The Assumption of Surplus: Startup Culture, Advertising Economies, and the Boundary Conditions of Growth

Flyxion

February 15, 2026

Abstract

Contemporary startup culture and advertising-based business models present themselves as universally applicable engines of innovation and opportunity. This essay argues that such models presuppose a condition of systemic surplus that is neither historically stable nor socially universalizable. Venture-backed growth, platform advertising, and gig-mediated labor operate under implicit boundary conditions of capital abundance, infrastructural subsidy, and consumer liquidity. When these conditions are absent, the celebrated dynamics of entrepreneurial expansion degrade into precarity, risk externalization, and gradient amplification within social systems. The essay proceeds from economic and institutional analysis toward a structural-dynamical model in which surplus functions as an external forcing term that sustains metastable concentrations of capital and influence. By identifying surplus as a hidden axiom of growth discourse, this work challenges the normative claim that startup logic can serve as a general template for social organization. Drawing on political economy frameworks from Marx to contemporary theorists of financialization, we demonstrate that entrepreneurial singularities represent thermodynamically unstable configurations requiring continuous energy injection to persist against entropic dissipation.

Contents

1 Introduction

Startup culture occupies a privileged position within contemporary economic imagination. It is invoked as a paradigm of agility, innovation, and meritocratic ascent (Ries, 2011; Thiel and Masters, 2014). Advertising-funded platforms are framed as efficient allocators of attention and demand (Zuboff, 2019). Together, these institutional forms are frequently presented as natural expressions of technological progress and market efficiency.

Yet beneath their celebratory rhetoric lies an unexamined premise: the availability of surplus. Venture-backed firms assume deployable capital sufficient to absorb extended periods of loss (Kenney and Patton, 2011; Rin et al., 2013). Advertising-driven platforms assume consumers possess discretionary income responsive to behavioral nudging (Turow, 2011). Founders are expected to endure prolonged income instability, often buffered by prior savings, family support, or access to credit (Shane, 2008). These assumptions rarely appear explicitly in growth narratives, but they function as structural preconditions.

The present essay advances a central claim: startup culture and advertising-based business models are not universalizable economic forms. They depend upon surplus conditions that cannot be generalized across entire populations without generating systemic fragility. What appears as entrepreneurial dynamism under high-surplus regimes becomes volatility and risk displacement under constraint.

This analysis builds upon classical political economy's attention to accumulation dynamics (Marx, 1867), contemporary critiques of financialization (Krippner, 2011; Lapavitsas, 2013), and recent work on platform capitalism (Srnicek, 2017). We extend these frameworks by formalizing the thermodynamic properties of capital concentration under varying surplus regimes, demonstrating that entrepreneurial attractors represent low-entropy states maintained far from equilibrium.

2 Surplus as Structural Precondition

2.1 Defining Surplus in Economic Space

Surplus, in this analysis, does not denote wealth in the abstract. It refers to discretionary margin within constraint space: capital not immediately required for subsistence, infrastructure already amortized by public investment, and consumer

purchasing power beyond essential expenditure (Kalecki, 1971; Baran and Sweezy, 1957).

Three layers of surplus are operative, each corresponding to a distinct stratum of the accumulation process.

Investor surplus consists in capital pools seeking high-yield deployment. Venture capital tolerates extended negative cash flow in expectation of future concentration (Gompers and Lerner, 2001). This tolerance allows firms to operate below cost, subsidizing growth through external injection. The institutional structure of limited partnerships, carried interest, and sequential funding rounds creates a temporal arbitrage in which present losses are exchanged for anticipated monopoly rents (Lazonick, 2013).

Consumer surplus consists in disposable income or credit elasticity that can be mobilized through advertising. Platforms convert attention into purchasing impulses only when purchasing capacity exists (Foster, 2014). The aggregate demand necessary for advertising-based revenue models presupposes not merely attention scarcity but monetary liquidity across consumer populations. When this liquidity derives from credit expansion rather than wage growth, the system becomes dependent on debt service capacity (Keen, 2017).

Institutional surplus consists in stable infrastructure—transport networks, digital communications, legal enforcement, educational systems—whose costs are socialized while returns are privatized (Mazzucato, 2015). The reproducibility of labor power itself depends upon a vast subsidization apparatus spanning public health, education, and social insurance (Fraser, 2016). Startup narratives rarely acknowledge these layered supports. Instead, growth trajectories are narrated as endogenous achievements of innovation and effort.

The hidden axiom is that surplus is available to absorb error, failure, and experimentation. This assumption structures the entire logic of portfolio diversification, minimum viable products, and rapid iteration cycles (Blank, 2013).

2.2 Historical Contingency of Surplus Conditions

Surplus conditions are not transhistorical constants but regime-specific configurations. The postwar expansion in core capitalist economies (1945–1973) featured high labor productivity growth, rising real wages, expanding credit access, and substantial public infrastructure investment (Brenner, 2006). These conditions supported both consumer

demand stability and capital accumulation.

The subsequent period (1973–present) exhibits wage stagnation, credit expansion compensating for income constraints, financialization of corporate strategy, and infrastructure underinvestment (Piketty, 2014; Hudson, 2012). Venture capital emerged as a structural response to declining industrial profit rates, seeking asymmetric returns through technological monopolization (Arrighi, 2010).

Contemporary startup culture thus inherits a specific historical configuration: abundant liquidity seeking yield, consumer demand sustained through debt, and concentrated wealth enabling angel investment and family support for founders. These are not natural features of market economies but artifacts of financialized accumulation regimes.

3 Advertising as Gradient Amplification

3.1 Information Asymmetry and Behavioral Extraction

Advertising-based platforms operate not merely as intermediaries but as gradient amplifiers. They harvest informational asymmetries, convert them into targeted persuasion, and stimulate demand differentials across populations (Pasquale, 2015).

Classical advertising theory posited informational efficiency: ads reduce search costs and match products to preferences (Stigler, 1961). Digital platforms invert this logic. Rather than revealing existing preferences, they engineer preference formation through microtargeted interventions (Yeung, 2017).

The algorithmic architecture extracts behavioral surplus—traces of attention, affect, and action—and converts them into predictive models (Zuboff, 2019). These models do not merely predict behavior but shape it, creating feedback loops in which platform design increasingly determines the object it purports to measure.

3.2 Credit Expansion and Demand Sustainability

Under conditions of consumer liquidity, this process appears benign or even efficient. Advertising matches available purchasing power to product offerings. However, where purchasing power is constrained, advertising shifts from matching demand to manufacturing aspiration.

Credit expansion substitutes for income growth (Cynamon and Fazzari, 2011). Households absorb volatility through debt accumulation, servicing obligations from stagnant wages. The advertising industry thus presupposes not static consumer budgets but elastic credit access.

As debt-to-income ratios rise, the marginal utility of additional advertising declines while systemic fragility increases. Defaults propagate through credit markets, precipitating contractions that reduce consumer surplus further (Mian and Sufi, 2014). The gradient amplification that appeared sustainable under credit expansion becomes destabilizing under debt saturation.

Advertising thus presupposes a buffer against induced demand. Absent such buffer, the extraction of attention becomes decoupled from material capacity, producing cycles of indebtedness and instability. The apparent frictionlessness of platform economies depends on a background of discretionary margin that is neither infinite nor self-replenishing.

3.3 Monopolization Dynamics and Rent Extraction

Platform advertising models exhibit strong network effects and economies of scale, producing winner-take-most outcomes (Srnicek, 2017). Once established, dominant platforms extract rents through attention monopolization and data accumulation (Durand, 2017).

This monopolization represents a transfer from consumer surplus to platform equity. The competitive process that ostensibly justifies venture losses culminates in market concentration that enables surplus extraction. The social efficiency claims for advertising—better matching, lower search costs—erode as monopoly power increases (Stiglitz, 2017).

4 Entrepreneurial Ideology as Historical Formation

4.1 From Bourgeois Enterprise to Venture-Backed Acceleration

The figure of the entrepreneur predates the contemporary startup ecosystem. Classical political economy situated the entrepreneur within processes of capital circulation and productive coordination (Marx, 1867). The nineteenth-century bourgeois enterprise

operated within tangible industrial constraints: fixed capital investment, wage labor contracts, and geographically bounded markets.

Contemporary startup culture, by contrast, emerges from a financialized reconfiguration of accumulation. Rather than deriving primarily from retained earnings or productive reinvestment, startup firms often arise through speculative capital deployment seeking asymmetric returns (Krippner, 2011). The entrepreneur becomes less an industrial coordinator and more a node within a venture-finance network whose temporal horizon is structured by exit events rather than stable production.

This transformation shifts the ontology of enterprise. Growth is no longer a consequence of incremental productivity gains but an explicit objective encoded in capitalization tables, funding rounds, and valuation multiples. The startup is born with an embedded imperative toward expansion, as stagnation implies capital loss under venture expectations.

Such imperatives are not universal features of market organization. They are artifacts of financial regimes characterized by liquidity surpluses seeking yield in speculative domains. The normalization of exponential growth expectations reflects the historical dominance of venture capital as an allocative mechanism.

4.2 Accelerationism and Temporal Compression

Startup discourse frequently invokes speed as virtue. Iteration cycles, rapid scaling, first-mover advantage, and blitzscaling strategies exemplify temporal compression. This compression presupposes the ability to externalize long-term costs into future financing rounds.

Temporal acceleration functions as a derivative of surplus. When capital is abundant and interest rates are low, the discount rate applied to future earnings decreases. This renders distant profits valuable in present terms, legitimizing aggressive expansion strategies that would be irrational under tighter capital conditions.

Conversely, when discount rates rise and liquidity tightens, the same strategies become unsustainable. The historical coincidence of low interest rates and startup proliferation underscores the dependency of entrepreneurial acceleration on macroeconomic boundary conditions.

Startup culture thus internalizes a surplus-dependent temporality. It assumes that time itself is a resource subsidized by capital markets. This assumption collapses under contraction, revealing the structural fragility of accelerated growth models.

5 Financialization and the Surplus Regime

5.1 From Productive to Financial Accumulation

Financialization denotes the increasing dominance of financial motives, markets, actors, and institutions in shaping economic life (Lapavitsas, 2013). In this regime, profit extraction shifts from production toward asset appreciation and speculative valuation.

Venture capital exemplifies this shift. Returns derive not from steady dividend flows but from capital gains realized through acquisitions or public offerings. The firm becomes an asset to be valued rather than an enterprise to be sustained.

This asset orientation requires surplus liquidity at scale. Pension funds, sovereign wealth funds, university endowments, and high-net-worth individuals allocate capital to venture funds in search of yield. These allocations are possible only under conditions of concentrated wealth and institutional savings surpluses.

Startup culture thus rests upon layered surpluses in global capital markets. Without institutional investors seeking high-risk allocations, the pipeline of venture funding contracts dramatically.

5.2 Interest Rates and Liquidity Cycles

The relationship between startup proliferation and monetary policy is nontrivial. Extended periods of low interest rates reduce the opportunity cost of speculative investment. Capital seeks higher returns in riskier domains, including early-stage technology firms.

Let $r(t)$ denote the prevailing risk-free interest rate. Venture funding intensity $V(t)$ can be modeled as inversely related to $r(t)$:

$$V(t) = \frac{\kappa}{r(t) + \epsilon}, \tag{1}$$

where κ represents aggregate risk appetite and ϵ prevents singularity.

As $r(t)$ approaches zero, $V(t)$ increases sharply. This captures the empirical observation that venture activity accelerates during loose monetary regimes.

The startup ecosystem is therefore embedded within macro-financial cycles. Surplus liquidity conditions are not permanent; they fluctuate with monetary policy, global

capital flows, and crisis dynamics. The normalization of high-venture intensity misreads a cyclical phenomenon as structural inevitability.

6 Advertising, Attention, and Commodification

6.1 Attention as Monetizable Substrate

Advertising-based business models transform attention into revenue streams. The commodification of attention presupposes a conversion mechanism from behavioral data to purchasing behavior (Turow, 2011).

Let $A(t)$ denote aggregate user attention, and $M(t)$ denote monetization capacity. Revenue $R(t)$ may be expressed as:

$$R(t) = \alpha A(t) \cdot \chi(C(t)), \tag{2}$$

where α measures targeting efficiency and $\chi(C)$ is a function of consumer liquidity $C(t)$.

If $\chi(C)$ is increasing and concave, revenue grows with consumer liquidity but saturates as debt burdens rise. Under stagnant wages, $C(t)$ becomes increasingly debt-dependent. Thus the monetization of attention relies on financial surplus within households.

Advertising does not create value ex nihilo. It reallocates purchasing decisions across firms. When aggregate purchasing power is constrained, intensified advertising redistributes rather than expands total demand, increasing competitive pressure without systemic gain.

6.2 Data Extraction and Surveillance Dynamics

Digital advertising extends beyond traditional persuasion into surveillance-based behavioral prediction (Zuboff, 2019). Data extraction functions as a continuous input into targeting algorithms.

The extraction process may be modeled as an informational entropy reduction:

$$\Delta H = H_{\text{prior}} - H_{\text{posterior}}, \tag{3}$$

where H denotes uncertainty about user behavior.

Reduced uncertainty increases targeting precision but does not increase aggregate purchasing power. Precision without surplus intensifies competition for limited demand, driving consolidation and rent extraction.

Thus surveillance capitalism amplifies gradients in purchasing propensity without generating new liquidity. The structural dependency on surplus remains.

7 The Sociology of Founding

7.1 Demographic Stratification of Entrepreneurship

Empirical research consistently demonstrates that entrepreneurship rates and success correlate with pre-existing wealth, education, and social capital (Fairlie and Miranda, 2018). The myth of universal founder accessibility obscures these stratifications.

Let W_0 denote initial wealth and P_s denote probability of startup survival. Empirical data suggests $P_s = f(W_0, E, N)$ where E represents education and N network access.

Higher W_0 increases runway duration, enabling longer experimentation cycles. Thus the assumption of surplus operates at the micro level through household wealth distributions.

The generalization of founder ideology to populations without such buffers generates structural mismatch. Individuals lacking surplus face disproportionate downside risk relative to expected returns.

7.2 Cultural Capital and Symbolic Legitimacy

Startup culture valorizes narratives of disruption, resilience, and visionary leadership. These narratives function as symbolic capital. Access to elite educational institutions, incubators, and venture networks enhances perceived legitimacy.

Symbolic capital operates as a multiplier on financial capital. The combined effect magnifies concentration dynamics. Surplus conditions enable not only material investment but also reputational amplification.

The ideology of meritocracy persists despite empirical concentration of opportunity. The assumption of surplus thus operates simultaneously at economic and symbolic

levels.

8 Risk Externalization and the Founder Ideal

8.1 Asymmetric Risk Distribution

Startup culture valorizes risk-taking as a virtue. Yet risk in venture-backed systems is asymmetrically distributed. Investors diversify across portfolios, achieving predictable returns through power-law distributions (Nanda and Rhodes-Kropf, 2014). Founders often rely on pre-existing safety nets—family wealth, spousal income, credentialed employment options (Fairlie and Miranda, 2018). Gig workers absorb demand volatility without equivalent upside participation (Schor, 2020).

The founder archetype presents survival as a function of ingenuity and perseverance. Structural supports recede into invisibility. In effect, the costs of experimentation are redistributed across labor, consumers, and public infrastructure (Standing, 2011).

Portfolio diversification operates through failure concentration. A small number of "unicorn" exits compensate for widespread failure (Gornall and Strebulaev, 2020). This structure presupposes that the majority of attempts will fail, with costs absorbed by founders, employees, and creditors. The celebration of failure as learning obscures the material consequences for those without safety nets.

8.2 The Hidden Subsidy of Unpaid Social Reproduction

Founder narratives typically omit the reproductive labor necessary to sustain entrepreneurial risk-taking. Domestic labor, emotional support, childcare, and household management—predominantly feminized and uncompensated—enable the long hours and income instability of startup founding (Weeks, 2011).

This hidden subsidy extends the effective runway of ventures beyond their nominal capital reserves. When unpaid reproductive labor is accounted for, the true cost structure of startup formation includes transfers from household economies to entrepreneurial projects (Federici, 2012).

The universalization of this model produces tension. If all individuals are expected to behave as founders—self-financing, self-marketing, perpetually optimizing—then systemic buffers must shrink or vanish. The reproductive capacity that enables

entrepreneurial risk cannot be universalized without generating its own crisis (Bhattacharya, 2017).

8.3 Gig Economy as Risk Transfer Mechanism

Platform capitalism extends entrepreneurial logic to labor relations through gig classification (Rosenblat, 2018). Workers bear demand volatility, capital costs, and regulatory risk while platforms capture coordination rents. This represents a transfer of business risk from capital to labor without corresponding equity claims.

The fiction of independent contractor status allows platforms to avoid employment obligations—minimum wages, benefits, unemployment insurance—while retaining algorithmic control over work processes (Dubal, 2020). The result is a systematic externalization of risk that appears as entrepreneurial opportunity but functions as precarity intensification.

Under widespread constraint, risk externalization ceases to be sustainable. What was manageable under surplus becomes destabilizing under scarcity. Gig workers without savings, healthcare, or unemployment protection face catastrophic consequences from income disruptions that venture-backed platforms treat as optimization parameters.

9 Non-Universalizability of the Startup Model

9.1 Portfolio Logic and Statistical Asymmetry

A model is universalizable only if it can scale to median conditions without contradiction. The startup model presupposes that a minority of high-growth firms will generate returns sufficient to justify widespread failure. This portfolio logic depends on concentrated capital and asymmetric reward (Kerr et al., 2014).

If the majority of households lack savings, housing security, or access to cheap credit, prolonged negative income periods are untenable. The expectation that individuals should "bootstrap" under such conditions is structurally incoherent (Shane, 2008).

The statistical properties of venture returns—fat-tailed distributions with most value captured by a small number of exits—cannot be preserved if all economic activity adopts this form. Portfolio diversification requires diversification across risk profiles. If all sectors operate under high-variance models, systemic volatility increases without

compensating returns (Haldane, 2009).

9.2 Liquidity Constraints and Market Failure

Similarly, advertising-based services assume monetizable attention. Where consumer liquidity contracts, revenue models shift toward more aggressive extraction, data monetization, or subscription gating. The model tightens precisely when surplus evaporates (Srnicek, 2017).

This produces a paradox: the entrepreneurial model most celebrated for flexibility and adaptation reveals itself most brittle under constraint. Ventures designed for growth through subsidized customer acquisition fail when acquisition costs exceed lifetime value. Platforms optimized for attention extraction face revenue collapse when attention no longer converts to purchasing.

The celebrated dynamism of entrepreneurial culture thus emerges as a high-surplus regime artifact rather than a generalizable social form. Its operational logic depends on boundary conditions that are neither permanent nor equitably distributed.

9.3 Ecological and Resource Constraints

Beyond financial constraints, the universalization of high-growth models confronts ecological limits. Continuous expansion presupposes continuous resource throughput—energy, materials, waste absorption capacity (Foster, 2009). The metabolic rift between accumulation dynamics and biophysical constraints becomes irreconcilable at scale (Moore, 2015).

Startup culture's emphasis on "disruption" and "scalability" implicitly assumes infinite growth trajectories. When generalized across the economy, this logic collides with planetary boundaries (Raworth, 2017). The surplus conditions enabling venture-backed growth include not only financial capital but also ecological headroom that is rapidly depleting.

10 A Structural-Dynamical Model of Surplus Forcing

10.1 Phase Space Formulation

To formalize these intuitions, we develop a dynamical systems model of capital concentration under varying surplus regimes. Consider a scalar potential field $\Phi(x,t)$ representing concentrated economic influence or capital density over a social manifold $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$.

The state of the system at time t is characterized not only by the field Φ but also by its associated entropy $S[\Phi]$ and free energy $F[\Phi]$. We seek to describe the evolution of capital concentration as a thermodynamic process operating far from equilibrium.

Let the dynamics evolve according to a reaction-diffusion equation with external forcing:

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2\Phi + \rho_{\text{venture}}(x,t) - \beta\Phi^2 - \tau\Phi + \eta(x,t), \tag{4}$$

where $D > 0$ represents diffusive redistribution of capital through taxation, competition, or market friction; $\rho_{\text{venture}}(x,t) \geq 0$ models external forcing corresponding to venture capital injection or advertising-driven capital concentration; $\beta\Phi^2$ captures nonlinear damping through competitive pressure, regulatory friction, or monopoly limits; $\tau\Phi$ represents linear dissipation through operational costs, value decay, or market exit; and $\eta(x,t)$ denotes stochastic fluctuations in market conditions.

This formulation extends classical models of pattern formation (Cross and Hohenberg, 1993) to economic concentration dynamics, treating capital accumulation as a self-organizing process under external driving.

10.2 Surplus as Forcing Amplitude

The crucial parameter is the amplitude and spatial distribution of ρ_{venture}. Define the dimensionless surplus parameter:

$$\Lambda(t) = \frac{\int_\Omega \rho_{\text{venture}}(x,t)\,dx}{\tau \int_\Omega dx}, \tag{5}$$

representing the ratio of total external forcing to total dissipation. This parameter characterizes the regime of operation.

Proposition 1. *When $\Lambda \gg 1$, the system supports metastable localized structures (startup singularities) far from equilibrium. When $\Lambda \lesssim 1$, such structures decay toward diffusive equilibria.*

Proof sketch. Consider the steady-state equation $D\nabla^2\Phi + \rho_{\text{venture}} - \beta\Phi^2 - \tau\Phi = 0$. For localized structures to persist, the forcing term must overcome combined dissipation. Linearizing about $\Phi = 0$ gives growth rate $\sigma = \rho_{\text{venture}}/\tau - 1$ for small perturbations. Localized growth requires $\Lambda > 1$ at the perturbation site. For extended persistence against nonlinear damping, Λ must substantially exceed unity. □

10.3 Entropy Production and Instability

The informational entropy of the capital distribution can be defined via the Shannon entropy functional:

$$S[\Phi] = -\int_\Omega \Phi(x,t) \ln\left(\frac{\Phi(x,t)}{\Phi_0}\right) dx, \tag{6}$$

where Φ_0 is a normalization constant ensuring dimensional consistency. Low entropy corresponds to high concentration; high entropy to diffuse distribution.

The rate of entropy production is:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = -\int_\Omega \left(1 + \ln\frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0}\right) \frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial t}\, dx. \tag{7}$$

Substituting equation (4) and integrating by parts:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = D\int_\Omega \frac{|\nabla\Phi|^2}{\Phi}\, dx - \int_\Omega \left(1 + \ln\frac{\Phi}{\Phi_0}\right)(\rho_{\text{venture}} - \beta\Phi^2 - \tau\Phi)\, dx. \tag{8}$$

The first term is always positive (diffusive entropy increase). The second term can be negative when forcing creates concentration. Under high surplus ($\Lambda \gg 1$), the system produces negative entropy locally, creating ordered structures (entrepreneurial singularities) at the expense of increased entropy elsewhere—the hallmark of non-equilibrium pattern formation (Prigogine and Nicolis, 1977).

10.4 Linear Stability Analysis

To characterize regime transitions, perform linear stability analysis. Let $\Phi = \Phi_* + \epsilon\phi(x,t)$ where Φ_* is a uniform steady state. Substituting into (4) and linearizing:

$$\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2\phi + (\rho_* - 2\beta\Phi_* - \tau)\phi, \tag{9}$$

where $\rho_* = \langle \rho_{\text{venture}} \rangle$ is the spatially averaged forcing.

For spatially uniform perturbations ($\nabla^2\phi = 0$), the growth rate is:

$$\sigma = \rho_* - 2\beta\Phi_* - \tau. \tag{10}$$

The system is stable when $\sigma < 0$. The critical condition for instability is:

$$\rho_* > \tau + 2\beta\Phi_*. \tag{11}$$

This demonstrates that increased forcing (surplus) destabilizes uniform distributions, promoting concentration. As surplus declines ($\rho_* \to 0$), the system stabilizes toward diffusive states.

10.5 Advertising as Gradient Steepening

Advertising modifies the dynamics by introducing advective transport and nonlocal coupling. Extend the model:

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2\Phi - \nabla \cdot (v_{\text{ad}}\Phi) + \rho_{\text{venture}} - \beta\Phi^2 - \tau\Phi, \tag{12}$$

where $v_{\text{ad}}(x,t) = -\mu\nabla U_{\text{consumer}}$ represents attention flow driven by advertising, with U_{consumer} denoting consumer liquidity potential.

This advective term steepens gradients: capital flows toward regions of high consumer purchasing power. Under abundant surplus, v_{ad} amplifies concentration efficiently. Under constraint, steep gradients in Φ amplify systemic stress, as capital concentration outpaces consumer capacity.

10.6 Free Energy and Metastability

Define a Lyapunov functional (free energy):

$$F[\Phi] = \int_\Omega \left[\frac{D}{2} |\nabla \Phi|^2 + V(\Phi) - \rho_{\text{venture}} \Phi \right] dx, \tag{13}$$

where $V(\Phi) = \frac{\beta}{3}\Phi^3 + \frac{\tau}{2}\Phi^2$ is a local potential. In the absence of stochastic fluctuations, $dF/dt \leq 0$ along trajectories.

Entrepreneurial singularities correspond to local minima of $F[\Phi]$—metastable configurations maintained by forcing. When forcing diminishes, these minima disappear, and the system relaxes to global equilibria characterized by lower concentration.

Lemma 1. *For $\Lambda < \Lambda_c$, all local minima of $F[\Phi]$ vanish, and the system admits only diffusive equilibria.*

This lemma formalizes the claim that startup singularities are sustained excitations requiring continuous energy injection.

10.7 Thermodynamic Interpretation

The model reveals startup ecosystems as dissipative structures operating far from thermodynamic equilibrium (Prigogine and Nicolis, 1977). They consume free energy (surplus) to maintain low-entropy configurations (concentrated capital). Absent continued forcing, entropy increase drives the system toward diffusive equilibria.

This thermodynamic perspective clarifies the non-universalizability claim: dissipative structures cannot be universalized because they require external gradients to persist. If all systems adopt the same form, the gradients necessary for operation vanish. The startup model presupposes an asymmetry between high-concentration regions (platforms, unicorns) and diffuse backgrounds (labor markets, consumer bases) that cannot be preserved under homogenization.

11 Structural-Dynamical Deepening

We now extend the formal model to incorporate endogenous surplus generation and dissipation dynamics.

Let $\rho_{\text{venture}}(t)$ itself evolve according to:

$$\frac{d\rho_{\text{venture}}}{dt} = \sigma_\rho \Pi(t) - \delta_\rho \rho_{\text{venture}}, \tag{14}$$

where $\Pi(t)$ denotes aggregate realized profit across ventures and σ_ρ represents reinvestment propensity.

When realized profits are high, reinvestment increases forcing. When profits decline, forcing decays. This introduces feedback between concentration outcomes and surplus injection.

Substituting into equation (4) produces a coupled nonlinear system exhibiting oscillatory or chaotic dynamics depending on parameter regimes.

Proposition 2. *For sufficiently high reinvestment elasticity σ_ρ, the system exhibits limit cycles corresponding to boom-bust venture cycles.*

Sketch. Coupling capital concentration with reinvestment produces delayed feedback. Standard analysis of nonlinear feedback systems with time lag demonstrates existence of Hopf bifurcation under appropriate parameter values. □

This formalizes cyclical venture booms followed by contractions. Surplus accumulation generates overconcentration, which destabilizes underlying consumer and labor fields, reducing profit and forcing collapse.

12 Nonlinear Stability and Bifurcation Analysis

12.1 Existence of Steady States

We return to the reaction–diffusion system

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2 \Phi + \rho - \beta \Phi^2 - \tau \Phi, \tag{15}$$

where $\rho := \rho_{\text{venture}}$ is treated temporarily as constant in space and time to analyze equilibrium structure.

Steady states satisfy

$$D\nabla^2\Phi + \rho - \beta\Phi^2 - \tau\Phi = 0. \tag{16}$$

For spatially uniform equilibria, $\nabla^2\Phi = 0$, yielding the quadratic equation

$$\beta\Phi^2 + \tau\Phi - \rho = 0. \tag{17}$$

The solutions are

$$\Phi_\pm = \frac{-\tau \pm \sqrt{\tau^2 + 4\beta\rho}}{2\beta}. \tag{18}$$

For $\rho > 0$, exactly one physically meaningful nonnegative equilibrium exists:

$$\Phi_* = \frac{-\tau + \sqrt{\tau^2 + 4\beta\rho}}{2\beta}. \tag{19}$$

This equilibrium increases monotonically in ρ. Thus surplus forcing directly controls concentration amplitude.

12.2 Linear Stability of Uniform Equilibria

Let $\Phi = \Phi_* + \epsilon\phi(x,t)$ and linearize equation (15). We obtain

$$\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2\phi - (2\beta\Phi_* + \tau)\phi. \tag{20}$$

Taking Fourier modes $\phi \sim e^{\sigma t + ik\cdot x}$ yields dispersion relation

$$\sigma(k) = -Dk^2 - (2\beta\Phi_* + \tau). \tag{21}$$

Since $2\beta\Phi_* + \tau > 0$, all modes decay. The spatially uniform equilibrium is linearly stable.

However, this analysis does not capture spatially localized forcing. When $\rho(x)$ is heterogeneous, pattern formation may occur.

12.3 Localized Forcing and Pattern Formation

Assume $\rho(x) = \rho_0 + \rho_1(x)$ with ρ_1 localized. The steady-state equation becomes a nonlinear Poisson equation:

$$D\nabla^2\Phi = \beta\Phi^2 + \tau\Phi - \rho_0 - \rho_1(x). \tag{22}$$

Under sufficiently strong localized forcing $\rho_1(x)$, solutions exhibit spatially localized peaks.

Let us approximate near a forcing maximum x_0. Expanding to leading order and treating diffusion radially:

$$D\frac{d^2\Phi}{dr^2} + \frac{D(n-1)}{r}\frac{d\Phi}{dr} = \beta\Phi^2 + \tau\Phi - \rho_0 - \rho_1(0). \tag{23}$$

If $\rho_1(0)$ exceeds a threshold, a localized high-Φ solution exists decaying to background Φ_* at infinity.

This corresponds to entrepreneurial singularities—capital concentrations sustained by localized surplus injection.

12.4 Saddle-Node Bifurcation

Define the effective forcing parameter

$$\Lambda = \frac{\rho}{\tau^2/\beta}. \tag{24}$$

For small ρ, $\Phi_* \approx \rho/\tau$. For large ρ, $\Phi_* \sim \sqrt{\rho/\beta}$.

Introduce stochastic fluctuations and finite domain size. In finite systems, nonlinear damping can produce bistability when additional cubic or higher-order terms are included:

$$\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial t} = D\nabla^2\Phi + \rho - \tau\Phi - \beta\Phi^2 + \gamma\Phi^3. \tag{25}$$

When $\gamma > 0$, the system may admit multiple equilibria depending on ρ. A saddle-node bifurcation occurs at critical forcing $\rho = \rho_c$ satisfying

$$\frac{d}{d\Phi}\left(\rho - \tau\Phi - \beta\Phi^2 + \gamma\Phi^3\right) = 0. \tag{26}$$

Solving simultaneously with equilibrium condition yields explicit ρ_c.

This bifurcation formalizes abrupt collapse: below ρ_c, high-concentration equilibria disappear.

13 Lyapunov Stability and Energy Landscape

13.1 Construction of Lyapunov Functional

Define the functional

$$\mathcal{F}[\Phi] = \int_\Omega \left(\frac{D}{2}|\nabla\Phi|^2 + U(\Phi) - \rho\Phi\right) dx, \tag{27}$$

with

$$U(\Phi) = \frac{\tau}{2}\Phi^2 + \frac{\beta}{3}\Phi^3 - \frac{\gamma}{4}\Phi^4. \tag{28}$$

One verifies

$$\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial t} = -\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}}{\delta\Phi}. \tag{29}$$

Therefore

$$\frac{d\mathcal{F}}{dt} = -\int_\Omega \left(\frac{\delta\mathcal{F}}{\delta\Phi}\right)^2 dx \leq 0. \tag{30}$$

Thus $\mathcal{F}$ is a Lyapunov functional. The system evolves toward local minima of $\mathcal{F}$.

Entrepreneurial singularities correspond to local minima sustained by forcing. When ρ decreases, these minima flatten and disappear.

13.2 Energy Barrier and Hysteresis

Let Φ_1 and Φ_2 be two local minima separated by unstable equilibrium Φ_u.

The barrier height is

$$\Delta\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}[\Phi_u] - \mathcal{F}[\Phi_1]. \tag{31}$$

As $\rho \to \rho_c$, $\Delta\mathcal{F} \to 0$.

This captures hysteresis: once concentration forms, reducing surplus does not immediately restore uniformity. The system must cross energy barrier to collapse.

Thus temporary surplus creates persistent inequality structures.

14 Macroeconomic Closure Conditions

The startup model implicitly assumes open-system conditions: global capital mobility, expanding markets, and externalized ecological costs. Under closed-system constraints, surplus generation must equal surplus dissipation.

Let E_{total} denote total free energy available to the economy. The conservation constraint requires:

$$\int_0^T \rho_{\text{venture}}(t)dt \leq E_{\text{total}}. \tag{32}$$

If venture reinvestment exceeds ecological throughput, the system accumulates fictitious capital claims exceeding real surplus generation.

This gap corresponds to asset bubbles. When correction occurs, forcing collapses rapidly.

15 Entropy, Inequality, and Concentration

Low-entropy capital distributions correspond to high inequality. Let the Gini coefficient G be monotonically related to concentration measure Φ:

$$G = g(\Phi). \tag{33}$$

Under high surplus forcing, Φ increases, raising G. Under contraction, Φ may decrease but hysteresis effects preserve inequality.

Thus surplus regimes are structurally linked to inequality dynamics. The assumption of surplus is inseparable from distributional asymmetry.

16 Inequality–Entropy Coupling Theorem

16.1 Concentration Measure

Define normalized density

$$p(x,t) = \frac{\Phi(x,t)}{\int_\Omega \Phi(x,t)dx}. \tag{34}$$

Define entropy

$$H[p] = -\int_\Omega p \ln p \, dx. \tag{35}$$

Define inequality functional

$$\mathcal{I}[p] = \int_\Omega (p - \bar{p})^2 dx. \tag{36}$$

Theorem 1. *For smooth p with fixed mass, $H[p]$ decreases monotonically as $\mathcal{I}[p]$ increases. In particular, there exists constant $K > 0$ such that*

$$H_{\max} - H[p] \geq K\mathcal{I}[p]. \tag{37}$$

Proof. Expand $H[p]$ about uniform distribution $\bar{p}$. Using Taylor expansion and convexity of $x \ln x$, the second variation yields quadratic form proportional to variance functional $\mathcal{I}[p]$. □

Thus low entropy corresponds to high inequality.

Since surplus forcing lowers entropy locally by creating concentration, it necessarily increases inequality measure $\mathcal{I}$.

17 Hopf Bifurcation and Boom–Bust Cycles

17.1 Dynamic Forcing Feedback

Consider coupled system:

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dt} = \rho - \tau\Phi - \beta\Phi^2, \tag{38}$$

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \sigma_\rho\Phi - \delta_\rho\rho. \tag{39}$$

Steady state:

$$\rho_* = \frac{\sigma_\rho}{\delta_\rho}\Phi_*. \tag{40}$$

Substitute into first equation to find equilibrium.

Linearizing about steady state yields Jacobian matrix

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} -\tau - 2\beta\Phi_* & 1 \\ \sigma_\rho & -\delta_\rho \end{pmatrix}. \tag{41}$$

Hopf bifurcation occurs when trace zero and determinant positive:

$$\tau + 2\beta\Phi_* = \delta_\rho. \tag{42}$$

When this condition holds, eigenvalues cross imaginary axis, producing oscillatory dynamics.

This corresponds to venture funding cycles: reinvestment amplifies concentration until damping overwhelms, then contraction reduces forcing, allowing recovery.

18 Catastrophe Structure and Universal Limits

The bifurcation structure corresponds to cusp catastrophe in parameter space (ρ, β).

Let control parameters be (a, b) with canonical form:

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dt} = a + b\Phi - \Phi^3. \tag{43}$$

Mapping economic parameters into (a, b) reveals region of bistability bounded by cusp curve.

The startup regime lies within cusp interior. Outside, only single equilibrium exists.

Universalization corresponds to parameter drift outside cusp, eliminating high-growth attractors.

19 General Entropy Production Bound

Define entropy production rate

$$\dot{S} = \Pi_{\text{diffusion}} - \Pi_{\text{forcing}}. \tag{44}$$

Total entropy must satisfy

$$\int_0^T \Pi_{\text{forcing}} dt \leq E_{\text{input}}. \tag{45}$$

If surplus input derives from ecological energy E_{ecol}, then sustainable forcing requires

$$\langle \rho \rangle \leq \lambda E_{\text{ecol}}. \tag{46}$$

Hence infinite growth under finite ecological throughput violates conservation constraints.

20 Generalized Field Dynamics of Surplus Regimes

20.1 Coupled Capital–Labor–Credit Fields

The scalar formulation developed earlier captures capital concentration but omits explicit labor and credit dynamics. To generalize, introduce three coupled fields over the social manifold Ω:

$$\Phi(x,t) := \text{capital concentration}, \tag{47}$$
$$L(x,t) := \text{labor stability potential}, \tag{48}$$
$$C(x,t) := \text{consumer credit density}. \tag{49}$$

We consider the coupled evolution system:

$$\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial t} = D_\Phi \nabla^2 \Phi + \rho_{\text{venture}} - \beta \Phi^2 - \tau_\Phi \Phi + \gamma_1 \Phi L + \gamma_2 \Phi C, \tag{50}$$
$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial t} = D_L \nabla^2 L - \alpha_1 \Phi L - \tau_L L + \sigma W(x,t), \tag{51}$$
$$\frac{\partial C}{\partial t} = D_C \nabla^2 C + \alpha_2 \Phi - \delta C - \kappa L. \tag{52}$$

The parameter $\gamma_1 \Phi L$ represents capital leveraging stable labor. The term $\gamma_2 \Phi C$ represents capital amplification through credit-fueled demand. The term $-\alpha_1 \Phi L$ models labor destabilization under capital concentration. Finally, $-\kappa L$ captures wage stagnation effects reducing credit serviceability.

This system admits a critical manifold in parameter space separating surplus-supported regimes from constraint-dominated regimes.

20.2 Bifurcation Structure and Regime Transitions

Define the aggregate surplus forcing parameter:

$$\Lambda_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\int_\Omega \rho_{\text{venture}}\, dx + \gamma_2 \int_\Omega \Phi C\, dx}{\int_\Omega (\tau_\Phi \Phi + \tau_L L + \delta C)\, dx}.$$

Proposition 3. *There exists a critical value Λ_c such that for $\Lambda_{\text{eff}} > \Lambda_c$, the system*

admits stable high-Φ attractors, while for $\Lambda_{eff} < \Lambda_c$, all capital concentration equilibria lose stability via saddle-node bifurcation.

Proof sketch. This follows from standard nonlinear bifurcation analysis applied to the reduced mean-field system. □

The collapse of surplus thus corresponds to annihilation of entrepreneurial attractors. Importantly, the bifurcation is not smooth but discontinuous under strong nonlinear coupling, implying sudden valuation collapses and cascading layoffs.

20.3 Renormalization of Surplus Under Scale

Let Φ_ℓ denote capital concentration coarse-grained at scale ℓ. Under renormalization:

$$\Phi_{\ell'} = \mathcal{R}_{\ell \to \ell'}[\Phi_\ell].$$

In high-surplus regimes, coarse-graining preserves concentration structures (scale invariance in power-law firm distributions). In low-surplus regimes, renormalization flows toward uniform fixed points.

This yields:

$$\frac{d\Lambda}{d\log \ell} = -\xi(\Lambda - \Lambda_c).$$

Surplus regimes are unstable fixed points requiring continuous injection. Constraint regimes are stable fixed points. Thus startup ecosystems resemble critical phenomena maintained by external energy flux.

21 A Category-Theoretic Formalization of Surplus as Boundary Condition

21.1 Motivation and Scope

The dynamical analysis treats surplus as a control parameter and forcing term that determines whether concentrated entrepreneurial configurations persist. A category-

theoretic reformulation clarifies the logical content of this claim by separating three layers that are frequently conflated in startup discourse: the internal composition law of economic activities, the external provisioning of slack that makes certain compositions feasible, and the coherence constraints that determine whether local growth narratives can be globalized. In this section, surplus is formalized as a boundary condition on the existence of certain colimits and as an externalization functor that supplies slack. The non-universalizability claim then becomes a statement about the failure of global gluing for venture-dependent diagrams when the required slack is not available.

21.2 The Category of Economic Processes

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be a symmetric monoidal category whose objects represent economic states and whose morphisms represent feasible transformations between states. One may interpret an object $X \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{E})$ as a bundle of constraints, capacities, and obligations, while a morphism $f : X \to Y$ represents a process that transforms X into Y without violating feasibility constraints.

The monoidal product $\otimes : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}$ represents parallel composition. If X and Y are independent subsystems, then $X \otimes Y$ denotes their combined state, and a morphism $f \otimes g : X \otimes Y \to X' \otimes Y'$ denotes simultaneous execution. The unit object $\mathbb{I}$ represents a null background.

Feasibility is encoded by the existence of morphisms. When startup rhetoric asserts that a pathway is available, it implicitly asserts the existence of a morphism in $\mathcal{E}$. The central thesis of this essay is that many such asserted morphisms exist only in a surplus-enriched environment.

21.3 Surplus as Enrichment and the Availability of Morphisms

To represent surplus explicitly, we introduce an ordered commutative monoid $(\mathsf{S}, +, 0, \leq)$ of slack resources. Elements $s \in \mathsf{S}$ represent discretionary margin, runway, liquidity buffers, institutional support, or ecological headroom, depending on context. The order relation $s \leq s'$ means that s' contains at least as much slack as s.

There are two natural ways to incorporate S.

The first is enrichment. We define an S-enriched category $\mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{S}}$ in which the hom-object $\mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{S}}(X, Y)$ is not merely a set but a slack requirement: the minimal surplus needed to

realize a transformation from X to Y. Formally, one may take $\mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{S}}(X, Y) \in \mathsf{S}$ with composition satisfying a subadditivity constraint

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{S}}(X, Z) \leq \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{S}}(X, Y) + \mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{S}}(Y, Z), \tag{53}$$

which expresses that composing two processes cannot require less slack than each requires separately, up to efficiencies captured by the order structure. The ordinary feasibility category is recovered by a thresholding rule: a morphism is feasible under available slack s if and only if $\mathcal{E}_{\mathsf{S}}(X, Y) \leq s$.

The second approach is parameterization. For each $s \in \mathsf{S}$, define a subcategory $\mathcal{E}_{\leq s} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ whose morphisms are those feasible under slack budget s. Then $s \leq s'$ implies $\mathcal{E}_{\leq s} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{\leq s'}$, yielding a filtration of feasible processes by surplus.

Both formalisms make surplus into a structural boundary condition on what morphisms exist. Startup culture can then be interpreted as operating in categories $\mathcal{E}_{\leq s}$ with unusually large s, while its universalization attempts to treat morphisms that exist only in large-s regimes as though they exist uniformly for small-s agents.

21.4 Venture Capital as a Slack-Providing Adjunction

Let $\mathcal{B}$ denote a base category of "baseline" economic processes feasible without venture injection, and let $\mathcal{V}$ denote an expanded category in which venture forcing and advertising amplification are permitted as additional mechanisms. Intuitively, $\mathcal{B}$ represents processes constrained by ordinary cash-flow discipline, while $\mathcal{V}$ represents processes permitted to run persistent losses via external subsidy.

We formalize the relation by a functor $U : \mathcal{V} \to \mathcal{B}$ that forgets the venture-specific structure, sending a venture-subsidized process to its baseline projection. A slack-providing left adjoint $F : \mathcal{B} \to \mathcal{V}$ represents the operation of embedding baseline processes into a venture-backed environment by supplying external surplus. The adjunction

$$F \dashv U \tag{54}$$

expresses that for $X \in \mathcal{B}$ and $Y \in \mathcal{V}$ there is a natural isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{V}}(FX, Y) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}}(X, UY). \tag{55}$$

This states that any baseline morphism out of X into the baseline projection of Y corresponds to a venture-realizable morphism out of the venture-enriched object FX into Y. Economically, F supplies runway, subsidized customer acquisition, and valuation-based financing that enlarge the reachable set of transitions. The right adjoint U forgets these supports, projecting a venture process to a baseline view in which its internal mechanisms are no longer visible.

The "assumption of surplus" arises when one reasons as though F were the identity, or as though U preserved the relevant colimits and limits. In particular, the error occurs when morphisms in $\mathcal{V}$ are treated as though they lived in $\mathcal{B}$ without loss, as though U were fully faithful. The critique is thus a critique of illegitimate transport of existence claims across an adjunction.

21.5 Advertising as a Nonlocal Endofunctor and Gradient Manufacture

Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote a category of consumer states and $\mathcal{A}$ a category of attention states. A platform advertising system is not merely a morphism in $\mathcal{E}$ but a mechanism that constructs new morphisms by reshaping attention landscapes.

Model this by an endofunctor

$$\mathsf{Ad} : \mathcal{E} \to \mathcal{E}, \tag{56}$$

which maps a process $f : X \to Y$ to an "advertising-amplified" process $\mathsf{Ad}(f) : \mathsf{Ad}(X) \to \mathsf{Ad}(Y)$ whose feasibility and effect depend on nonlocal coupling to attention and credit fields. The point is not that Ad preserves all structure, but that it systematically alters which morphisms exist at all in $\mathcal{E}_{\leq s}$ for a fixed slack budget s. In particular, advertising increases conversion rates only when consumer liquidity exists; it is thus naturally modeled as an endofunctor that is partial or only defined on an admissible subcategory determined by credit conditions.

One may therefore treat advertising as a functor defined on a slice over liquidity:

$$\mathsf{Ad} : \mathcal{E}/\mathcal{L} \to \mathcal{E}/\mathcal{L}, \tag{57}$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ encodes liquidity constraints, so that the functor is only coherent when liquidity objects exist and are stable under the induced dynamics.

21.6 Non-Universalizability as a Failure of Global Colimits

The universalization claim of startup culture can be formulated as a gluing assertion: that local startup pathways, observed in high-surplus regions, can be assembled into a global economic organization in which everyone may adopt the same high-variance model. Category theory expresses such gluing through colimits, sheaves, and descent.

Let Ω be a social domain equipped with a cover $\{U_i\}$ representing local contexts, for example regions, classes, or institutional niches. Associate to each $U \subseteq \Omega$ a category $\mathcal{E}(U)$ of feasible processes within that context, with restriction functors $\mathrm{res}_{V,U} : \mathcal{E}(V) \to \mathcal{E}(U)$ for $U \subseteq V$. This defines a presheaf of categories

$$\mathcal{E} : \mathrm{Open}(\Omega)^{\mathrm{op}} \to \mathbf{Cat}. \tag{58}$$

Surplus is encoded by a presheaf S assigning to each U a slack budget $\mathsf{S}(U)$, together with compatible restriction maps. The feasible category at U is then filtered as $\mathcal{E}_{\leq \mathsf{S}(U)}(U)$.

A venture-backed ecosystem corresponds to open sets U_i with large $\mathsf{S}(U_i)$. Startup narratives are extracted from these U_i and then asserted globally, implicitly claiming that the local diagram of processes and compositions admits a colimit in the global category $\mathcal{E}_{\leq \mathsf{S}(\Omega)}(\Omega)$.

The non-universalizability claim is then a precise obstruction statement: the relevant colimit does not exist when $\mathsf{S}(\Omega)$ is not large enough, or when the restriction maps force incompatibilities on overlaps. In sheaf language, startup pathways fail descent because they require slack that is not available on intersections, or because the gluing data is inconsistent with global resource conservation.

One may express this by saying that the presheaf of venture-feasible morphisms is not a sheaf. There exist morphisms $f_i \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}(U_i)}(X|_{U_i}, Y|_{U_i})$ that agree on overlaps but do not glue to a global morphism $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}(\Omega)}(X, Y)$ because the glued transformation would require surplus exceeding $\mathsf{S}(\Omega)$.

This gives a categorical formulation of the reservoir argument. Local venture feasibility is not stable under global gluing because it consumes a background slack that is not globally replicable.

21.7 A Descent-Theoretic Statement of the Surplus Constraint

Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a diagram in $\mathcal{E}(\Omega)$ representing the startup ecosystem: founders, workers, platforms, advertisers, credit markets, and infrastructural supports linked by morphisms encoding flows of wages, attention, data, and investment. Let $\operatorname{colim} \mathcal{D}$ denote the "assembled" system state implied by universalizing the diagram.

Define a surplus valuation functor

$$\mathfrak{s} : \mathcal{E}(\Omega) \to \mathsf{S} \tag{59}$$

that assigns to each morphism its minimal slack requirement, extended to diagrams by setting

$$\mathfrak{s}(\mathcal{D}) := \inf\{s \in \mathsf{S} \mid \mathcal{D} \text{ factors through } \mathcal{E}_{\leq s}(\Omega)\}. \tag{60}$$

Then the assumption of surplus is the implicit claim that $\mathfrak{s}(\mathcal{D})$ is bounded by the slack available to the median agent, and that this bound is stable under forming $\operatorname{colim} \mathcal{D}$.

The critique is that, in general,

$$\mathfrak{s}(\operatorname{colim} \mathcal{D}) \not\leq \mathsf{S}(\Omega), \tag{61}$$

and that the inequality is structural rather than contingent. The reason is that colimit formation aggregates obligations and concentrates variance, effectively increasing minimal slack requirements. In economic terms, universalization increases system-wide covariance of risk and thus increases the necessary buffer.

21.8 Monoidal Constraints and the Conservation of Slack

The monoidal structure provides an additional clarity. Parallelizing high-variance ventures does not average risk when failures are correlated; it compounds obligations. This is represented categorically by the fact that the slack requirement valuation is typically subadditive in idealized independent regimes but becomes superadditive under coupling.

Let $\mathfrak{s}$ satisfy

$$\mathfrak{s}(f \otimes g) \leq \mathfrak{s}(f) + \mathfrak{s}(g) \tag{62}$$

in the independent case. Under systemic coupling, effective slack requirements may obey

$$\mathfrak{s}(f \otimes g) \geq \mathfrak{s}(f) + \mathfrak{s}(g), \tag{63}$$

reflecting correlation and shared failure modes. Advertising and platforms increase coupling by synchronizing demand shocks and labor volatility, thereby increasing slack requirements for parallel venture composition. The category thus encodes the transition from portfolio diversification to systemic risk.

21.9 Categorical Summary of the Argument

The category-theoretic reformulation yields an austere statement of the thesis. Startup culture and advertising-based business models are regimes in which a slack-providing left adjoint effectively enlarges the space of feasible morphisms. The cultural error consists in treating those enlarged morphisms as though they were baseline morphisms, thereby erasing the adjunction and suppressing the boundary conditions that make the morphisms exist. Universalization fails because the venture-feasible presheaf fails descent: local high-surplus pathways do not glue into a global social organization under bounded slack. In monoidal terms, parallel composition of high-variance ventures is not closed under available slack once coupling is introduced by platforms and advertising, so the required colimits cease to exist.

This is the categorical analogue of the dynamical conclusion. Entrepreneurial singularities correspond to structured morphisms sustained by external forcing. Without the slack object that supplies the forcing, the morphisms are not merely improbable but undefined. The assumption of surplus is therefore an assumption about existence in the category of feasible economic processes.

22 A Theorem on Non-Universalizability

We now formalize the central claim.

Theorem 2 (Non-Universalizability of Surplus-Dependent Growth)**.** *Let $\mathcal{S}$ denote a social system governed by capital dynamics requiring external surplus forcing $\rho_{venture} > 0$*

to maintain concentrated attractors. If all agents within $\mathcal{S}$ adopt the high-variance startup model, then surplus gradients necessary for forcing vanish in the limit of full homogenization.

Proof sketch. Entrepreneurial concentration requires asymmetric resource distribution. Let E_i denote entrepreneurial nodes and B_j denote background labor nodes. The forcing term depends on:

$$\rho_{\text{venture}} \sim f(B_j \to E_i).$$

If all B_j become E_i, the reservoir generating asymmetry collapses. Hence $\rho_{\text{venture}} \to 0$ in the homogenized limit. Without forcing, the concentration equilibria become unstable. Therefore the model cannot be universalized without self-negation. □

This theorem expresses in dynamical language what political economy has long described as class asymmetry: concentration presupposes a diffuse background.

23 Entropy Budget Constraint and Ecological Coupling

23.1 Entropy Budget Constraint

Total system entropy obeys:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(S_\Phi + S_L + S_C\right) = \Pi_{\text{diffusion}} - \Pi_{\text{forcing}}.$$

In sustained startup regimes, $\Pi_{\text{forcing}} > 0$ must hold persistently. If surplus energy throughput (financial or ecological) is bounded, then long-run stability requires:

$$\int_0^T \Pi_{\text{forcing}} dt \leq E_{\text{available}}.$$

This establishes a thermodynamic ceiling on entrepreneurial concentration. Growth cannot exceed available free energy.

23.2 Ecological Coupling

Let $E(t)$ represent ecological energy throughput. Couple surplus forcing to resource extraction:

$$\rho_{\text{venture}} = \lambda E(t).$$

If $E(t)$ is bounded or declining, then ρ_{venture} must decline. Thus ecological contraction forces financial contraction. The startup model implicitly assumes $dE/dt \geq 0$. This assumption fails under planetary boundary constraints.

24 Instability Cascades and Systemic Fragility

24.1 Coupling to Credit Markets

The capital concentration dynamics couple to credit markets through consumer purchasing power. Let $C(t)$ denote aggregate consumer credit, evolving as:

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = \alpha(W - W_*) - \delta C, \tag{64}$$

where W is aggregate wages, W_* is subsistence threshold, and δ is debt service rate. Advertising efficacy scales with credit availability, so $v_{\text{ad}} \propto C$.

This creates a feedback loop: advertising drives consumption, consumption requires credit, credit requires servicing from wages. When $W < W_* + \delta C$, the system enters crisis dynamics. Credit contraction reduces advertising efficacy, diminishing platform revenues, triggering venture funding contractions, further reducing ρ_{venture}.

The coupled system exhibits instability cascades: perturbations in one sector amplify through feedback loops, producing systemic crises (Haldane, 2009).

24.2 Hysteresis and Path Dependence

The nonlinearity produces hysteresis effects. Reducing ρ_{venture} from high to low values does not simply reverse the concentration process. Established monopolies exhibit persistence through network effects and sunk cost advantages.

This path dependence implies that temporary surplus conditions can create enduring concentrations that resist dissipation even when forcing subsides. The political economy consequence is that short-term capital abundance generates long-term inequality that cannot be easily reversed through market mechanisms alone (Piketty, 2014).

24.3 Critical Slowing Down

Near the critical threshold $\Lambda = \Lambda_c$, the system exhibits critical slowing down: perturbations decay increasingly slowly, and recovery times diverge (Scheffer et al., 2009). This is a generic feature of systems approaching critical transitions.

For startup ecosystems, this manifests as increasing fragility to shocks—sudden shifts in interest rates, regulatory changes, or consumer confidence—as surplus conditions deteriorate. The celebrated resilience of entrepreneurial systems reveals itself as regime-dependent, collapsing near critical thresholds.

25 Surplus, Information, and the Political Economy of Uncertainty

25.1 Uncertainty Absorption and Institutional Buffering

A neglected dimension of surplus concerns its function as an absorber of uncertainty. Classical Keynesian theory emphasized that investment decisions occur under conditions of fundamental uncertainty rather than calculable risk. Surplus capital provides the temporal buffer required to sustain experimentation when outcomes are indeterminate.

In venture-backed ecosystems, uncertainty absorption is centralized within capital pools capable of tolerating repeated failure (Gompers and Lerner, 2001). The rhetoric of innovation presumes this absorption capacity as given. However, uncertainty tolerance is itself a function of surplus distribution. Agents without financial slack cannot internalize volatility; instead, they experience uncertainty as existential threat.

Institutional buffering historically mitigated this asymmetry. Welfare states, public employment, and industrial policy reduced exposure to market fluctuations. Financialization, by contrast, has dismantled many such buffers, reallocating uncertainty to households while centralizing gains within asset-owning classes (Krippner, 2011).

Thus surplus performs a dual function: enabling entrepreneurial experimentation while shielding investors from its consequences. When buffering mechanisms erode, startup culture increasingly transfers uncertainty downward through gigification and debt dependence (Standing, 2011). The celebration of risk-taking becomes incoherent when risk is unequally distributed.

25.2 Information Asymmetry and Surplus Capture

Information asymmetry plays a central role in surplus capture. Venture capitalists often possess superior information regarding firm performance, funding timelines, and exit probabilities relative to founders and employees. This asymmetry allows investors to negotiate favorable liquidation preferences and control provisions.

Advertising platforms similarly exploit informational asymmetry between platform operators and users (Pasquale, 2015). Users generate behavioral data without full knowledge of its monetization. Platforms convert this informational surplus into advertising revenue, capturing value generated by collective participation.

In both cases, surplus is not merely pre-existing but actively constructed through asymmetrical information flows. The capacity to aggregate, analyze, and monetize data becomes itself a form of surplus extraction. This extraction presupposes infrastructure, computational capacity, and legal permissibility—each historically contingent and politically mediated (Zuboff, 2019).

The universalization of such models would require symmetric informational access, eliminating the asymmetries that generate surplus in the first place. Thus information asymmetry constitutes a structural precondition of entrepreneurial profitability that cannot be universally replicated.

25.3 Innovation, Public Investment, and Collective Risk

Empirical studies of technological innovation reveal extensive public sector involvement in foundational research (Mazzucato, 2015). Government funding underwrites early-stage technological development, absorbing risks unattractive to private capital.

The subsequent privatization of returns converts collectively funded surplus into private equity gains. This process relies upon legal regimes of intellectual property and venture finance structures that transform public investment into concentrated ownership (Block, 2008).

If surplus originates in collective provisioning, then startup narratives attributing success solely to private entrepreneurship obscure the socialized basis of innovation. Universalization would require universal access to comparable public investment and institutional support—conditions absent in most global contexts.

25.4 The Financialization of Uncertainty

Financial derivatives markets illustrate the commodification of uncertainty itself. Risk becomes tradable, priced, and redistributed. Venture capital operates analogously: uncertainty regarding technological feasibility and market adoption is bundled into portfolios.

However, as Minsky's financial instability hypothesis suggests, stability breeds instability. Extended periods of low volatility encourage leverage expansion, increasing systemic fragility. Venture-backed ecosystems, particularly in low-interest environments, exhibit similar dynamics: abundant liquidity encourages speculative investment in increasingly uncertain ventures.

When surplus contracts, leveraged positions unwind rapidly, producing nonlinear collapse. Thus financialization transforms surplus from a stabilizing buffer into a destabilizing amplifier under certain parameter regimes.

26 Category Theory and Political Economy: A Synthesis

26.1 Surplus as a Structural Adjunction

The adjunction $F \dashv U$ introduced earlier may now be interpreted politically. The left adjoint F corresponds to institutional mechanisms that inject slack into baseline economic processes—venture capital, state subsidies, credit expansion. The right adjoint U corresponds to the baseline economy stripped of such supports.

The assumption of surplus consists in collapsing the adjunction, treating F as identity and ignoring the structural transformation required to produce venture-feasible morphisms. This corresponds to ideological naturalization of historically contingent institutional supports.

In political economy terms, the adjunction encodes class relations. The ability to

apply F is unevenly distributed; access to venture capital, elite networks, and public subsidies is stratified by wealth and social position (Fairlie and Miranda, 2018). The category-theoretic formalism thus captures asymmetry without resorting to rhetorical abstraction.

26.2 Descent Failure and Social Reproduction

The failure of descent in the presheaf of venture-feasible morphisms corresponds to breakdowns in social reproduction. When high-surplus entrepreneurial zones cannot be glued into a coherent global economy, the burden of adjustment falls on labor markets, households, and public institutions (Fraser, 2016).

This can be formalized as a mismatch between local colimits (startup ecosystems) and global resource constraints. The gluing obstruction is not merely mathematical but material: ecological limits, wage stagnation, and credit saturation impose hard boundaries on expansion.

26.3 Concentration as a Low-Entropy Fixed Point

The entropy–inequality coupling theorem demonstrated that concentration corresponds to entropy reduction. Political economy literature has long observed the tendency toward concentration of capital (Marx, 1894; Piketty, 2014). The thermodynamic model supplies a formal mechanism: surplus forcing lowers entropy locally, producing concentrated fixed points.

Category theory reframes these fixed points as objects with high slack requirements. Their existence depends on morphisms that are undefined under low surplus. The persistence of concentration under surplus contraction reflects hysteresis encoded in the energy landscape.

27 Toward an Empirical Research Program

27.1 Parameter Estimation and Calibration

The structural-dynamical model admits empirical calibration. Venture funding intensity $\rho_{\text{venture}}(t)$ can be proxied by aggregate funding rounds reported in databases such

as PitchBook. Capital concentration $\Phi(x,t)$ can be approximated by market capitalization distributions or Herfindahl-Hirschman indices across sectors (Christophers, 2020).

Entropy measures can be computed from firm size distributions, while surplus parameters may be estimated from household savings rates and corporate retained earnings. Testing the predicted bifurcation behavior near critical surplus thresholds would require time-series analysis across liquidity cycles.

27.2 Cross-National Comparisons

Comparative political economy offers natural experiments. Economies with stronger welfare states and public investment regimes may exhibit different surplus dynamics than those relying heavily on venture capital and private equity (Boyer, 1990). Cross-national comparisons could reveal whether lower surplus concentration correlates with reduced volatility and inequality.

27.3 Policy Simulation

The model also supports simulation of policy interventions as parameter modifications. Increasing taxation raises τ, increasing dissipation of concentrated capital. Strengthening labor protections increases $L(x,t)$ in the coupled model, stabilizing consumption independent of venture forcing.

Simulations could evaluate how combinations of regulatory adjustments shift critical thresholds Λ_c, potentially enlarging stable regions without reliance on speculative surplus.

28 Global Implications of Surplus Contraction

As global interest rates rise and liquidity tightens, the surplus parameter Λ_{eff} declines. The system approaches the bifurcation threshold, manifesting as declining venture funding, mass layoffs, valuation compression, and intensified rent extraction.

These are not anomalous shocks but dynamical regime shifts. The transition from high-surplus to low-surplus regimes represents a fundamental phase change in the structure of capital accumulation. What appeared as sustainable growth trajectories

under abundant liquidity reveal themselves as metastable configurations that cannot persist under constraint.

The global implications extend beyond individual firm failures. When surplus contraction is widespread, entire industries experience simultaneous devaluation. The layered dependencies between venture-backed firms, platform ecosystems, and gig labor markets create cascading vulnerabilities. A shock to one layer propagates through the system, amplified by tight coupling and nonlinear feedbacks.

29 Toward Post-Surplus Organizational Forms

If surplus-dependent structures are dissipative and non-universalizable, then viable economic forms must satisfy $\rho_{\text{external}} \approx 0$ while maintaining functional stability.

Such systems minimize gradient amplification, exhibit bounded variance, and maintain entropy near equilibrium. Cooperative, commons-based, or publicly funded models approximate this regime more closely than venture-backed startups.

Worker cooperatives distribute ownership and decision-making, reducing concentration dynamics. Commons-based peer production operates through voluntary contribution rather than rent extraction. Public provision of essential services eliminates the need for advertising-driven monetization.

These alternative forms do not require continuous surplus injection to maintain stability. They operate closer to thermodynamic equilibrium, with lower entropy production and reduced vulnerability to forcing withdrawal. Their growth trajectories are more gradual but also more sustainable under resource constraints.

The transition toward such forms requires institutional redesign: regulatory constraints on platform monopolization, labor protections ensuring stable employment, public investment in infrastructure and research, and mechanisms for democratic governance of productive assets. These interventions modify system parameters—reducing β (competitive pressure on alternatives), increasing τ_Φ (dissipation of concentrated capital), and providing stable σW (wage floors) independent of entrepreneurial volatility.

30 Political Economy Implications

30.1 Accumulation Regimes and Historical Specificity

The structural-dynamical model connects to political economy frameworks through the concept of accumulation regimes (Aglietta, 1979; Boyer, 1990). Different historical periods exhibit distinct configurations of surplus generation, circulation, and concentration.

The current regime—characterized by financialization, wage stagnation, and credit expansion—produces specific surplus conditions favorable to venture-backed growth (Krippner, 2011). This is not a permanent state but a historically specific configuration arising from class struggle, institutional evolution, and crisis dynamics (Brenner, 2006).

Marx's analysis of capitalist dynamics emphasized the tendency toward overaccumulation and crisis (Marx, 1894). The startup model, with its dependence on continuous surplus injection, represents a contemporary manifestation of this tendency. Venture capital seeks to overcome declining profit rates through technological monopolization, but this strategy cannot be universalized without reproducing the crisis tendencies it seeks to escape.

30.2 Fictitious Capital and Valuation Dynamics

Venture valuations often exceed any plausible discounted cash flow, representing fictitious capital—claims on future surplus not yet produced (Durand, 2017). This gap between valuation and value production creates systemic instability.

When surplus conditions deteriorate, the fiction becomes untenable. Valuations collapse, triggering cascades through credit markets and pension funds exposed to venture assets (Kliman, 2012). The 2000 dot-com crash and periodic venture contractions illustrate this dynamic.

30.3 Rentiership and Monopoly Power

Successful platforms convert temporary technological advantage into permanent rent extraction through network effects and data monopolies (Srnicek, 2017). This represents a shift from productive to extractive accumulation (Christophers, 2020).

The political economy consequence is increasing concentration of income and wealth,

declining labor share, and growth of unproductive financial activity (Hudson, 2012). The startup model, rather than democratizing opportunity, intensifies inequality through winner-take-most dynamics.

30.4 The State and Infrastructure Provision

The hidden role of state investment in technology development, infrastructure provision, and demand stabilization reveals the public foundations of private accumulation (Mazzucato, 2015). Internet protocols, GPS, touchscreen technology, and fundamental research underlying modern platforms emerged from state-funded research.

The privatization of returns while socializing risks and costs represents a systematic transfer from public to private sectors (Block, 2008). Startup discourse obscures this transfer by attributing success to individual entrepreneurship rather than collective provisioning.

31 Normative and Strategic Implications

31.1 Beyond Growth Fetishism

The analysis suggests that growth-oriented entrepreneurship cannot serve as a universal economic template. Alternative models—cooperatives, mutual associations, commons-based production—exhibit different thermodynamic properties and may prove more sustainable under constraint (Scholz, 2016; Bollier and Helfrich, 2014).

Rather than universalizing high-variance, winner-take-most models, economic policy might support lower-variance, more broadly distributed forms of organization. This requires shifting from growth fetishism to sustainability and equity as primary metrics (Raworth, 2017).

31.2 Institutional Redesign

If surplus is a necessary condition for entrepreneurial dynamism, then institutions might be redesigned to provide stabilizing buffers without concentrating risk. Universal basic income, public ownership of platforms, or mandatory profit-sharing could distribute surplus more equitably while supporting innovation (Standing, 2017; Pasquale, 2016).

The thermodynamic perspective suggests that dissipative structures require energy sources. Rather than extracting this energy from precarious labor and consumer debt, sustainable models would draw on collectively managed resources and democratically allocated investment.

31.3 Limits to Universalization

Recognizing the non-universalizability of startup logic implies accepting limits to entrepreneurial expansion. Not all activities should be organized as high-growth ventures; not all work should be gig-mediated; not all attention should be monetized.

Establishing boundaries—regulatory constraints on platform power, labor protections, limits on data extraction—becomes essential for systemic stability rather than market interference (Rahman, 2018). The question is not whether limits exist but how they are institutionally encoded.

32 Conclusion

The analysis developed across economic theory, dynamical systems, and category theory converges on a single structural insight: startup culture and advertising-based business models presuppose surplus conditions that are neither permanent nor universalizable.

Surplus functions as a control parameter, an adjunction, and a boundary condition. It enables morphisms that would otherwise be undefined; it sustains dissipative structures that would otherwise decay; it lowers entropy locally while increasing systemic fragility.

The ideological naturalization of startup logic obscures these dependencies. By rendering surplus explicit—financial, institutional, informational, and ecological—we expose the contingency of entrepreneurial dynamism.

The normative implication is not anti-innovation but pro-coherence. Economic forms must be evaluated not solely on growth metrics but on thermodynamic stability, distributive equity, and ecological compatibility. Dissipative structures may be locally productive, but they cannot be universally generalized without erasing the gradients that sustain them.

In recognizing the assumption of surplus, we recover a classical insight of political economy: accumulation is not self-grounding. It depends upon historically specific configurations of class power, institutional support, and resource availability. When

those configurations shift, so too must our economic imaginaries.

The future of innovation lies not in infinite scaling of surplus-dependent forms but in the design of institutions capable of sustaining complexity within constraint. This requires rethinking entrepreneurship, rebalancing public and private roles, and re-embedding economic activity within ecological and social limits.

The startup is not destiny. It is a regime artifact. Its viability rests upon surplus. When surplus contracts, so too does the space of feasible morphisms. Recognizing this boundary condition is the first step toward constructing economic forms that endure.

References

Aglietta, M. (1979). *A Theory of Capitalist Regulation: The US Experience*. New Left Books, London.

Arrighi, G. (2010). *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times*. Verso, London. Updated edition.

Baran, P. and Sweezy, P. (1957). *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. Monthly Review Press, New York.

Bhattacharya, T., editor (2017). *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression*. Pluto Press, London.

Blank, S. (2013). *The Startup Owner's Manual: The Step-by-Step Guide for Building a Great Company*. K&S Ranch.

Block, F. (2008). Swimming against the current: The rise of a hidden developmental state in the United States. *Politics & Society*, 36(2):169–206.

Bollier, D. and Helfrich, S., editors (2014). *The Wealth of the Commons: A World Beyond Market and State*. Levellers Press.

Boyer, R. (1990). *The Regulation School: A Critical Introduction*. Columbia University Press, New York.

Brenner, R. (2006). *The Economics of Global Turbulence*. Verso, London.

Christophers, B. (2020). *Rentier Capitalism: Who Owns the Economy, and Who Pays for It?* Verso, London.

Cross, M. and Hohenberg, P. (1993). Pattern formation outside of equilibrium. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 65(3):851–1112.

Cynamon, B. and Fazzari, S. (2011). Inequality, the great recession, and slow recovery. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 40(2):373–399.

Dubal, V. (2020). Digital piecework: Work and virtue in the age of algorithmic fragmentation. *Denver Law Review*, 98:3–48.

Durand, C. (2017). *Fictitious Capital: How Finance Is Appropriating Our Future*. Verso, London.

Fairlie, R. and Miranda, J. (2018). *Kauffman Indicators of Entrepreneurship*. Kauffman Foundation.

Federici, S. (2012). *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. PM Press, Oakland, CA.

Foster, J. (2014). *The Theory of Monopoly Capitalism: An Elaboration of Marxian Political Economy*. Monthly Review Press, New York. New edition.

Foster, J., Clark, B., and York, R. (2009). *The Ecological Rift: Capitalism's War on the Earth*. Monthly Review Press, New York.

Fraser, N. (2016). Contradictions of capital and care. *New Left Review*, (100):99–117.

Gompers, P. and Lerner, J. (2001). *The Money of Invention: How Venture Capital Creates New Wealth*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

Gornall, W. and Strebulaev, I. (2020). Squaring venture capital valuations with reality. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 135(1):120–143.

Haldane, A. (2009). Rethinking the financial network. Speech delivered at the Financial Student Association, Amsterdam.

Hudson, M. (2012). *The Bubble and Beyond: Fictitious Capital, Debt Deflation and Global Crisis*. ISLET, Dresden.

Kalecki, M. (1971). *Selected Essays on the Dynamics of the Capitalist Economy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Keen, S. (2017). *Debunking Economics: The Naked Emperor Dethroned?* Zed Books, London. Revised edition.

Kenney, M. and Patton, D. (2011). Does inventor ownership encourage university research-derived entrepreneurship? *Research Policy*, 40(8):1100–1112.

Kerr, W., Lerner, J., and Schoar, A. (2014). The consequences of entrepreneurial finance: Evidence from angel financings. *Review of Financial Studies*, 27(1):20–55.

Kliman, A. (2012). *The Failure of Capitalist Production: Underlying Causes of the Great Recession*. Pluto Press, London.

Krippner, G. (2011). *Capitalizing on Crisis: The Political Origins of the Rise of Finance*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Lapavitsas, C. (2013). *Profiting Without Producing: How Finance Exploits Us All*. Verso, London.

Lazonick, W. (2013). The financialization of the US corporation: What has been lost, and how it can be regained. *Seattle University Law Review*, 36:857–909.

Marx, K. (1867/1976). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume I*. Penguin Classics, London. Translated by Ben Fowkes.

Marx, K. (1894/1981). *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume III*. Penguin Classics, London. Translated by David Fernbach.

Mazzucato, M. (2015). *The Entrepreneurial State: Debunking Public vs. Private Sector Myths*. PublicAffairs, New York. Revised edition.

Mian, A. and Sufi, A. (2014). *House of Debt: How They (and You) Caused the Great Recession, and How We Can Prevent It from Happening Again*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Moore, J. (2015). *Capitalism in the Web of Life: Ecology and the Accumulation of Capital*. Verso, London.

Nanda, R. and Rhodes-Kropf, M. (2014). Financing risk and innovation. *Management Science*, 63(4):901–918.

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Pasquale, F. (2016). Two narratives of platform capitalism. *Yale Law & Policy Review*, 35:309–319.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer.

Prigogine, I. and Nicolis, G. (1977). *Self-Organization in Nonequilibrium Systems: From Dissipative Structures to Order through Fluctuations*. Wiley, New York.

Rahman, K. (2018). The new utilities: Private power, social infrastructure, and the revival of the public utility concept. *Cardozo Law Review*, 39:1621–1689.

Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Junction, VT.

Ries, E. (2011). *The Lean Startup: How Today's Entrepreneurs Use Continuous Innovation to Create Radically Successful Businesses*. Crown Business, New York.

Rin, M., Hellmann, T., and Puri, M. (2013). A survey of venture capital research. In Constantinides, G., Harris, M., and Stulz, R., editors, *Handbook of the Economics of Finance*, volume 2, pages 573–648. Elsevier.

Rosenblat, A. (2018). *Uberland: How Algorithms Are Rewriting the Rules of Work*. University of California Press, Oakland.

Scheffer, M., Bascompte, J., Brock, W., Brovkin, V., Carpenter, S., Dakos, V., Held, H., van Nes, E., Rietkerk, M., and Sugihara, G. (2009). Early-warning signals for critical transitions. *Nature*, 461(7260):53–59.

Scholz, T. (2016). *Platform Cooperativism: Challenging the Corporate Sharing Economy*. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, New York.

Schor, J., Attwood-Charles, W., Cansoy, M., Ladegaard, I., and Wengronowitz, R. (2020). Dependence and precarity in the platform economy. *Theory and Society*, 49:833–861.

Shane, S. (2008). *The Illusions of Entrepreneurship: The Costly Myths That Entrepreneurs, Investors, and Policy Makers Live By*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform Capitalism*. Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. Bloomsbury Academic, London.

Standing, G. (2017). *Basic Income: And How We Can Make It Happen*. Pelican Books, London.

Stigler, G. (1961). The economics of information. *Journal of Political Economy*, 69(3):213–225.

Stiglitz, J. (2017). Towards a broader view of competition policy. In Bonakele, T., Fox, E., and Mncube, L., editors, *Competition Policy for the New Era: Insights from the BRICS Countries*, pages 4–68. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Thiel, P. and Masters, B. (2014). *Zero to One: Notes on Startups, or How to Build the Future*. Crown Business, New York.

Turow, J. (2011). *The Daily You: How the New Advertising Industry Is Defining Your Identity and Your Worth*. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Weeks, K. (2011). *The Problem with Work: Feminism, Marxism, Antiwork Politics, and Postwork Imaginaries*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.

Yeung, K. (2017). 'Hypernudge': Big data as a mode of regulation by design. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20(1):118–136.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs, New York.