Preserving Capitalism's Competitive Engine

A Scale–Contestability Framework for High-Concentration Economies

Author: Che-Hwon Bae
Website: www.baemax.co.uk
Version: V3 — Revised Working Paper
Last Updated: February 2026

Disclaimer

This paper reflects the personal views of the author at the time of writing and is provided for informational and discussion purposes only. It does not constitute legal, regulatory, investment, or policy advice. The framework presented is conceptual in nature and intended to stimulate dialogue on market structure and institutional design. Readers should seek independent professional advice before acting on any ideas discussed herein.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Capitalism's core advantage is not private ownership alone. It is competitive dynamism — the continuous reallocation of capital, labour, and innovation under decentralised pressure.

However, in several critical sectors — finance, cloud infrastructure, AI platforms, and digital marketplaces — concentration has reached levels where failure becomes politically intolerable and exit becomes operationally difficult. When exit becomes operationally implausible, competitive pressure erodes — even in the absence of formal monopoly power. While scale improves efficiency up to a point, excessive concentration risks eroding the very competitive mechanisms that make capitalism adaptive.

This paper introduces a **Scale–Contestability Framework** to reconcile three realities:

1. Scale often increases efficiency and is sometimes strategically necessary.
2. Excessive concentration weakens contestability and long-term dynamism.
3. Not all industries can or should be made competitive in the same way.

Rather than advocating fragmentation or ideological restructuring, this framework proposes architectural solutions:

- **Pro-portability design in competitive markets**
- **Scale-with-exit safeguards in strategic industries**
- **Measured efficiency governance in natural monopolies**

The objective is not to limit scale, but to preserve capitalism's competitive engine in an era of exponential infrastructure and global rivalry.

---

1. Capitalism's Mechanical Advantage

Capitalism functions as a decentralised optimisation engine.

Its defining strengths are:

- Distributed decision-making
- Price signalling
- Creative destruction
- Capital mobility
- Competitive discipline

Competition forces adaptation.
Competition reallocates inefficiency.
Competition generates innovation rents through performance rather than protection.

This competitive pressure is the system's core mechanism.

Without credible competition, capitalism risks devolving into protected incumbency.

---

2. The Concentration Efficiency Curve

Economies of scale produce undeniable benefits:

- Lower marginal cost
- Shared infrastructure efficiencies
- Greater R&D capacity
- Global distribution networks
- Data-driven network effects

Up to a threshold, concentration increases efficiency.

Beyond that threshold, however, diminishing competitive pressure can:

- Raise entry barriers
- Increase switching costs
- Entrench incumbents
- Shift innovation from disruptive to defensive
- Increase systemic fragility

This can be conceptualised as a **Concentration Efficiency Curve**:

Concentration Level	**System Outcome**
Low	Fragmentation, inefficiency
Moderate	Optimal scale + competition
High	Reduced contestability
Extreme	Entrenchment + fragility

The structural challenge is not eliminating scale, but preventing scale from eliminating competition.

The policy error of the past decade has often been to treat stability and efficiency as aligned objectives. In reality, extreme stability achieved through concentrated scale may suppress the competitive dynamism that underpins long-term efficiency.

---

3. The Too-Big-To-Fail Feedback Loop

The 2008 financial crisis exposed a structural distortion.

When institutions become systemically critical:

- Failure becomes politically intolerable.
- State intervention replaces market selection.
- Moral hazard emerges.

Regulatory responses, while stabilising, increased compliance costs and capital requirements — disproportionately favouring large incumbents.

This raises the minimum viable scale and further entrenches concentration.

The system becomes safer in the short term, but less dynamic over time.

Stability and competition are not identical goals. Both must be preserved.

The timeline of concentration has compressed.

Network effects and regulatory complexity enable firms to reach systemic scale faster than traditional policy frameworks can adapt.

In AI-driven markets, model scale, compute intensity, and data aggregation compound this effect further, accelerating concentration dynamics beyond historical precedent.

---

4. The Consumer–System Tension

Consumers benefit from scale:

- Lower prices
- Convenience
- Integrated services
- Reliability

Short-term consumer welfare often reinforces concentration.

However, long-term systemic welfare depends on:

- Innovation
- Entry potential
- Adaptive resilience
- Avoidance of regulatory capture

The policy challenge is reconciling short-term price optimisation with long-term dynamism.

---

5. Contestability as the Structural Lever

The central insight of this framework is:

The problem is not size alone — it is loss of contestability.

A market may be concentrated yet competitive if:

- Entry remains credible
- Switching costs are low
- Data portability exists
- Interoperability is preserved

Thus, instead of limiting scale directly, policy should prioritise:

> Designing systems where exit remains credible.

Scale + Low Exit Friction = Dynamic Efficiency

Scale + High Exit Friction = Entrenched Monopoly

This reframes competition policy from anti-scale to pro-portability.

5.1 Typology of Exit Friction

Exit friction is not uniform. It arises through multiple structural channels, which may operate independently or in combination.

For analytical clarity, exit friction can be categorised into three primary forms:

1. Technical Exit Friction

Technical friction arises where system architecture, data formats, or integration dependencies make migration operationally complex.

Examples include:

- Proprietary data schemas
- Non-standard APIs
- Deep integration across enterprise systems
- High data egress costs
- Embedded workflow dependencies

In such cases, exit is technically feasible but operationally burdensome.

---

2. Economic Exit Friction

Economic friction arises where pricing structures, incentives, or contractual arrangements materially penalise switching or multi-homing.

Examples include:

- Volume-based rebates contingent on exclusivity
- Preferential commission tiers
- Loyalty-linked ranking advantages
- Termination penalties
- Bundled service discounts

Here, exit is legally possible but financially unattractive.

---

3. Relational or Network Exit Friction

Relational friction arises where value is embedded in reputation, user graphs, or accumulated behavioural data that cannot be ported.

Examples include:

- Non-transferable subscriber networks
- Platform-specific reputation scores
- Historical engagement metrics
- Algorithmically derived trust signals

In such environments, leaving entails loss of accumulated relational capital.

These forms of friction may compound. A market exhibiting high technical, economic, and relational friction simultaneously presents elevated entrenchment risk.

The objective of pro-portability architecture is not to eliminate scale or competitive incentives, but to prevent these forms of friction from rendering exit operationally implausible.

---

6. Innovation-Compatible Portability

A legitimate concern is that standardisation may suppress innovation.

Rigid system-wide standardisation can indeed constrain evolution.

Therefore, this framework distinguishes between:

- System standardisation (undesirable)
- Interface interoperability (necessary)

Systemically significant firms should:

- Maintain documented, version-controlled APIs
- Provide machine-readable export layers
- Ensure defined backward compatibility windows
- Preserve full data continuity upon exit

Internal architectures remain unconstrained.

Innovation occurs within modules; portability is enforced at boundaries.

Historically, stable interface standards have accelerated ecosystem innovation by lowering entry barriers without freezing internal design.

---

7. The Dual-Layer Competition Model

Modern markets operate across both domestic and geopolitical dimensions.

Layer I — Strategic Scale

In sectors such as:

- AI infrastructure
- Cloud computing
- Financial clearing
- Defence systems
- Payments networks

Scale may be strategically necessary.

Where strong international competitors exist, domestic concentration may not eliminate competition — it relocates it to the global level. In such cases, scale may be justified on strategic grounds.

Layer II — Domestic Contestability

Even where scale is strategically permitted, domestic exit must remain credible.

Requirements may include:

- Data portability
- Interoperable migration tooling
- Transparent switching protocols
- Non-discriminatory access

Scale is permitted in exchange for credible exit.

This preserves both national competitiveness and domestic dynamism.

7.1 Jurisdictional Concentration Risk

In globally integrated technology markets, concentration risk may extend beyond firm-level dominance to jurisdictional dependence.

Where critical infrastructure — cloud services, operating systems, identity frameworks, AI platforms — is concentrated within firms operating under a single sovereign jurisdiction, exit risk becomes geopolitical as well as economic.

Widespread reliance on platforms such as Microsoft, Amazon, or Google creates not only market concentration considerations, but exposure to extraterritorial regulatory regimes and policy divergence.

In such environments, portability and interoperability function as tools of strategic resilience. The objective is not fragmentation of global platforms, but reduction of operational dependency risk through:

- Multi-cloud capability
- Data localisation flexibility
- Interoperable system architectures
- Sovereign fallback capacity

Contestability, in this context, becomes a mechanism of geopolitical optionality.

7.2 Contestability and Investment Uncertainty

In high-concentration digital markets, entry barriers are shaped by both product capability and migration friction.

Challengers must compete on performance, reliability, and price. However, where switching costs are opaque or operationally uncertain, customers may delay transition even when technically viable alternatives exist.

This uncertainty compounds competitive disadvantage. When migration cost and operational disruption are difficult to quantify, potential entrants face increased revenue uncertainty and

extended payback horizons. Capital markets, in turn, discount the probability of successful displacement.

The result is elevated investment risk and slower competitive formation.

Reducing exit friction does not eliminate capability gaps. It reduces uncertainty. In doing so, it lowers the barrier to entry for credible challengers and improves capital allocation toward innovation.

---

8. Stability Constraints in Finance

In financial systems, exit mechanisms must be designed carefully.

Unrestricted instantaneous migration could amplify liquidity stress.

Therefore:

- Portability must be engineered alongside liquidity safeguards.
- Settlement windows and supervisory coordination remain essential.
- Migration protocols must be structured, not chaotic.

Contestability must not undermine systemic stability.

---

9. Natural Monopolies: When Competition Is Inefficient

Certain sectors exhibit structural natural monopoly characteristics:

- Gas pipelines
- Electricity transmission
- Water networks
- Rail infrastructure

Duplication is inefficient.

In such sectors, exit cannot discipline performance.

Instead, accountability must be enforced through measurable efficiency.

Not all concentrated industries exhibit exit friction. In capital-intensive manufacturing sectors such as semiconductor memory — where firms like Samsung Electronics, SK Hynix, and Micron compete within standardised product specifications — switching between suppliers remains feasible for customers. In such cases, concentration reflects scale economics rather than lock-in architecture.

---

10. Public Project Token (PPT) as Accountability Architecture

Where contestability is infeasible, transparency becomes the discipline mechanism.

A Public Project Token (PPT) framework can:

- Track capex delivery against milestones
- Monitor uptime and service reliability
- Measure cost per unit delivered
- Record maintenance backlog metrics
- Link performance to contractual consequences

In competitive markets, discipline comes from exit.

In natural monopolies, discipline must come from verifiable measurement.

---

11. Illustrative Applications

Cloud Infrastructure — Egress Neutrality

Large cloud providers deliver efficiency through scale.
Lock-in often emerges through high data egress fees and proprietary architectures.

A pro-portability framework would require:

- Non-punitive export pricing
- Transparent interoperability documentation
- Migration tooling availability

Scale remains. Lock-in weakens.

Online Marketplaces — Reputation Portability

Platforms such as Amazon create network effects via seller ratings and reviews.

If reputation capital cannot move, competition diminishes.

Pro-portability requirements could include:

- Machine-readable export of verified review histories
- Portable transaction performance records
- Standardised seller reputation certificates

The platform retains scale, but sellers regain mobility.

Financial Services — Account Continuity

Switching financial providers should preserve:

- Direct debit mandates
- Transaction history
- Credit profile continuity

Migration friction, not service quality, often drives inertia.

Reducing exit friction restores competitive pressure without fragmenting scale.

Digital Media Platforms — Creator Portability

In video and digital media markets, platform dominance is reinforced by network effects embedded in subscriber graphs, engagement history, and monetisation systems.

Where creator identity, verified subscriber relationships, and performance analytics cannot be ported across platforms, exit friction becomes substantial.

Pro-portability architecture could include:

- Transferable verified subscriber lists
- Portable engagement and watch-history data
- Standardised creator reputation credentials
- Interoperable monetisation verification

Portability would not eliminate the need for infrastructure scale or discovery innovation. It would reduce migration uncertainty and enable challengers to compete on merit rather than on lock-in.

Digital Marketplaces — Economic Exit Friction

In platform-based marketplaces such as Uber and Deliveroo, suppliers may technically retain the ability to multi-home across platforms.

However, preferential commission structures, algorithmic ranking advantages, and volume-based incentives can create economic disincentives to exit or diversify.

Where economic penalties for non-exclusivity materially affect supplier income, switching remains legally possible but financially constrained.

Such economic exit friction can reduce contestability even in the absence of technical lock-in.

The objective of pro-portability policy is not to prohibit competitive pricing or incentives, but to ensure that commercial structures do not eliminate credible supplier mobility.

---

12. Operationalising the Framework

To avoid abstraction, pro-portability must be measurable.

Possible tools include:

- **Interface certification** for systemic firms
- **Portability stress testing**
- **M&A conditionality linked to exit readiness**
- **Exit Friction Index metrics**
- **Regulatory proportionality thresholds**

Portability obligations activate at defined systemic importance thresholds to avoid burdening startups.

Illustrative Exit Friction Index (EFI)

To make contestability measurable, regulators and market designers may consider the development of an Exit Friction Index (EFI).

The EFI would not measure firm size, but the practical difficulty of switching.

Indicative dimensions could include:

- **Migration Time**: Average time required to complete a full operational transition.
- **Switching Cost Ratio**: Direct financial cost of migration relative to annual service expenditure.
- **Data Continuity Score**: Percentage of historical data that can be transferred in machine-readable format.
- **Integration Dependency Burden**: Number of third-party systems requiring manual reconfiguration.
- **Penalty & Lock-In Exposure**: Presence of contractual or technical barriers to exit.

Markets exhibiting high concentration combined with high EFI scores would represent heightened entrenchment risk.

The purpose of such an index would not be punitive, but diagnostic — identifying where exit has become operationally implausible.

---

13. Incentive Alignment and the Role of the State

Firms operate rationally.

In competitive markets, they optimise for:

- Customer acquisition
- Retention
- Margin stability
- Switching friction

Reducing switching costs is rarely in a firm's private interest once scale has been achieved.

Lock-in creates:

- Pricing power
- Revenue predictability
- Higher valuation multiples
- Reduced competitive pressure

Therefore, portability and exit mechanisms are unlikely to arise voluntarily at scale.

This is not a moral judgment.
It is a predictable outcome of incentive structures.

Where private incentives diverge from systemic welfare, institutional design becomes necessary.

---

14. Why Government Must Demand Transferability

In competitive markets, exit is the ultimate disciplining force.

If exit becomes prohibitively costly, competitive pressure weakens even without formal monopoly.

Thus, governments and regulators have a legitimate role in preserving contestability — not by capping scale arbitrarily, but by ensuring that exit remains feasible.

The role of the state is not to suppress scale.

It is to:

- Prevent artificial barriers to mobility
- Preserve market optionality
- Maintain credible threat of switching

- Ensure innovation rents arise from performance rather than captivity

This is not interventionism; it is structural stewardship of competitive architecture.

---

15. Transferability as a Licensing Condition

One mechanism is to embed portability into regulatory approval.

Systemically significant service providers could be required to:

- Demonstrate interoperable export layers
- Maintain migration tooling
- Support continuity of historical data
- Publish interface documentation
- Undergo portability stress tests

These requirements would scale proportionally with systemic importance.

Small firms would not face the same burden.

Portability thus becomes:

A condition of scale.

Not a punishment for success.

---

16. Preventing Regulatory Overreach

At the same time, caution is required.

Excessive regulatory burden can:

- Increase minimum viable scale
- Raise compliance costs
- Entrench incumbents further

Therefore:

Portability obligations must be:

- Targeted
- Interface-focused
- Proportional
- Technology-neutral

The objective is not bureaucratic expansion.

It is preserving competitive oxygen.

---

17. The Structural Principle

The principle can be stated clearly:

> Where scale becomes systemically significant, transferability must become mandatory.

This preserves:

- Consumer benefit from scale
- Innovation inside firms
- Long-term market dynamism

Without transferability, scale risks evolving into structural entrenchment.

With transferability, scale remains productive.

---

18. Conclusion

Capitalism's strength lies in competitive dynamism.

Economies of scale increase efficiency — but without structural safeguards, scale may erode the competitive pressure that sustains innovation.

The solution is not ideological restructuring.

It is an architectural design.

- Preserve scale where it enhances efficiency.
- Preserve contestability where competition is possible.
- Enforce measurable accountability where competition is infeasible.

The challenge of modern capitalism is not whether scale exists.

It is whether the competitive engine survives alongside it.

Capitalism does not fail when firms become large.
It fails when exit becomes implausible.
The preservation of mobility — not the suppression of scale — is the defining challenge of high-concentration economies.