

Value Creation, Labor Distribution, and Frontier Innovation: An Economic Assessment of Jeff Bezos's Fortune

Tin Yan Alexandra Chiu

*Ho Fung College, Hong Kong, China
alexandrachiu30@gmail.com*

Abstract. This study assesses whether Jeff Bezos's wealth was accumulated at the expense of Amazon customers, employees, neither, or both. It combines stakeholder-welfare analysis with theories of property rights, capital accumulation, labor-market power, and creative destruction. The evidence indicates that Amazon generated substantial consumer surplus through product variety, convenience, logistics, and lower search costs, while creating many jobs and offering hourly pay above the federal wage floor. However, consumer benefits coexist with allegations of anticompetitive conduct, and relatively high wages coexist with injury risks, work intensity, and unequal access to equity-based gains. Bezos's fortune primarily reflects founder ownership in a rapidly appreciating frontier firm rather than a direct transfer from customers or employees. Yet the distribution of the resulting surplus is highly unequal because capital owners capture scalable gains from innovation while frontline labor receives mainly fixed compensation. The most defensible conclusion is therefore that Bezos did not become rich through a simple zero-sum extraction from either group, but neither did all stakeholders share proportionately in the value created.

Keywords: Amazon, Jeff Bezos, labor markets, consumer welfare, wealth inequality

1. Introduction

"You cannot continue to pay your workers starvation wages," said Bernie Sanders, the most prominent and consistent critic of Amazon [1]. Jeff Bezos, with a net worth of \$271.5 billion, has sparked intense debate about the ethics of modern capitalism [2]. Critics argue that his fortune came at the expense of customers and employees, while supporters point to the value and employment Amazon has brought. Indeed, the story of Bezos's wealth involves more than a narrow zero-sum sense. This study evaluates Bezos's wealth through three linked mechanisms. First, it examines the value Amazon created for customers and the limits imposed by platform power. Second, it compares employee gains from wages and employment with costs related to safety, intensity, and unequal bargaining power. Third, it analyzes why founder ownership in a frontier firm can generate wealth far more rapidly than labor income. The central conclusion is that Bezos's fortune cannot be explained as a simple transfer from customers or employees. Amazon created substantial new value, and much of the founder's wealth arose from the appreciation of an equity claim on that value. Nevertheless, the distribution of gains was highly unequal, and some costs were borne by workers and potentially by competition.

2. Literature review

2.1. Capitalism, property rights, and accumulation

Classical and institutional theories explain why entrepreneurial wealth can arise without a direct loss to trading partners. Adam Smith argued that exchange coordinated through self-interest can generate mutual gains when transactions are voluntary and competition constrains private power [3]. North later emphasized that secure property rights and predictable institutions make long-term investment possible by allowing individuals to retain returns from innovation and exchange [4]. Under this framework, Bezos's wealth is not primarily a wage paid by customers or deducted from employees' pay. It is the market value of an ownership claim created and protected by corporate and property law.

Weber's account of the spirit of capitalism adds a cultural dimension. Systematic reinvestment, disciplined organization, and the treatment of economic activity as a vocation helped legitimate accumulation as evidence of rational conduct rather than mere consumption [5]. Amazon's history of reinvesting cash flow in logistics, software, infrastructure, and new business lines fits this model. Yet the same institutional and cultural arrangements can produce outcomes that appear morally disproportionate. Karl Marx emphasized the separation between workers, who sell labor power, and owners, who retain the residual value generated by production [6]. Piketty's analysis similarly shows that when returns on capital exceed the growth of labor income, existing asset ownership can produce persistent concentration [7]. These perspectives do not establish that every return to capital is exploitative, but they explain why value creation and unequal distribution can occur simultaneously.

2.2. Innovation, competition, and consumer welfare

Entrepreneurs are many, but Bezos is the only one. Capital accumulation and ownership in different resources exacerbate income inequality within social classes, but they do not fully explain why Bezos can generate more wealth than other entrepreneurs. Schumpeter described capitalist development as creative destruction. Innovators earn temporary rents by replacing less efficient technologies and business models, while the resulting disruption reallocates resources across firms and industries [8]. Aghion, Antonin, and Bunel extend this idea through the distinction between frontier and laggard firms. Firms near the technological frontier have strong incentives to innovate in order to escape competition, but successful incumbents may later attempt to protect their rents by restricting entry [9]. This tension is central to Amazon. The same innovations that generated convenience and scale can also create network effects, data advantages, and infrastructure dependencies that make competition more difficult.

3. Economic assessment

3.1. Analytical framework

The assessment uses a stakeholder analysis framework. Customer welfare includes price, quality, selection, search costs, delivery time, reliability, and the future effects of competition. Employee welfare includes pay, benefits, job availability, safety, work intensity, advancement, and bargaining power. Bezos's gain is measured as the increase in the value of his ownership claim, not as the company's revenue or the total wages paid by Amazon. Under this framework, coexistence is

possible: customers may gain, workers may gain on some dimensions and lose on others, and the founder may capture a much larger absolute gain because equity returns scale with the entire firm.

3.2. Customer welfare and market power

The strongest argument against the claim that Bezos became rich at customers' expense is revealed preference combined with the economic value of convenience. Consumers repeatedly chose Amazon despite the availability of alternative retailers. The platform reduced the time required to compare products, expanded access to niche goods, and integrated ordering, payment, delivery, entertainment, and cloud-enabled services. Earlier evidence from online bookselling suggests that product variety alone can produce large welfare gains [10]. Amazon's fulfillment network also exhibits economies of scale, as facilities and demand become geographically denser, average delivery costs fall and faster delivery becomes more economical. These cost reductions can be shared with consumers through lower prices, improved reliability, and broader service coverage.

Amazon's current scale also reflects sustained investment rather than a single act of appropriation. In 2025, the company recorded \$108.5 billion in technology and infrastructure expenses and \$109.1 billion in fulfillment expenses [11]. These categories include research, product development, data centers, logistics systems, and the staffing of fulfillment and customer-service operations. Such spending does not prove that every business practice benefits consumers, but it shows that the consumer proposition depends on costly, replicable capabilities rather than pure rent extraction.

However, voluntary use does not by itself rule out customer harm. Digital platforms can become difficult to avoid because network effect. Buyers attract sellers, sellers attract buyers, and accumulated data improve search and recommendation systems. The Federal Trade Commission's complaint alleges that Amazon has used practices that prevent sellers from offering lower prices elsewhere and that its conduct raises costs for both sellers and shoppers [12]. Although Amazon has not been finally adjudicated a monopoly in litigation, a major competition authority has formally alleged monopolization. The economic implication is that present consumer surplus may coexist with risks to long-run competition.

The balance of evidence nevertheless makes a broad claim of customer exploitation difficult to sustain. Amazon's growth depended on customers perceiving continuing value in price, selection, speed, or service. A platform that transferred value only away from consumers would be unlikely to generate such persistent adoption in contested retail markets. The more defensible criticism is conditional. Amazon may have created considerable consumer surplus while using part of the resulting scale to protect its position, and influence the distribution of future surplus. This is a competition-policy concern, but it is not equivalent to saying that Bezos's wealth was financed by making customers worse off.

3.3. Employee compensation, employment, and working conditions

Contrary to claims of widespread worker exploitation, Amazon offers competitive compensation that exceeds the US retail industry standards. In 2018, the company set a \$15 minimum wage and publicly challenged competitors to match it [13]. By 2025, average hourly pay for fulfillment and transportation workers rose above \$23, with total compensation exceeding \$30 per hour, which is more than four times the federal minimum of \$7.25 [14]. The median US Amazon full-time worker earned \$47,990 in 2025, well above Walmart's \$29,469 and Target's \$27,090 [15, 16]. Amazon has also been an engine of job creation. The company directly employs over 1.57 million people

globally, with independent research documenting a job multiplier effect of 1.9. For every 10 direct jobs Amazon creates, 9 additional indirect jobs emerge in local communities. Counties with Amazon investment see an average 1.7% increase in employment-to-population ratio, lifting local economies [17].

Unfortunately, laborers' wage do not reflect their efficiency gains. Amazon's revenue surged 39.4% from 2022 to 2025 alongside inventory turnover reaching 10.14 in 2025, driven by 25% reduction in processing times from automation in fulfillment operations outpacing human labor. However, fulfillment workers experienced only 35% cumulative wage growth over 3 years, amid injury rate of over 30% above industry averages, revealing how labors' efficiency gains do not necessarily mean higher income [18-20].

Return on capital outpaces wage growth. Piketty states that "the rate of return on capital exceeds the economic growth rate [7]." Once top executives earn higher incomes than ordinary workers, they can save a portion of their income, build larger capital stocks, and convert wages into capital ownership, thereby feeding long-run wealth concentration. In other words, wealth generates more wealth. 90% of Bezos's fortune lies in his Amazon stock holdings, which generated \$229.4 billion as capital returns until January 2026 [21, 22]. Although Restricted Stock Units (RSUs) are awarded to workers as part of an internal compensation package, only a limited number of workers are eligible. More specifically, since 2018, hourly warehouse associates have been excluded from RSUs to fund their \$15/hour minimum wage, meaning lower-income employees have been excluded from capital gains [23]. Even though higher-level employees receive RSUs as compensation, the shares vest in a hierarchical way. RSUs reinforce the gap between high-level and low-level employees, since RSUs tie wealth creation to capital owners rather than to ordinary labor.

3.4. Frontier innovation and the source of Bezos's wealth

Amazon started as an online bookstore in 1994, directly challenging the leader of physical bookstores, Barnes & Noble, which had a 25% market share at the time [24]. Physical bookstores often had rigid prices because their selection was limited by shelf space. Amazon broke these constraints by offering an online catalog of millions of titles, far exceeding the selection of others. This innovation triggered rapid market restructuring. Thereafter, Amazon's net sales surged by 10,346%, rising from \$15.7 million to \$1.64 billion between 1996 and 1999, while Barnes & Noble's sales grew only 22.4%, from \$2.45 billion to over \$3 billion [25, 26]. Barnes & Noble was unable to keep pace with Amazon's digital innovation.

Subsequently, Amazon began expanding into other retail categories, transforming itself into "The Everything Store" in the early 2000s and breaking the geographical constraints of traditional brick-and-mortar retailers [27]. It soon meets its rival, the Walmart. Amazon persisted. It introduced another innovation as opening its platform to third-party sellers, increasing its net sales from \$1.64 billion to \$6.921 billion from 1999 to 2004, exceeding eBay's (\$3.27 billion) but still less than Walmart's (\$259 billion). This innovative ecosystem created a self-reinforcing virtuous cycle. Thanks to the network effect, in 2025, Amazon had an annual net sales of \$716.92 billion in the US retail sector, outpacing Walmart's \$713.16 billion [28].

Cloud computing further changed its economic character. Amazon Web Services converted internal computing capabilities into a commercial infrastructure platform and became a major source of operating income. Industry estimates placed Amazon's share of cloud infrastructure services at approximately 29% in 2025, ahead of Microsoft and Google [29]. Cloud computing is not a transfer from Amazon warehouse employees or retail customers, but a separate innovation whose global revenue contributed to the market value of the company and therefore to the wealth of its founder.

The frontier-firm framework explains why the reward can be exceptionally large. Innovation produces rents because a successful firm temporarily offers capabilities that rivals cannot match. When the innovation is digital or organizational, the same system can serve millions of users at a declining average cost. The value of the founder's equity claim can therefore rise much faster than the wage of any individual employee. Amazon's 2026 proxy statement notes that Bezos receives a salary of \$81,840 and no additional annual compensation because of his substantial ownership stake [30]. His wealth is consequently tied to the capitalized expectation of Amazon's future profits rather than to an unusually large salary extracted from current operations.

This mechanism is economically distinct from a claim of personal exploitation, but it remains distributionally consequential. Amazon's 2025 financial statements recorded \$19.5 billion in stock-based compensation across the company [11], yet equity awards are concentrated among corporate, technical, and managerial employees rather than evenly distributed across the workforce. Founder shares participate in the entire increase in market capitalization, while most frontline employees receive wages and benefits that do not automatically rise with the firm's valuation. The result is a very large divergence between value creation and the ownership of claims on that value.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Did customers or employees finance Bezos's wealth at their own expense

The evidence does not support a general conclusion that customers and employees were made worse off so that Bezos could become rich. Amazon offers consumers lower prices, a wider product selection, and greater convenience, while providing employees with millions of jobs and competitive pay that outperforms that of other retail firms. Bezos's wealth stems from managing productive resources and relentless innovation, a combination shared by other Silicon Valley entrepreneurs. Though concerns over labor conditions and wealth inequality remain, labeling Bezos's success as exploitative overlooks tangible benefits to consumers and staff. Ultimately, his fortune comes from entrepreneurship, market value creation, and capitalist opportunity, instead of exploitation.

4.2. Value creation and distributional fairness

The central analytical result is that value creation and distributional fairness are separate. Amazon can increase total surplus while allocating a disproportionate share of the gains to capital owners. Property rights make this outcome legally coherent. Founders and shareholders bear risk and hold the residual claim. Innovation theory makes it economically coherent, as frontier firms can generate temporary rents as a reward for creating new technologies and organizational systems. The resulting inequality is predictable because capital gains compound across the entire asset base, while labor income remains linked to hours, occupation, and bargaining power.

This distinction also clarifies the role of public policy. Competition policy should focus on exclusionary conduct and the preservation of entry, not punish scale that results from superior products. Labor regulation should focus on safety, transparent productivity standards, mobility, and bargaining conditions, not assume that a high wage resolves every workplace concern. Tax and corporate-governance policy can address the unequal distribution of capital gains without denying that innovation created genuine social value. Broader employee profit-sharing or equity participation could allow workers to share more directly in productivity and valuation gains, although such arrangements would introduce risk and should not replace secure wages and benefits.

The original binary question therefore conceals a layered answer. Bezos did not become wealthy simply because customers overpaid or because employees received nothing of value. His wealth was generated primarily by owning a large share of a firm that created new services, achieved scale, and entered high-value technological markets. Yet the institutions that assign residual gains to owners ensured that the founder captured far more of the upside than ordinary workers, while some operational costs were borne by employees and some competitive risks were borne by customers and rivals. The outcome is better described as unequal surplus distribution within a value-creating enterprise than as pure extraction or pure meritocratic reward.

5. Conclusions

This study assessed whether Jeff Bezos became rich at the expense of Amazon's customers, employees, neither, or both. The evidence rejects a simple zero-sum interpretation. Amazon generated substantial customer benefits through selection, convenience, logistics, and digital infrastructure. It also created a large number of jobs and offered compensation that, according to the company, exceeds the federal wage floor by a wide margin. Bezos's extraordinary wealth arose mainly from founder ownership in a firm whose market value expanded through innovation, scale, network effects, and the growth of cloud computing. These mechanisms created value rather than merely transferring a fixed stock of wealth from customers or employees.

While it is insisted that Bezos did not build his success on exploiting customers and workers, concerns about the broader cultural narratives that normalize the ever-widening wealth gap should remain. Too often, the stories about celebrating business heroes like Bezos overshadow the contributions of the ordinary workers who not only power Amazon's operations but also sustain the infrastructure, public systems, and communities that make such innovation possible. In this way, the very system that rewards frontier innovation and competitive capitalism also risks devaluing the collective labor that underpins all economic growth.

The analysis has several limitations. Public data do not permit a precise counterfactual estimate of customer surplus, employee welfare, or the share of Amazon's valuation attributable to particular labor practices. Company disclosures, government investigations, and academic models measure different outcomes and sometimes reflect competing institutional perspectives. Future research could combine transaction-level prices, worker-level compensation and injury data, local labor-market alternatives, and changes in platform fees to estimate the distribution of Amazon's surplus more rigorously. Such evidence would make it possible to distinguish more precisely between legitimate entrepreneurial rents, returns to market power, and costs shifted to workers or consumers.

References

- [1] Kelly, C. (2018, October 3). Bernie Sanders praises Jeff Bezos on Amazon \$15 minimum wage. *CNN*.
- [2] Forbes 2026 billionaires list - The richest people in the world ranked. (n.d.). *Forbes*.
<https://www.forbes.com/billionaires/>
- [3] Smith, A. (1991). *Wealth of nations*. Great Minds.
- [4] North, D. C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. In Cambridge University Press eBooks.
- [5] Weber, M. (2005). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Routledge.
- [6] Marx, K. (2012). *Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844*. Courier Corporation.
- [7] Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Harvard University Press.
- [8] Schumpeter, J. A. (2013). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. Routledge. (Original work published 1942)
- [9] Aghion, P., Antonin, C., & Bunel, S. (2021). *The power of creative destruction: Economic upheaval and the wealth of nations*. Belknap Press.

- [10] Brynjolfsson, E., Hu, Y. J., & Smith, M. D. (2003). Consumer surplus in the digital economy: Estimating the value of increased product variety at online booksellers. *Management Science*, 49(11), 1580-1596.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.49.11.1580.20580>
- [11] Amazon.com, Inc. (2026). Annual report for the fiscal year ended December 31, 2025 (Form 10-K). U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1018724/000101872426000004/amzn-20251231.htm>
- [12] Federal Trade Commission. (2023, September 26). FTC sues Amazon for illegally maintaining monopoly power. <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/09/ftc-sues-amazon-illegally-maintaining-monopoly-power>
- [13] Perez, S. (2019, April 11). Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos challenges rival retailers to raise their minimum wages, too. *TechCrunch*. <https://techcrunch.com/2019/04/11/amazon-ceo-jeff-bezos-challenges-rival-retailers-to-raise-their-minimum-wages-too/>
- [14] Sumrall, F. (2025, September 17). Amazon raises worker pay to \$23 an hour, invests \$1B in wages and benefits. *Yahoo News*. <https://www.yahoo.com/news/articles/amazon-raises-worker-pay-23-153153566.html>
- [15] Reuter, D. (2025, November 2). *How much the typical worker makes at 30 top retailers, from Amazon to Walmart*. Business Insider. <https://www.businessinsider.com/how-much-retail-jobs-pay-at-amazon-costco-walmart-2025-11>
- [16] Shibu, S. (2025, July 23). How much do Amazon employees make? Salaries revealed. *Entrepreneur*. <https://www.entrepreneur.com/business-news/how-much-do-amazon-employees-make-salaries-revealed/494974>
- [17] Amazon. (2024). *2024 Amazon Annual Report*. Amazon.com, Inc. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1018724/000110465925033453/tm254123d4_ars.pdf
- [18] Taylor, G. (2026, April 30). *One million robots in, Amazon's automation ambitions are just heating up*. Yahoo Finance. <https://finance.yahoo.com/sectors/technology/articles/one-million-robots-amazon-automation-183547807.html>
- [19] Madan, U. (2025, September 17). *Amazon raises pay, lowers health insurance costs for US fulfillment and transportation employees*. *Amazon News*. <https://www.aboutamazon.com/news/workplace/amazon-wage-increase-2025-fulfillment-transportation-employees>
- [20] Sherman, N. (2024, December 16). Amazon aware of warehouse injury risk, Senate report finds. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/clyjm507462o>
- [21] Sandler, R. (2021, June 28). *Here's how much money Jeff Bezos has reaped from selling Amazon stock*. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/rachelsandler/2021/06/24/heres-how-much-money-jeff-bezos-has-reaped-from-selling-amazon-stock/>
- [22] Richmond, T., & Richmond, T. (2026, January 16). *Who owns Amazon? 12 major AMZN shareholders in 2025*. *TIKR.com*. <https://www.tikr.com/blog/who-owns-amazon-15-major-amzn-shareholders-in-2025>
- [23] Kim, E. (2018, October 4). *Amazon's hourly workers lose monthly bonuses and stock awards as minimum wage increases*. *CNBC*. <https://www.cnn.com/2018/10/03/amazon-hourly-workers-lose-monthly-bonuses-stock-awards.html>
- [24] Hartmans, A. (2023, February 19). *The rise and fall — and rise again — of Barnes & Noble*. *Business Insider*. <https://www.businessinsider.com/barnes-and-noble-history-bookstore-amazon-feud-rise-and-fall-2023-2#barnes-and-noble-can-trace-its-roots-back-to-1873-when-charles-barnes-opened-a-bookselling-business-out-of-his-home-in-wheaton-illinois-over-40-years-later-his-son-william-moved-to-new-york-city-and-joined-forces-with-g-clifford-noble-establishing-barnes-and-noble-1>
- [25] Amazon. (2024, July 16). *Amazon's investment in local U.S. communities boosts job numbers, improves household income*. *Amazon News*. <https://www.aboutamazon.com/news/community/household-income-and-job-numbers-go-up-when-amazon-invests-in-local-communities-a-new-study-says>
- [26] Faithfull, M. (2026, March 5). *How Barnes & Noble made a comeback*. *The Robin Report*. <https://therobinreport.com/how-barnes-noble-made-a-comeback/>
- [27] Stone, B. (2021). *Amazon unbound*.
- [28] Jadeja, V. (2026, April 11). *Amazon vs. Walmart: The retail war just picked a winner*. Yahoo Finance. <https://finance.yahoo.com/markets/stocks/articles/amazon-vs-walmart-retail-war-133913276.html>
- [29] Synergy Research Group. (2025). *Cloud market share trends - Big Three together hold 63% while Oracle and the Neoclouds inch higher* | *Synergy Research Group*. <https://www.srgresearch.com/articles/cloud-market-share-trends-big-three-together-hold-63-while-oracle-and-the-neoclouds-inch-higher>
- [30] Amazon.com, Inc. (2026). 2026 proxy statement (Schedule 14A). U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1018724/000110465926041026/tm261382-1_def14a.htm