4]. This lopsided pyramid of wealth is illustrated by the fact that the bottom 60% of the world's people held wealth equivalent to that of just 1,200 or so billionaires on the Forbes list [5]. Such data underscore how a tiny elite has amassed unprecedented economic power relative to everyone else.

Dominance in Key Sectors: This elite wealth translates directly into control over resources and industries. The top 4% (and especially the top 1%) include many of the major shareholders, owners, and executives in global business, giving them outsized influence in virtually every economic sector. Some sectors are especially dominated by a few wealthy actors:

- **Finance and Investment:** A handful of giant financial firms manage *trillions* of dollars and hold sway over corporate governance worldwide. Notably, the "Big Three" asset management companies – **BlackRock, Vanguard, and State Street** – together hold about $20 trillion in assets, which is close to one-fifth of all investable assets in the world [6]. These three are among the largest shareholders in *nearly 90%* of S&P 500 corporations [8], effectively giving them significant voting power over major companies across all industries. In banking, concentration is also extreme: the top 10 global banks (e.g. ICBC, JPMorgan Chase, etc.) each have assets in the trillions of dollars, and a few financial families and conglomerates often have historical or ownership ties to these institutions. Wealthy dynasties such as the Rothschilds and Rockefellers played major roles in the development of global finance, and today investment tycoons and billionaire financiers like Warren Buffett (Berkshire Hathaway) exert enormous influence. In sum, a tiny fraction of players in finance direct an outsized portion of capital flows, credit, and investment decisions worldwide, amplifying their wealth further. According to Oxfam, the richest 1% alone own about 43% of all *financial* assets globally [6], highlighting how financial wealth is heavily skewed toward the top.

- **Real Estate and Land Ownership:** Land and real estate – fundamental resources – are heavily owned by elites and large institutions. In many countries, a minuscule slice of the population controls a huge share of land. For example, in England less than **1%** of the population (about 25,000 landowners, including aristocratic families and corporations) owns *half* of all the land in the country [9]. The bulk of ordinary people, including homeowners, collectively own only a small single-digit percentage of land (only ~5% in England) [10]. Similar patterns of land concentration exist globally: large agribusinesses, real estate developers, and wealthy landlords own vast tracts of urban and rural property. In the United States, a few dozen billionaire families and trusts (sometimes called “land barons”) have accumulated tens of millions of acres of land; the 100 largest private landowners in the U.S. now hold an area roughly the size of the state of Florida. Around the world, foreign investors and sovereign wealth funds have also been buying up farmland and real estate, further concentrating ownership. This control over real estate by the wealthy leads to high rents and property values that can price average people out of housing. Moreover, since land is a source of food production, development, and natural resources, having it concentrated in elite hands means the common public often has limited access to or benefit from these resources.

- **Technology Industry:** The technology sector is a prime example of how enormous wealth has accrued to a tiny group of individuals and corporations. A handful of tech mega-corporations dominate global markets and have valuations exceeding the GDP of many countries. The five largest U.S.-based tech companies (often referred to by acronyms like FAANG or MAMAA – e.g. **Facebook (Meta)**, **Amazon**, **Apple**, **Netflix**, **Google (Alphabet)**, plus Microsoft) together had a combined market capitalization of nearly **$10 trillion** by mid-2025, accounting for roughly 20% of the S&P 500 stock index’s value [11]. These firms – led by billionaire CEOs or founders like Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk, Mark Zuckerberg, Bill Gates, and others – exert monopolistic control in their niches (e.g. e-commerce, social media, online search, personal computing, cloud services). The wealth of tech billionaires expanded dramatically in recent years, and they feature prominently among the world’s richest individuals. For instance, the fortune of Elon Musk (Tesla/SpaceX) or Jeff Bezos (Amazon) at times exceeded $200 billion each, levels of wealth unprecedented for single individuals. This translates into outsized influence: tech tycoons invest in space exploration, artificial intelligence, and even media and politics, thereby shaping the future economy and public discourse. The technology sector’s network effects and patent control also mean that a few large players set terms for the digital infrastructure the world relies on. In summary, the top 1%’s influence is clearly visible in Big Tech, where a few corporations owned by the elite control platforms used by billions of people daily.

- **Energy and Industry:** The energy sector – especially oil, gas, and mining – has historically been a source of great fortunes and remains dominated by a mix of billionaire-owned corporations and state-backed giants. A striking example is **Saudi Aramco**, the Saudi Arabian national oil company, which is often the world’s most valuable company (with a market capitalization around $1.8 trillion) and produces over 10 million barrels of oil per day [12]. Aramco is effectively controlled by the Saudi royal family, making the House of Saud one of the wealthiest families on the planet by asset value. In the West, companies like **ExxonMobil**, **Chevron**, **Shell**, and **BP** rank among the largest firms, and they are publicly traded but significantly owned by wealthy investors and funds. Many of these oil majors also trace back to old wealthy families (for example, Exxon and Chevron are successors of John D. Rockefeller's Standard Oil empire). Additionally, privately-held energy conglomerates like **Koch Industries** (owned by the Koch family, among the richest families in America) wield enormous influence in oil refining, chemicals, and pipelines. The pattern is that a small number of corporations control the majority of fossil fuel reserves and production; for instance, the top 10 oil companies account for a large share of global output and profits. This concentrated control over energy resources has geopolitical implications and generates vast cash flows for shareholders. Even in emerging energy industries (such as renewable energy, solar and wind farms), large asset managers and billionaire investors are scooping up projects, meaning the transition to green energy may still be led by those at the top of the wealth pyramid rather than by communities at large.

- **Agriculture and Food**: A few giant agribusiness corporations and wealthy farming dynasties dominate global food supply chains. Just **four companies** – Archer Daniels Midland (ADM), **Bunge**, **Cargill**, and Louis Dreyfus, collectively nicknamed the "ABCD" companies – are estimated to control between **70% and 90%** of the world's grain trade [13]. This extraordinary concentration means that decisions by a handful of private companies (some of them family-owned for a century or more) can influence global food prices and availability. **Cargill**, in particular, is the world's largest agricultural commodities firm and the largest *privately held* company in the United States; it is still majority-owned (around 88%) by about 20 members of the Cargill-MacMillan family [14] [15]. The Cargill family alone has an estimated collective fortune of ~$50 billion and counts over a dozen billionaires among its members [16] – all stemming from the grain and meat empire founded in the 19th century. Likewise, billionaire farming families (such as the owners of **Cargill**, or the descendants of Henry Ford and others who have invested in large tracts of farmland) quietly own massive agricultural assets. In the agrochemicals and seed industry, consolidation has left only a few major players (after mergers like Bayer-Monsanto and Dow-DuPont). As a result, just **two corporations** control about *40% of the global seed market* for crops [6], giving them tremendous power over what farmers can plant. Billionaires like Bill Gates have even become some of the largest owners of farmland in the U.S. by purchasing hundreds of thousands of acres. Overall, the production of food – from seeds, fertilizers, and farm land to processing and distribution – is heavily in the hands of a small capitalist elite, which can reap huge profits especially when food prices surge. (Indeed, during recent food price spikes, the wealth of large agribusiness families like the Cargills jumped significantly [17] [16].)

- **Media and Communications:** The information that people consume is largely curated by a few powerful media conglomerates owned by wealthy families or shareholders. In the United States, for example, just **six corporations** (including Comcast, Disney, AT&T/Warner Bros. Discovery, ViacomCBS, News Corp, and Sony) control roughly *90%* of all media outlets – newspapers, TV channels, radio, publishing, and film studios [18]. This is a drastic consolidation from decades past and means a few billionaire-controlled boards determine much of the news and entertainment content. Globally, similar trends are evident: the largest media conglomerates by revenue include **Comcast NBCUniversal**, **Disney**, **Warner Bros. Discovery**, **Paramount Global**, and **News Corp**, among others [19]. These entities own myriad subsidiaries that span continents. For example, News Corp (controlled by the Murdoch family) owns major news organizations on multiple continents. Amazon's billionaire founder Jeff Bezos personally owns *The Washington Post*. A Chinese tech billionaire may own large stakes in social media apps and gaming companies; similarly, tech giants like Google and Meta (Facebook) – led by billionaires – dominate online advertising and information distribution algorithms. The result is that a small elite not only owns the material wealth but also the means of shaping narratives and public opinion. This concentration raises concerns about media bias and the silencing of diverse voices, since wealthy owners can steer content in directions that protect their interests. As one analysis of U.S. media noted, the landscape has effectively become an **oligopoly** where a “few companies own much of the market” [20], which can undermine pluralism and democratic debate.

Examples of Elite Entities: To put faces and names to this top 4%, we can consider some prominent examples across regions and industries. The *Walton family* (heirs to Walmart) is one of the richest families globally, with substantial holdings in retail and other businesses. The *Mars family* (behind Mars Inc. candies) and the *Koch brothers* (energy and manufacturing conglomerate) are other American examples of dynastic wealth controlling major private companies. In Europe, old banking and industrial families (like the Rothschilds, who still have a prominent investment bank, or the Agnelli family of Italy which controls Fiat/Stellantis auto group and media ventures) illustrate continuity of wealth power. In the Middle East, monarchies such as the Saudi Royal Family use national oil wealth for global investments (including stakes in Uber, Twitter, etc.) and count thousands of princes among the ultra-rich. Major corporations often have billionaire founders or CEOs: e.g. **Amazon** under Jeff Bezos, **Tesla/SpaceX** under Elon Musk, **Microsoft** co-founded by Bill Gates (who remains a major shareholder in various sectors), and **Meta (Facebook)** led by Mark Zuckerberg. These individuals wield influence not just as business leaders but also through philanthropy or political donations, effectively setting policy agendas. Another notable corporate entity is **BlackRock**, the world’s largest asset manager (led by Larry Fink), which through index funds holds significant ownership in companies worldwide; though not a family business, its size makes it a proxy for the concentrated financial power of the investing elite. All these examples reinforce the pattern: a small network of extremely wealthy actors sit atop key nodes of the global economy.

Credible Data on Inequality: Table 1 below highlights the scale of global economic inequality with recent data:

Global Wealth Group	Share of World Wealth	Illustrative Statistic
Top 1% of adults	~43–46% of global wealth [6] [2]	Richest 1% owns more wealth than the bottom 95% [3].
Top 5% of adults	≈70–72% of global wealth [5]	(Top 0.6% held 39%; next 4.4% held 32% as of 2012 [5].)
Bottom 50% of adults	< 2% of global wealth [4]	Poorest half owns only about 1% (year 2000 data) [4].
Billionaires (≈2,600 people)	~$12 trillion (approx. 3% of global wealth)	e.g. 10 richest men > wealth of bottom 3.1 billion [7].

Table 1: Global Wealth Distribution – a snapshot of inequality. (Sources: United Nations University, OECD, Oxfam, UBS, as cited)

As shown above, the top 1% alone command nearly half of all wealth, and the top 10% (not shown in table, but roughly the top decile) around 80–85% [1]. This leaves a mere fraction for the remaining majority of humanity. Such *credible data* from organizations like the OECD and Oxfam validate the claim that the top tier of wealthy entities own a disproportionate share of resources. The implication is a form of global oligarchy: economic power – and by extension political and social power – is heavily concentrated in a tiny class. In Oxfam’s words, “the shadow of global oligarchy” now looms over international affairs [21] [22], as billionaires and mega-corporations use their resources to shape economies and even influence governance across borders.

Consequences for the Broader Population

The massive inequality between the ultra-wealthy and the rest of the population translates into a very different lived experience for common people. While the elites enjoy immense economic security, influence, and opportunity, the majority face intensified competition for limited resources and often feel disempowered in both economic and political spheres. This section explores how economic inequality affects the broader population psychologically, politically, and socially – including the everyday struggles over resources and opportunities that many face.

Psychological Impacts and Mental Health

Wide economic inequality has deep psychological effects on individuals and on societal well-being. Research shows that in societies with high inequality, people across all income levels experience *greater stress, anxiety, and feelings of insecurity*. One reason is the sharp status differences that inequality produces. When a small minority is exorbitantly wealthy while others struggle, it heightens the emphasis on social status and comparisons. People in more unequal societies tend to worry more about how they are judged by others and about their own worth, a phenomenon often called "status anxiety" [23]. In fact, psychologists Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett note that *status anxiety increases not just among the poor, but across all income groups* as inequality grows – everyone becomes more anxious about their place in the social hierarchy [23]. The wealthy may fear losing their status, while the non-wealthy feel diminished or left behind.

These psychological strains manifest in measurable mental health outcomes. Greater inequality correlates with higher rates of mental illness such as depression, anxiety disorders, and even personality disorders in the population [24]. One study found that mental illnesses like depression and schizophrenia occur *more frequently in more unequal societies* than in more egalitarian ones [24]. The human brain is sensitive to feelings of subordination or exclusion – in highly unequal environments, those who are less affluent may internalize a sense of inferiority or failure, which can fuel depression and low self-esteem [25]. Conversely, some individuals respond to the competitive, hierarchy-oriented environment with narcissism or antisocial behavior – essentially an overreaction to preserve a sense of dominance [25].

Inequality also erodes *social trust*. In societies with relatively even wealth distribution (for example, some of the most equal nations), a majority of people might agree that "most people can be trusted." But in highly unequal societies, trust plummets – only around 20% agree most others can be trusted, versus 60–65% in the most equal societies [26]. This lack of trust between citizens can be traced to the social distance and segregation that inequality creates: the rich live in gated bubbles, the poor are marginalized, and people interact less across class lines. When trust erodes, community life suffers and suspicion or envy can increase. People also feel less *safe*; for instance, walking alone at night feels riskier in societies with more inequality and social fragmentation [26].

Furthermore, chronic stress from economic insecurity (worrying about making ends meet, debt, job instability) has well-known health impacts, both mental and physical. In unequal societies, even middle-class individuals often feel one misfortune away from hardship, since wealth and safety nets are concentrated at the top. The constant stress and "social evaluative threat" (fear of being seen as a failure) elevate stress hormones like cortisol in populations [27]. This kind of stress has been linked to worse health outcomes, contributing to disparities in life expectancy and illness between economic classes. In sum, living in the long shadow of extreme wealth inequality can undermine psychological well-being for society at large – increasing mental health issues, lowering self-esteem for the have-nots, and even burdening the haves with anxiety and pressure to maintain status.

On a societal level, inequality frays the social fabric and sense of solidarity. Studies find that *community engagement and social cohesion weaken as inequality rises* [28] . People in highly unequal societies are less likely to participate in civic groups, community activities, or collective problem-solving. The widening gulf in lifestyles and perspectives means people have fewer shared experiences. This can lead to isolation, with the less privileged feeling excluded or voiceless, and the more privileged retreating into exclusive circles. Notably, *violent crime rates tend to be higher in more unequal societies* – for example, homicide rates correlate positively with income or wealth inequality [28] . Criminologists argue this is partly due to the social strains and perceived injustices caused by inequality, which can fuel anger, desperation, or social breakdown in disadvantaged communities.

Finally, inequality often promotes a culture of consumerism and material status-seeking that affects everyone's consciousness. With large gaps, there is often a heightened drive to display success (since the differences are so visible). Evidence shows people in unequal societies work longer hours, save less, and go into higher debt trying to "keep up" with consumption norms set by the affluent [29] . As Wilkinson and Pickett observe, *consumerism intensifies under inequality* – purchases and possessions become ways to prove one's self-worth when other forms of dignity (like equal respect) are lacking [29] . This can create psychological strain and misallocation of effort, as people chase status symbols rather than, say, personal fulfillment or community improvement. In summary, the psychological toll of inequality is multifaceted: it drives stress and mental illness, erodes trust and empathy, and pushes individuals into unhealthy social competitions – all of which lower the overall quality of life for a society.

Political Disempowerment and Erosion of Democracy

Extreme economic inequality also translates into *political* inequality, which can leave the average citizen feeling disempowered and alienated from the political process. Wealth is power in politics: the rich are able to fund election campaigns, lobby policymakers, own media outlets, and otherwise disproportionately influence governance. This creates a feedback loop where policies often cater to elite interests, further entrenching inequality.

A striking empirical finding in the United States illustrates this dynamic. A landmark study by political scientists Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page (2014) analyzed over 1,700 policy decisions and the preferences of different income groups. They found that the preferences of average citizens had virtually *no independent impact* on whether a policy was adopted by the government, whereas the preferences of economic elites and organized business lobbies had a very strong influence [30] . In other words, if a majority of ordinary Americans supported a particular change but the elite opposed it, the change was very unlikely to happen – and vice versa, if the elite wanted something, it often became law even with low public support. The researchers concluded that the U.S. political system functions effectively as an *oligarchy*: lawmakers respond to wealthy donors and interest groups, not to the median voter [30] . This phenomenon is not unique to the United States; similar patterns of elite influence over policy are observed in many countries, especially as money plays a big role in politics.

One mechanism for political capture is campaign financing. Only a tiny fraction of the population can afford to make large political donations, and that fraction holds outsized sway over candidates. For example, in the U.S., just **12 megadonors** (6 wealthy individuals from each major party, 8 of whom are billionaires) contributed about $3.4 billion to federal campaigns over a decade, accounting for 7.5% of all political giving in that period [31] . Just a hundred or so billionaire families regularly rank among the top donors in elections, meaning they effectively bankroll and king-make many candidates. This level of concentrated donor power skews whose voices get heard. Politicians, needing funds to win elections, are incentivized to align with the interests of their wealthy backers – be it via tax policy, deregulation, or other favorable legislation.

Beyond elections, the wealthy exercise influence through *lobbying and revolving doors*. Giant corporations and financial firms (often led or owned by those top 4%) spend millions annually on lobbying governments. For instance, a recent analysis found that 180 of the largest U.S. corporations collectively spent $746 million on lobbying in a single year [32]. This buys access to lawmakers and regulators that ordinary citizens simply do not have. Moreover, industry often captures regulatory agencies by cycling executives (who are part of the elite class) into government positions and vice versa. This can dilute public-interest regulation and ensure that rules favor incumbent big players.

The result of these processes is a sense of *political alienation* among the broader public. When people see that billionaires and corporate CEOs have the ears of ministers and senators – while their own voices vanish into the void – trust in democracy erodes. Many feel that governments serve only "the rich and powerful" and that voting changes little. This disempowerment can breed apathy (low voter turnout, disengagement) or, conversely, explosive anger that fuels populist movements and street protests. Indeed, rising inequality has been linked to surges in political polarization and unrest. Large segments of the population, struggling economically, perceive (often correctly) that the system is rigged against them. This can lead to resentment toward elites and governing institutions.

At the extreme, the nexus of wealth and power can undermine democratic institutions entirely. In some countries, billionaire oligarchs hold official political positions or wield veto power over governments (using media empires to sway public opinion, or simply leveraging their economic clout to threaten capital flight). Even in international governance, ultra-rich individuals have started to play roles usually reserved for states – for example, tech billionaires funding global initiatives or influencing space and cyber regulations. Oxfam warns of a "movement toward a global oligarchy" where *ultra-wealthy actors and mega-corporations shape global rules in their favor* [33], often at the expense of the wider public interest. This is evident in areas like tax policy (rich individuals and companies lobbying to maintain tax havens and loopholes), trade and intellectual property (pharmaceutical giants resisting patent waivers on life-saving medicines [34]), and debt and development (private lenders holding impoverished countries in debt traps) [35].

For common people, this means their ability to collectively address grievances – through democratic government – is weakened. Even widely popular policies (like raising the minimum wage, expanding healthcare, or stronger financial regulation) can stall if they threaten elite interests. Over time, this *gap in political power* can dampen civic participation: people feel that they are fighting over crumbs and that decisions are made without them. In summary, economic inequality begets political inequality, which in turn makes it harder to correct the economic inequality – a vicious cycle that leaves the general population feeling voiceless and frustrated, and democracy itself diminished.

Social Consequences and the Struggle for Resources

The social fabric of communities is strained under the weight of inequality. As the wealthy accumulate huge portions of resources, the rest of the population often finds itself competing over what remains. This manifests in numerous "everyday struggles" for limited resources and opportunities – whether it's jobs, affordable housing, quality education, or even basic necessities in poorer regions. The contrast between the lifestyles of the elite and the conditions of ordinary people can breed a sense of injustice and social tension.

One visible consequence is the competition for **jobs and wages**. In a globalized economy, while top executives and shareholders reap an increasing share of profits, ordinary workers often face stagnant wages and precarious employment. Good-paying, stable jobs can feel scarce. Many people must work longer hours or multiple jobs to make ends meet, even as they see news of record corporate profits or CEO bonuses. This contributes to a sentiment that the "common people struggle for scraps" while the rich take the lion's share. In some developing countries, limited formal jobs mean masses of young people hustling in informal economies, leading to desperation and sometimes unrest (as seen in protests fueled partly by lack of opportunity). Meanwhile, the outsourcing of labor and the weakening of labor unions (often with policy support from wealthy interests) have reduced workers' bargaining power, exacerbating the struggle of average families to secure a decent livelihood.

Access to **education and upward mobility** also becomes more limited in unequal societies. Wealthy families can afford elite private schooling, tutors, and prestigious university fees for their children, giving them a head-start to remain in the upper class. By contrast, public education may be underfunded or uneven in quality, and competition for scholarships or spots in good schools is fierce for everyone else. This can create a vicious cycle where inequality of outcome (income/wealth) is reinforced by inequality of opportunity – children from poorer backgrounds find it much harder to climb the socioeconomic ladder. As people sense that opportunities are rigged or shrinking, it can lead to disillusionment, or in some cases, a brain drain (where those who can, emigrate to seek opportunities elsewhere, leaving behind communities with even fewer resources).

Housing is another flashpoint. In many cities worldwide, **affordable housing** has become a critical problem as property prices and rents skyrocketed – often driven up by wealthy investors, speculators, or corporate landlords. When big investment firms buy up large swathes of homes (turning them into rentals or leaving them empty as investment assets), average families find themselves priced out of the housing market. This leads to overcrowding, long commutes from distant affordable areas, or even homelessness for the most vulnerable. The stark image of luxury high-rises overlooking slums or homeless encampments is a physical manifestation of inequality. Studies in England and elsewhere highlight how tiny elites owning most land translates into housing inequity: e.g., less than 1% owning half the land means that housing development and land use are controlled by a few, often prioritizing upscale projects over affordable homes [36] [37]. As common people compete for the limited affordable units, social stress intensifies. In extreme cases, this has led to social movements or riots (for instance, rent protests, "occupy" movements, etc., where people call out the injustice of homes lying empty as investments while many are shelterless).

Public resources and services can also become strained in an unequal context. When the wealthy underpay taxes through loopholes or push for austerity, public funding for healthcare, transportation, and social safety nets often dwindles. The broader populace then faces under-resourced hospitals, crowded public transit, and weaker social protections. This scarcity of quality services means people must either pay private providers (which many cannot afford) or suffer the consequences. For example, if billionaires and corporations lobby to slash taxes (as noted by Oxfam in cases of tax rules influenced by rich-country lobbying [38]), the result might be less money for education or welfare in the budget – thereby directly affecting ordinary citizens' lives. It creates a scenario where, as one commentator put it, "the richest have privatized gains and socialized losses," leaving the public sector threadbare for the rest.

Socially, high inequality can increase **crime and conflict** at the community level. When groups of people feel systematically marginalized and see no fair way to improve their lot, some may turn to illicit activities or violence. High inequality cities tend to have more crime than more equal cities, in part because stark inequality can erode the informal social controls and mutual respect that keep crime low. Additionally, tensions can arise between groups – for instance, between immigrants and natives, or between racial groups – especially if economic hardships are blamed on competition for jobs or resources. Elites sometimes exploit these divisions (scapegoating minorities or the poor themselves for problems) to distract from the structural causes of scarcity.

At a human level, the experience of struggling over limited resources while a minority lives in opulence has psychological effects: it can breed feelings of humiliation, resentment, or fatalism among those at the bottom. Sociologists have noted that in highly unequal societies, there can develop a form of **denial or fatalistic acceptance** among the poor – a belief that "this is just how things are" or that one's suffering is due to personal failure rather than systemic issues. This learned helplessness further reduces civic engagement or demands for change, potentially allowing inequality to persist unchallenged.

Yet, we also see many instances of resistance and resilience. Common people have organized cooperatives, unions, and grassroots campaigns to fight for a fairer share of resources. Whether it's slum-dwellers fighting evictions by developers, workers striking for better pay, or global movements for debt relief and climate justice, there is a continuous pushback from below. These struggles underscore that while resources and opportunities might be limited by the current system, the desire of people to live with dignity and agency is undiminished.

In conclusion, the broad population faces not only economic hardship due to inequality, but a host of social consequences: intense competition for basic needs, feelings of injustice, erosion of community, and sometimes outright conflict. The contrast between their struggles and elite luxury can galvanize social unrest or, if unmet, lead to a society that is both polarized and unstable.

The Influence of Institutions and Ideas on Consciousness

Beyond the visible economic and political effects of inequality, there are more subtle ways in which human consciousness and awareness are shaped (or suppressed) by existing power structures. Two important factors here are **institutional forces, such as organized religion**, and the **widespread denial of mortality** in society. Each in its way can influence how people perceive their reality, sometimes reducing the likelihood that they will challenge unjust conditions or reach a higher level of collective awareness about their situation.

Organized Religion and the Shaping of Consciousness

Throughout history, organized religion has been one of the most powerful institutional forces influencing people's worldviews, values, and behavior. Religion provides meaning, moral codes, and community – functions that can be positive – but it has also frequently been used by elites as a tool of social control or a way to justify the status quo. When considering how religion might suppress or influence consciousness, it's useful to recall the famous words of philosopher Karl Marx: **"Religion is the opium of the people. It is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of our soulless conditions."** [39] . In this metaphor, Marx suggests that religion soothes pain much like a drug, offering comfort to people who are suffering ("oppressed") and living in harsh circumstances – but in doing so, it can also create an *illusory* happiness that distracts them from the real sources of their suffering.

In practical terms, organized religion can encourage people to accept their lot in life by framing it as divinely ordained or by promising rewards in an afterlife rather than in the here and now. For example, doctrines that preach contentment with one's socio-economic position ("the meek shall inherit the earth" or the idea that wealth in this life might compromise one's spiritual fate) may reduce the impetus of the poor to demand justice **now**. In feudal and colonial history, ruling classes often allied with religious authorities to legitimize power: kings were said to rule by "Divine Right," the caste system in some cultures was buttressed by religious notions of karma and duty, and enslaved or colonized peoples were sometimes taught that their suffering was part of God's plan (with freedom awaiting in the next life, not necessarily through rebellion in this one). Such usages of religion can be seen as cultivating a kind of *false consciousness* – a term in Marxist theory describing when people are unable to perceive their real conditions of oppression because a dominant ideology (here, religious ideology) misleads them about their situation [40]. **False consciousness** is essentially a state where one's beliefs and identity (often shaped by institutions like church, media, etc.) prevent one from recognizing inequality and exploitation [40]. Religion, when co-opted by those in power, can contribute to this by teaching the populace that the worldly hierarchy is natural or divinely sanctioned and that questioning it is a moral transgression.

It's important to note that Marx did not entirely condemn religion; he recognized it as a "sigh of the oppressed" – in other words, a response to very real suffering that provides solace [39]. However, from a consciousness perspective, that solace can come at the cost of critical awareness. If, for example, a poor laborer finds hope in the belief that enduring hardship will earn heavenly reward, he might be less inclined to see the need for *earthly* changes like fair wages or labor rights. Organized religions often stress virtues like obedience, humility, and patience; taken in a certain light, these virtues align neatly with what an authoritarian or oligarchic system would want in its subjects: obedience (to authority), acceptance of one's place, and forbearance rather than revolt.

Additionally, religious institutions themselves can become part of the elite. Many major organized religions have accumulated vast wealth, property, and political influence. The Vatican (the Catholic Church) is both a religious authority and a wealthy entity owning priceless assets and real estate. Televangelists and mega-church leaders in some countries live lavishly, essentially forming a class of religious elites. These institutions have a vested interest in preserving their influence and often align with secular power structures. For instance, at various points churches have discouraged revolutionary movements or sided with the wealthy class, sometimes portraying social hierarchies as reflecting God's will (e.g., the idea that wealth is a sign of divine favor in some Protestant theologies, or that charity from the rich – rather than systemic change – is the proper remedy to poverty).

In terms of consciousness, this dynamic can **suppress questioning**. When people are taught from childhood to accept certain truths on faith and to revere authority figures (priests, imams, etc.), they may carry that habit of thought into other realms, perhaps being more deferential to political and economic authorities as well. Organized religion often deals in absolutist narratives (clear distinctions of good/evil, saved/damned) that can make people less inclined to embrace ambiguity or critical inquiry. In extreme cases, religious indoctrination can lead to the rejection of scientific or factual information that conflicts with dogma. While faith can be deeply personal and positive, institutional religion as a force has the potential to **channel human consciousness** into established grooves that support the existing social order. As one modern commentator bluntly observed, *"organized religion is a means of social warfare. Those in power in religion maintain wealth through that power, and create another separate ruling class…freely able to indoctrinate their constituents"* [41]. This view highlights that religious leaders themselves can become a ruling elite (a theocracy or simply a wealthy clergy), and their control over believers' minds can serve to uphold their own status and that of allied secular elites.

Of course, religion is not universally a force for suppression – many religious teachings also emphasize justice, compassion for the poor, and even liberation (liberation theology, for example, is a movement within the Catholic Church that explicitly sides with the poor against oppressive regimes). However, the **institutional** aspect of organized religion – its role as a long-standing authority in society – means it often has a stabilizing (conservative) effect on social consciousness. It provides meaning and community, but often within parameters that discourage radical change. In summary, organized religion can influence human consciousness by providing narratives that justify or soften the pain of inequality, by promoting moral frameworks that prioritize the next world over this one, and by inculcating obedience to authority. These effects can suppress the kind of critical, rebellious awareness that might otherwise arise in the face of exploitation.

Denial of Mortality and Collective Awareness

Humans are unique in our acute awareness of mortality – we know that we and everyone we love will eventually die. This awareness can be terrifying, and psychologists have long noted that people employ various defenses to cope with existential fear. A *widespread denial of death* pervades modern culture: we tend to avoid thinking about our mortality, distract ourselves from it, and often use cultural beliefs to soften or deflect the reality of it. This denial of mortality has profound implications for collective consciousness and behavior.

Ernest Becker, a cultural anthropologist, famously argued in *The Denial of Death* that much of human civilization is essentially a **"symbolic defense mechanism against the awareness of mortality."** [42] We engage in what he called "immortality projects" – efforts to create or be part of something that will outlast our own lifespan, thereby giving us a sense of enduring meaning [42]. These projects might include building great monuments or businesses, amassing lasting wealth, achieving fame, or even having children to carry on one's name. On a collective level, cultures develop grand narratives (such as religion, nationalism, or ideological causes) that allow individuals to feel they are contributing to something eternal or greater than themselves, which buffers the terror of knowing life is finite [43].

While these mechanisms can be motivating and help structure society, the downside is that denial of death can also **limit our awareness and willingness to confront truth.** When a society avoids the reality of mortality, it often avoids other uncomfortable truths as well, preferring comforting illusions. For instance, the consumerist pursuit of endless growth and accumulation can be seen partly as an immortality project – people subconsciously hoping that wealth will secure them (or at least symbolically immortalize them). If everyone is busy chasing status, distraction, and consumption to ward off existential anxiety, there is less collective attention available to question deeper issues like *"What is the purpose of our society?" or "Why are we tolerating gross injustices and environmental destruction?"* The denial of death encourages *denial in general* – of vulnerability, of interdependence, and of the fact that some day all our material pursuits will be nullified. Societies deep in denial may shy away from addressing long-term threats like climate change (which can be psychologically linked to mortality), instead favoring short-term gratification or avoidance.

Psychologically, there is a rich body of research known as **Terror Management Theory (TMT)** that shows when people are reminded of their mortality (*mortality salience*), they react in patterned ways to protect their worldview. Often, this means doubling down on their pre-existing beliefs and group identities as a shield against the terror of death. Studies have shown, for example, that subtle reminders of death (like asking someone to think about their own funeral) can increase their nationalism, religiosity, or hostility toward those who are different – essentially, people cling harder to their cultural worldviews and become less tolerant of challenges to those worldviews [44]. One famous set of experiments found that after being reminded of death, American participants became more favorable to charismatic or authoritarian leadership figures and more punitive toward perceived wrongdoers, suggesting that fear of mortality can make people seek security in strong leaders and clear answers [45] [46]. This means that *denial or fear of death can be exploited by demagogues* – by stoking existential fears (of death, of violence, of chaos), leaders can encourage the public to rally around them and not question their authority. It's a phenomenon that has been observed in times of crisis: for instance, after events that remind people of mass death (like wars or terrorist attacks), populations often show increased support for hardline policies or leaders, at least temporarily [45].

At a more mundane level, everyday denial of death leads people to focus on trivialities or personal gain in place of collective reflection. If a culture encourages constant youthfulness, cosmetic "cheating" of aging, euphemisms for death (passing away, etc.), and generally keeps death out of sight (sequestering the dying in hospitals, hiding the dead quickly via funerals), it creates an *artificial bubble* where life's finitude isn't fully grappled with. Without that perspective, it's arguably harder to achieve a **higher collective awareness** – the kind of wisdom that might prioritize long-term well-being over short-term interests. Many spiritual and philosophical traditions say that remembering mortality can bring compassion and clarity (e.g., the Stoic practice of *memento mori*, or Buddhist meditations on death). In contrast, a society in denial may chase endless productivity and competition, as if we had all the time in the world, thereby neglecting deeper human values and the common good.

In Becker's terms, when we deny death we often *project our fear outward* in unhealthy ways. For instance, we may scapegoat others (it's their fault we feel insecure) or become fixated on heroic triumphs (becoming "great" in career or war to transcend death in memory). These impulses can detract from a clear-eyed assessment of our shared mortality, which could otherwise unite people in humility. Widespread denial of death thus contributes to what the prompt calls a *"lower level of collective awareness."* People might collectively indulge in fantasies of invincibility – like civilizations acting as if resources are infinite or as if catastrophic risks (pandemics, climate catastrophes) are too abstract to worry about. Such denial-fueled hubris can be dangerous.

Conversely, confronting mortality can be very liberating and awareness-raising. Societies or groups that openly discuss and accept mortality (such as "death-positive" movements, hospice workers, or certain indigenous cultures) often report a greater sense of *community and priority* – knowing life is short can spur people to care for each other and focus on what truly matters, rather than getting lost in trivial pursuits or petty divisions. Unfortunately, the dominant global culture, driven by consumer capitalism, often encourages denial: encouraging people to buy products to appear young, to distract themselves with entertainment, and to avoid the topic of death. This keeps people in a kind of complacent or fearful state that is not fully conscious of the bigger picture.

In summary, the **denial of mortality** in modern societies contributes to a diminished collective awareness by encouraging delusional pursuits (immortality projects, excessive materialism) and by making people psychologically susceptible to manipulative forces. It suppresses deep existential inquiry and can prevent societies from making wise, long-term decisions. When combined with other institutional influences like religion or media, it forms part of an ideological environment that keeps people from "waking up" to certain realities – be it the injustice of inequality or the urgency of global threats. Only by overcoming denial – facing death calmly and seeing through comforting illusions – might society attain a higher level of awareness and solidarity, recognizing our common humanity and fragile existence on this planet.

Conclusion

The analysis above has drawn a comprehensive picture of how a very small elite – roughly the top 4% – owns and controls a hugely disproportionate share of the world's resources, and how this reality affects the rest of humanity. In the economic sphere, data shows an extreme concentration of wealth: a tiny minority holds the majority of global wealth and dominates critical sectors like finance, tech, energy, agriculture, real estate, and media. Specific influential families, individuals, and corporations were highlighted as examples of this concentration, from trillion-dollar tech giants to agribusiness families controlling the world's food supply. Such concentration of economic power has cascading impacts on social structures and opportunities.

For the broader population, the consequences of this inequality are profound. Psychologically, living in the shadow of vast inequality engenders stress, status anxiety, and mental health struggles, while fraying the social bonds of trust and community. Politically, inequality translates into a loss of voice and agency for ordinary people, as wealthy elites leverage their resources to shape policies and narratives in their favor, often sidelining the needs of the many. Socially, common people find themselves locked in fierce competition over limited jobs, housing, and services – a daily struggle that can breed frustration and conflict, especially when juxtaposed with the opulence of the few.

Moreover, the report delved into deeper cultural and consciousness-related factors. It examined how institutional forces like organized religion can mollify the masses with promise and meaning, but at the potential cost of discouraging critical awareness of worldly injustices – thus acting as a double-edged sword (both comfort and constraint). It also explored how the collective denial of mortality keeps society preoccupied with superficial pursuits and vulnerable to manipulation. In essence, by not squarely facing the reality of death, people may more readily accept illusion or authority, thereby reducing the potential for a more enlightened collective consciousness that might challenge the status quo.

Addressing these issues requires multi-faceted approaches. On the economic front, credible proposals include more progressive taxation, closing of tax loopholes, stronger antitrust enforcement to break up monopolies, and policies to empower workers (from raising minimum wages to supporting unions). Some movements call for democratizing the economy – for instance, encouraging cooperatives or public ownership in key sectors – so that resources are more broadly controlled. Politically, campaign finance reform and anti-corruption measures would help restore balance, as would greater transparency and inclusion in decision-making (participatory budgeting, citizen assemblies, etc.). Socially, massive investments in public goods – education, healthcare, housing – are needed to ensure everyone has a fair shot at a dignified life, thus narrowing the opportunity gap.

On the consciousness level, encouraging open dialogue about death and fostering *media and educational literacy* to immunize against propaganda can help raise collective awareness. Communities might benefit from spaces that blend the spiritual and the civic – for example, interfaith or secular groups focused on social justice, which use the moral force of religion to fight inequality rather than justify it. In other words, the very institutions that can suppress awareness can also, if reinterpreted, become sources of liberation (as seen in various progressive religious movements or philosophical schools that emphasize personal awakening and social responsibility).

Ultimately, bridging the vast chasm between the top 4% and the rest is not just an economic challenge but a moral and existential one. Extreme inequality is not only inefficient (wasting human potential and causing instability) but also poses ethical questions about what kind of world we want to live in. A more equitable distribution of resources would likely lead to healthier, happier societies – ones where psychological well-being improves, democracy is reinvigorated, and social cohesion is strengthened. It would also likely elevate our collective consciousness: a society that values each member enough to ensure a decent life for all is a society more in touch with fundamental human truths (our equality in birth and death, our interdependence, our shared stewardship of the planet).

The task ahead is enormous, but history provides examples of positive change – from the reduction of inequality in the post-war era in some countries, to civil rights movements, to international efforts like the Sustainable Development Goals aiming to reduce poverty and inequity. The first step is understanding and acknowledging the realities, as we have endeavored to do in this report using credible data and diverse perspectives. With awareness comes the impetus for action. By recognizing how the top 4% hold the reins of global resources and how that impacts everyone else, humanity can better strategize how to ensure that **resources and opportunities are more fairly shared**, that institutional powers serve the many and not just the few, and that a higher level of collective awareness – one that faces reality but aspires to justice – guides our progress.

Sources:

- Global wealth distribution data (United Nations University WIDER report; OECD): Richest 1% owned ~40% of assets (2000); top 10% owned 85% [1]. In 2012, top 0.6% held 39.3% and next 4.4% held 32.3% (so ~72% for top 5%), while bottom 95% had 28% [5]. Bottom half owned about 1% [4].
- Oxfam (2024) briefing: "The richest 1 percent have more wealth than the bottom 95 percent of the world's population" [3]; trend toward global oligarchy and billionaire-controlled corporations [22]. Top 1% own 43% of global financial assets; Big Three asset managers hold $20T (1/5 of investable assets) [47]; two companies control 40% of seed market [47].
- UBS Global Wealth Report (2023): In 2022, global top 1% owned 44.5% of wealth (up from ~35% in 2000) [2]; ~59 million millionaires worldwide (1.1% of adults) held 45.8% of wealth [48]. Middle segment (11.8% of adults) held ~39% [49], etc.
- VisualCapitalist/Statista: The top ~1% (1.1% of adults) hold ~45.8% of wealth (~$208 trillion); next ~12% hold ~39%; bottom 53% hold ~1.2% (based on Credit Suisse data) [48] [2].
- Example of land inequality: "Half of England is owned by less than 1% of the population… ~25,000 landowners (aristocracy and corporations) control half the country" [9]. Homeowners in total own only 5% of land [10]. Aristocracy still owns about 30% of England [50], corporations ~18%, public sector 8% [51] [52].
- Big Three ownership: A Harvard study found that BlackRock, Vanguard or State Street is the largest shareholder in 88% of S&P 500 firms [8]. These firms together own ~20% of an average S&P 500 company's stock (combined) [53].
- Media consolidation: "90% of US media is controlled by 6 companies" [18] (Business Insider, 2012). Major global media conglomerates listed by revenue [19].
- Agribusiness concentration: Cargill-MacMillan family owns 88% of Cargill Inc. (world's largest food company, $177B revenue) [14] [15]. Four firms (ABCD) control 70–90% of global grain trade [13]. Cargill family fortune ~$50B and 14 family members are billionaires [16] [54].
- Psychological and social effects of inequality: Wilkinson & Pickett (2017) – more unequal societies have higher rates of mental illness and "status anxiety" across all classes [23] [24]. Inequality increases dominance behavior in some (narcissism) and submissiveness in others (depression) [25]. Trust is much lower in unequal societies (20% vs 60% trust most people) [26]. Community participation falls and violence rises with inequality [28]. People in unequal societies work longer, borrow more, and consume more status goods (to signal worth) [29].
- Political influence: Gilens & Page (2014) – "average citizens and mass-based interest groups have little or no independent influence" on U.S. policy, whereas economic elites and business interests have significant influence [55] [30]. Essentially, the median voter's preference is often ignored if it conflicts with elite interests [30].
- Campaign finance: Just 12 top donors accounted for 7.5% of all US federal political donations (2009–2020, totaling $3.4B) [31]. The top 100 donors gave 25% of all funding (Issue One report) [56]. This shows the outsized role of billionaire donors in politics.
- Marx on religion: "Religion is the opium of the people… the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world…" [39] – suggesting religion provides illusory comfort to oppressed people.
- False consciousness: People's inability to recognize oppression due to pervasive ideology that legitimizes the status quo [40]. Often attributed to dominant institutions (education, religion, media) in Marxist thought.

- Ernest Becker – *Denial of Death*: Human civilization is a symbolic defense against death; people pursue "immortality projects" to cope [42]. We deny death to control our anxiety [57].
- Terror Management Theory: Reminders of mortality cause people to reinforce their cultural worldviews and biases. For instance, mortality salience increases religiosity and prejudice: *"Thoughts of death have also been found to increase religious beliefs… even for people who claim to be nonreligious."* [44]. Landau et al. (2004) found mortality salience increased support for then-President George W. Bush (a charismatic leader) in U.S. studies [45]. Other studies found similar effects with different leaders and groups [58]. Essentially, fear of death can lead to greater conformity, authoritarianism, or aggression against "outsiders," all of which can be manipulated by those in power.
- Overall, the sources paint a consistent picture that extreme inequality is entrenched and self-perpetuating, but also that understanding these patterns is the first step toward change.

[1] [3] [47] [9] [26] [30] [39] [42]

---

[1] [4] [5] [7] Distribution of wealth - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Distribution_of_wealth

[2] [48] [49] ubs.com
https://www.ubs.com/global/en/family-office-uhnw/reports/global-wealth-report-2023/_jcr_content/mainpar/toplevelgrid_5684475_1708633751/col1/innergrid/xcol1/actionbutton_copy_co.1784379955.file/PS9jb250ZW50L2RhbS9hc3NldHMvd20vZ2xvYmFsL2ltZy9nbG9iYWwtZmFtaWx5LW9mZmljZS9kb2NzL2d3ci0yMDIzLWVuLTIucGRm/gwr-2023-en-2.pdf

[3] [6] [21] [22] [32] [33] [34] [35] [38] [47] World's top 1% own more wealth than 95% of humanity, as "the shadow of global oligarchy hangs over UN General Assembly," says Oxfam | Oxfam International
https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/worlds-top-1-own-more-wealth-95-humanity-shadow-global-oligarchy-hangs-over-un

[8] S1469356917000064jra 298..326
https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/30AD689509AAD62F5B677E916C28C4B6/S1469356917000064a.pdf/hidden-power-of-the-big-three-passive-index-funds-re-concentration-of-corporate-ownership-and-new-financial-risk.pdf

[9] [10] [36] [37] [50] [51] [52] Half of England is owned by less than 1% of the population | Property | The Guardian
https://www.theguardian.com/money/2019/apr/17/who-owns-england-thousand-secret-landowners-author

[11] FAANG Stocks: Investing in the Future of Tech
https://www.businessinsider.com/personal-finance/investing/what-is-faang

[12] 10 Biggest Oil Companies
https://www.investopedia.com/articles/personal-finance/010715/worlds-top-10-oil-companies.asp

[13] [14] [15] [54] The Cargill-MacMillans Legacy of Secrets
https://burninglegacy.org/legacy/a-legacy-of-secrets/

[16] [17] Soaring food prices push more Cargill family members on to world's richest 500 list | The super-rich | The Guardian
https://www.theguardian.com/news/2022/apr/17/soaring-food-prices-push-more-cargill-family-members-on-to-world-richest-500-list

[18] Media Consolidation in the U.S. - Fake News, Fact-checking, and Bias
https://tacomacc.libguides.com/fakenews/media

[19] [20] Concentration of media ownership - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Concentration_of_media_ownership

[23] [24] [25] [26] [27] [28] [29] How Inequality Endangers Our Mental Health
https://inequality.org/article/inequality-endangers-mental-health/

[30] [55] Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites, Interest Groups, and Average Citizens | Perspectives on Politics | Cambridge Core
https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/testing-theories-of-american-politics-elites-interest-groups-and-average-citizens/62327F513959D0A304D4893B382B992B

[31] 'Get big money out of politics': Same 12 'mega donors' discovered to ...
https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/us-election-donors-bloomberg-b1836684.html

[39] [41] Karl Marx on Religion – Marquette University Law School Faculty Blog
https://law.marquette.edu/facultyblog/2015/01/karl-marx-on-religion/comment-page-1/

[40] False consciousness | Definition, Examples, & Facts | Britannica
https://www.britannica.com/topic/false-consciousness

[42] [43] [57] The Denial of Death: Listen to Ernest Becker's Final Interview - TalkDeath
https://talkdeath.com/the-denial-of-death-listen-to-ernest-beckers-final-interview/

[44] Terror management theory - Wikipedia
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Terror_management_theory

[45] [PDF] The Impact of Mortality Salience on Implicit Leadership Theories
https://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1114&context=jepson-faculty-publications

[46] You're Hired! Mortality Salience Increases Americans' Support for ...
https://spssi.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/asap.12143

[53] How "Big Three" Blackrock, Vanguard & State Street have amassed ...
https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/how-big-three-blackrock-vanguard-state-street-have-amassed-shah-es6jf

[56] Outsized Influence - Issue One
https://issueone.org/articles/outsized-influence-12-political-megadonors-are-responsible-for-1-of-every-13-in-federal-elections-since-citizens-united-and-25-of-all-giving-from-the-top-100-zip-codes-a-total-of-3-4-bil/

[58] The Effects of Mortality Salience and Reminders of 9/11 on Support ...
https://scholarship.libraries.rutgers.edu/esploro/outputs/journalArticle/Deliver-us-from-Evil-The-Effects-of-Mortality-Salience-and-Reminders-of-911-on-Support-for-President-George-W-Bush/991031550006104646