



The Global Company Inequality and Employment

Mozart Nino

Program of Post-graduate Studies in Social Sciences [1]

Pontifícia Universidade Católica – São Paulo, Brasil

Address: Praça Germânia, 57 ap. 163, São Paulo - SP. CEP: 01455-080

E-mail: mozart.nino@gmail.com

Abstract: Extremes of socioeconomic inequality demand the need for work, jobs, employment and the resulting income all across the planet more than anything else. This article attempts to explore the contribution of what part of this task, companies and namely the large global companies do.

Keywords: companies, employment, inequality, market, state, sustainable development

Paper received: 12/11/2013

Paper accepted for Publication: 20/01/2014

INTRODUCTION

The debate on sustainable development in its economic, environmental and social dimensions, through the media, the academia, the organizations and social networks, have led companies and notably the great global company – including in Brazil, to regularly develop the so-called sustainable actions and almost always disclose and/or obtain media coverage of these initiatives, where they seek to present themselves to society - market and constituted powers, as responsible and committed institutions both to the environment and to the socioeconomic human progress.

This article aims to show what has been the contribution of these companies by evaluating the level and evolution of their direct jobs in the global market, taken from a doctoral research project in progress, whose theme is the capital and the social dimension of sustainable development and the focus is its role, responsibility and commitment to the reduction of socioeconomic inequality, poverty and misery on the planet, under orientation of Prof. Dr. Miguel Chaia, PhD [2].

CRISIS AND SOCIETY

The world socioeconomic crisis in the years 1970 [3] had as precedents high inflation, swollen States, stagnation, low productivity and high level of state interventionism. The reaction via liberal public policies – still interventionist, but to a lesser extent – announced by some nation States, causes the collapse of the system that was based on a set of job control practices, technologies, consumer habits and economic and political power settings; triggers a process of change, uncertainty and instability in capitalism, with production and flexible jobs, geographic mobility, changes in practices of consumption.

Taken to extremes in the years 1990 and 2000, such policies bring as result, a global financial crisis at start, which evolves into another extremely serious socioeconomic crisis, once financial markets have liberalized to a point of being unstable, generating low growth, recession and unemployment.

The ever finding of a persistent poverty, world widely scattered amid high and growing concentration of wealth, the growth of inequality and its reappearance in developed societies highlight the socioeconomic issue and has made arise ever since movements of humanitarian and assistance character by direct help from NGOs / CSOPs [4] to populations in precarious and difficult conditions both also by wars and natural disasters as well as the absence, indifference and very little successful integrated action between States and markets, governments and companies.

The change in the political model of the welfare State – its retreat from its presumed social function on one side, and the innovations brought by the information and communication technologies on the other, increase the problem and the visibility of backwardness and socioeconomic inequalities.

However, reducing inequality and poverty and even eradicate misery, requires substantial change in the lives of its protagonists. The imperative is that all should not be just passive agents of assistance and paternalism, but subjects who seek projects that require initiative, dedication, commitment and responsibility in the search for higher standards and quality of life. Necessary becomes that they directly participate in the development of income generating projects as remuneration for the work done and not just receive emergency resources, in order for them to make the entry by assistance programs already linked to a decent way out by a productive work generator of income.

This action is ethically and morally required. But to also be socioeconomically sustainable it needs to happen by the learning on how to use the resources of nature, transforming them, with capital and labor, in production and trade in a free market. As a result of this natural process instinctively created by human beings since very early and improved throughout history, come innovation, productivity and increase in the standard of living to all that of this process actively participate.

Due to the global scale of operations many companies already operate their own projects and a myriad of others along with humanitarian associations. With that they hope to be seen as institutions with social vision, acting beyond the economic dimension focused only on remuneration of investments.

The local and business elites are impacted in a particular form of consciousness and taken to act socially with moral and religious motivations as well as social legitimation.

However, in general they should not understand the exercise of good citizenship as a business imperative only and just only because it is assumed to be good for the company.

The liberal thought inherited from the Austrian School of Economics [5] [6] [7] rejects the welfare State as a paradigm of the process or the institutional system of social life, also because it is a generator of accommodation to benefits with no commitments nor responsibilities and, in addition, to discourage the innate motivations and capacity of human beings to learn, engage and take risks.

Actually what is proposed here is that this socioeconomic rescue could be much more successful if the participation of the capital, assumed here as imperative, happens integrated and complementary to both public authorities and independent social movements.

Although there are records of previous initiatives, it was only from the years 1960, with the advent of the administration by objectives and the rational management focused on efficiency in order to serve the economic and social progress [8] that companies began to define and develop policies, practices and objectives so-called social – both internal and external – and many of them accountable and disseminating at least part of those called social investments.

This growing interest of the company for a more relevant social role should and needs to be much more than the capitalist accumulation, its perpetuation and security to continue to generate value and obtain profits. Beyond the human being's behavior with regard to power and money, the crisis of the State, either hypertrophied, minimum or absent, and constituted public officials taking care over their own personal and family power projects, one should discuss the role of business in reducing inequality, in overcoming poverty and in meeting essential needs of human beings and society.

This 2008 and still ongoing socioeconomic and political crisis already made disappear millions of jobs in the formal market of developed economies. The resulting instability, we have seen, in addition to having already toppled Governments, has jeopardized even some democracies.

Even where there is unemployment insurance, discloses the international media, people have taken informal jobs with low pay, no social protection and with risks even for survival. More than 200 million people may fall into absolute poverty – in addition to the hundreds of millions already there.

A crisis of these proportions cannot be solved by the ideological dogma of the austerity cutbacks of expenses and investments. On the contrary, the elite world leaders should make the generation of jobs an absolute political priority, to at least sustain some more consumption by

income growth and not just by people's indebtedness.

In addition, allow and/or facilitate debt restructuring – needs, interest and time limits – where applicable, and to improve the functionality of the credit system, make credit flow more for medium-sized, small and micro enterprises. Even more important would be the reduction of taxes and charges paid by entrepreneurs and employers on investments and wages, as a stimulus for companies to invest and to hire people.

Stimulate and preserve its internal market, Governments spending better and within limits of a tax burden that focuses and not only punish the productive investment generator of jobs, should be the basis of the plans of any nation organized as a market economy, open to research and knowledge transfer, with a necessary State, more agile, less bureaucratic and provider of quality public services.

In Brazil, although there are occasional adverse effects that may even expand, one has to highlight the performance of the Brazilian economy in the current crisis, at least so far, as a result of governmental action of developmental and social focus, generator of jobs, broad support to social programs and, in particular, the existing greater control and regulatory action of the local financial banking system market. Still not perfect, has served as an example and model to Governments and global institutions for monitoring, control and promotion of economies and markets.

But the lack of large-scale infrastructure investments, the complexity of legislation and high level tax rates on production, consumption, income, labor and payroll, Government spending, deficits and excessive waste, added to the inefficiency of the administrative engine at all levels, are the focus and essence of the vulnerabilities of the Brazilian economy. The industry, commerce and services sectors of the economy suffer severe competitive limitations imposed by the endless series of legal, bureaucratic, logistical, tax and fiscal barriers. Without structural changes, Brazil will continue to follow on the margins of the global economy, always fighting symptoms, not the causes of inefficiencies.

INEQUALITY

*In my commonwealth... For no kind of traffic would I admit
Letters should not be known... No name of magistrate
Riches, poverty and use of service, none... No occupation... No sovereignty
All things in common... Nature should bring forth of its own kind... All foison, all abundance
Line of Gonzalo, honest councillor of Alonso, King of Naples
The tempest. William Shakespeare. 1611.*

Conceptually, inequality is expressed as social due to the many existing objective differences, particularly in the economic and legal fields, between members of a community or between groups of reference with which one is able to draw comparisons regarding cause of actions and reactions in order to eliminate these differences[9]. Actually and more specifically, the concept being used here is of socioeconomic inequality expressed from the differences in abilities, commitments and responsibilities of individuals, families, regional populations and also between markets and nation-States with generation, accumulation and distribution of wealth and income.

It is known that the above-mentioned councillor Gonzalo's paradisiac commonwealth -

that in fact, none of the characters in the play takes seriously, even centuries before the time it was written nor today, can be considered as an example of a society with social organization, quality of life, well-being, innovation and development, since what could be the idealization of paradise is actually the description of a precarious way of life of populations and cultures of very primitive hunters – gatherers nomads.

In his research, Jared Diamond[10] shows that even today, there are people living out of nature by collecting plants and hunting. Nomads just like more than 10,000 years ago, they do not experience quality of life and social organization capacity even minimal under the so-called civilized standards, at least in Western terms, once they do not even dominate food production technology, with domestication of animals and primitive agriculture. As they all have to devote most of their time looking for food, they tend to develop more egalitarian societies, in a collectivist production model, in a tribal society and still no social classes, no bureaucrats, no hereditary chiefs and a minimum of political organization.

However, priests already act among them with the worship of deities, the help to reduce fears and grievances and also, to bring relief to suffering and evil [11].

In our contemporary times[12] there are successes and signs of hope for better well-being and quality of life, with infant mortality dropping, increased human life expectancy, the proportion of adults in the world who can read and write, as well as increases the proportion of children starting school. In addition, the world food production increases more rapidly than population growth.

However, the same processes that produced these gains also gave rise to trends as, in absolute numbers, there are more hungry people, who cannot read or write, who do not have safe drinking water, safe and comfortable houses nor energy for cooking and heating. The gap between rich and poor countries increases – does not diminish – and there are few prospects, taking into account the trends and present institutional arrangements, that this process reverts. Socioeconomic inequality varies between societies, historical periods, economic structures and systems (capitalism or socialism), wars and abilities of individuals to create value and wealth. But mankind has never managed to end the horror of war and famine, these being the biggest systemic failure of human society[13].

Dramatically true ever since and when written (1987) as it is today. Since always human beings have talent, innovation, technology, resources, power, politics, Government, bureaucracy and personal interests sometimes nothing but transparent. But also lack desire, commitment and responsibility.

By analyzing and trying to answer why some societies flourished more than others, Jared Diamond [14] identifies in food production – the beginnings of the agricultural revolution, with irrigation technologies, plant cultivation and domestication of animals – the formation of the first human groups and the origin of socioeconomic inequality.

Stocks of food release humans from the daily effort to ensure food. However, the complexity resulted from the need for planning, resource use and mainly with the stockpiling of food, raises the need for the organization of human groups in towns and cities later and also its protection and security.

From the existence of herds and the stockpiling of food and around that wealth, arise both craftsmen and scribes as well as a political elite to control, taxation, full-time political,

administrative and safety activities. All of them free from the obligation to produce and ensure their own food. So then begins the development of settled societies, established, politically centered, socially stratified, economically complex and technically innovative [15], bringing to join religion, the need for governance, social management, regulation, control, bureaucracy, and the already cited protection and security.

From here also changes virtually every relationship of humans with the environment because it begins the reversal of the relationship of prevalence of nature onto the human being, with his process of intervention, search and use of natural resources, fed by the slow, continuous, long, inexorable, unending and irreplaceable evolution of innovation, productivity, science and technology.

Metals expert craftsmen produce swords and other weapons, and along with the production and supply of food, humans acquire a base from which to mount police and armed forces, make wars and create civilizations, empires and dynasties. Thus, by the accumulation of wealth and power by the fittest and most productive and technologically advanced and, along with the environmental effects arising, the political power, the economic power and the socioeconomic inequality broadens and consolidates.

So, politics, the military, the public administration and production join mysticism and religion, which with its natural vocation for power, feeds on humans a life haunted by spirits and demons, subduing them with guilt and fear, intimidation and duress and precepts of good and evil, with appeals not only to accept a superior metaphysical entity protection, essential to their salvation and redemption, but also [16] one moral of compassion and of exaggeration of piety. Princes, kings, emperors, nobles and military, dictators and tyrants, rulers and bureaucrats, join priests and religious not only to the deification of the State but also to the exercise of moral and social regulation in the world. All this permeated not only by beliefs generators of ideologies, disciples and followers, as well as by fears of the unknown, structured from economic power, environmental imbalance and socioeconomic inequality.

In contemporary times there are alerts that the damage of economic activity has gone beyond the limits of sustainable survival of the planet and the human species, which in turn has never experienced existence without extremes of wealth and poverty, misery and famine.

Inevitable is the controversy over the morality and usefulness of inequality and its effects on human society on ceno system of social division of labor should dispense a method that makes individuals responsible for their contribution of free choice to the joint effort of production, responsibility established by the framework of prices, with the consequent inequality of income and wealth, essential characteristics of a market economy, whose alleged distributive inefficiency was also never worked out by State interventionism, lavish model in the transformation of free individual choice to generate well-being, in bureaucratic human beings abiding by orders and obligations without any relation to the real needs of the consumer market[17].The fully awareness of the innate inequality between humans is that it is this inequality that leads to social cooperation and to civilization. And what makes possible the evolution of society is precisely the fact that peaceful cooperation under the sign of division of labour in the long run, pick up and meets better to the selfish interests of all. The superiority of market society consists in the fact that its operation confirms this principle[18].

However, even if it is accepted that the selfish human initiative and its innate inequality –

and not the provoked – can be a promoter of investment, extremes of socioeconomic inequality need to be seen as a social problem that widens and becomes great, if not the greatest generator of harm to society.

It is well established that [19] also in the richest societies the poor live less and suffer more of almost all social problems. However, one common factor binds societies healthier and happier: the greatest degree of equality among its members. In addition, more unequal societies with extreme boundaries of wealth and poverty generate negative effects to the wellbeing of the upper limit of the band, not by any form of deprivation of essential needs, but, for example, [20] more crime, more fear and insecurity that are reflected by increasingly aggressive use of fences and walls for homes and condominiums, internal and external surveillance cameras, armored cars and private security.

Being a wide socioeconomic inequality a deplorable social phenomenon and indeed destructive to society and its individual constituents everywhere, what should and can be done and how best to reduce it? In general has prevailed the State action with assistance via redistribution and transfer of income and philanthropy of individuals and businesses. However, from what can be seen, at best this only mitigates extreme situations. More than often it does not overcome it, once preserves the inequality by maintaining the populations served on poverty.

Seems to be the challenge of our time[21], to match the minimum essential needs of the world's population consumption with physical and environmental limits of the planet and with less extravagant consumption patterns, without compromising the dynamism of market economies and individual freedoms, once egalitarian experiences, always associated with both left and right-wing totalitarianism, have failed and demoralized throughout the 20th century, no longer being viable and sustainable options.

Among the many reasons for socioeconomic inequality, the remuneration for work has been singled out as its biggest cause[22]and examples of extremes between Nations and companies, individuals and jobs are plentiful, in this [23]contemporary organizations and knowledge era.

Metrics and extremes

The evolution of the GDP [24] of the 153 emerging countries, where more than 5 billion human beings live (4/5 of world population) [25] with the lowest HDIs [26] of the planet and the revenues of the 500 largest global companies with their direct employment looks like this:

	YEARS	2012	2011	2010	2004	2000	1994
GDP 153	US\$ trillions	27.3	25.7	21.9	9.1	6.5	4.8
REVENUES 500	US trillions	30.3	29.5	26.0	16.8	14.1	10.2
EMPLOYEES 500	Millions	64.9	63.7	60.7	47.9	47.2	34.2
Sources: GDP [27]; Revenues and Employees [28]							

The OECD[29] estimates the formal jobs on the planet in 1.2 billion, for a population between 15 and 64 years estimated at 4.5 billion[30]. Thus, the participation of the 500 global companies in direct formal employment around respectively of 5% and 1.2% is unimpressive. However, their revenues have always been greater than the GDP of the 153 Nations.

Among the several indices to measure income inequality, the Gini coefficient[31] grew

by over 10% (1985 to 2010) and has never been so high among the OECD member countries, in most developed economies and societies and with the highest HDIs of the planet, where data are available.

Gini Coefficient Income Inequality – OECD average

YEARS	1985	1990	1995	2000	2005	2007	2010
GINI	0.286	0.293	0.297	0.307	0.314	0.315	0.316
BASE	100.0	102.3	103.6	107.1	109.6	109.9	110.2
Source: OECD May 13, 2013 Report [32]							

The average income in the entire OECD of 10% richest population increased from 7 to 9 times that of the poorest 10% in 25 years from 1985 to 2010. Even countries traditionally more egalitarian, as Germany, Denmark and Sweden, had the gap between rich and poor increased from 5 to 6 times since the 1980. Some countries have managed to reverse this trend more recently—Chile and Mexico, even though the incomes of the richest are still more than 25 times those of the poorest. In Brazil, which is not part of this index, although it has made progress, this relationship is still 50 times [33].

About 2/3 of the world's population – four billion people – lives on less than US\$2 a day [34]. Four million children died from no access to water (2005) and 10 million die of absurd causes each year [35]. No less absurd, 20% of the richest people held 70% of the income in 1960 and in 2000 already reached 85%. In the same period, the fraction of income of the poorest 20% fell from 2.3% to 1.1%. A total of 94% of the world income goes to 40% of the population, causing 60% of the population live with only 6% of this income and more than a billion human beings live on less than \$ 1 dollar a day [36].

About 21% of the world's population of the advanced capitalist countries control 78% of world production of goods and services, and consume 75% of the energy produced. In the last 50 years the planet lost 1/3 of the forest cover and 1/5 of humanity has no access to drinking water. Industrialization didn't bring development to 2/3 of humanity—just watch the growth and level of wealth from developed countries and the remaining [37].

In Brazil, local research PNAD/IBGE [38][39] also published by IPEA [40], shows that from year 2002 on, income of the richest 1% reversed to slightly below the income of the poorest 50%.

For families receiving Bolsa Família [41], the IDF [42] in 2012 shows significant progress in access to improvements regarding: child development (0.85), income (0.63), vulnerability of the family (0.74) and housing conditions (0.78). However, lower knowledge (0.38) and lower work (0.29) indicate that the dependence on the monthly income transfers program follows high, since these dimensions, sustainable natural way out of paternalism, have not yet had their specific vulnerabilities exceeded.

5WORK AND MARKET

From divine curse to divine condition; from forced to spontaneous; from punishment to reward; from active life to contemplative life; from natural law to moral duty; from option to needing; from frustration to supreme achievement; from doing to learning; from manual to

intellectual; from material to immaterial; from control to power; from search to receiving; from right to responsibility – all these are some of the multiple social categories of human work incorporated throughout history.

Work can be defined as an activity whose purpose is to use natural things or even modify the environment to meet human needs – generating dependency of human beings in relation to nature, preparation or use of natural elements and, more or less effort, pain and fatigue as consequent human cost [43]. Work can also be time spent in tasks increasingly abstract, partial and immaterial, in exchange for a remuneration system and not only just for a salary [44].

From subsistence to accumulation and hence for the exchange and for sale of its fruit which can both be essential, necessary, complementary and even quite often superfluous, none of that matters more than the fact of the work as an agent of transformation of humans into social beings, whether he's an artisan or part of a production gear. The duty to work to survive needs to be lived and performed as a manifestation of freedom, of overcoming the limits of nature and never as alienation and subjugation. Necessary is that humans work in what they like most, that like much of what they do and also seek the sound balance in their professional, personal, family and community lives.

This close connection between work and human existence ennobles it and the distressing aspect in many activities is much more associated with social conditions in which is performed than the work itself, once be natural that the activity would should be nice or to seek out pleasant ways of doing it, process that becomes rewarding with success even if partial in finding a way out [45].

However, we cannot lose sight that, as throughout history, even today persist monotonous jobs, under pressure, unhealthy, dangerous and even stupid, brutal and terrible environmental conditions, and under orders from mediocre, stupid, despotic bosses, giving the working human being not even minimal conditions to overrun[46].

In this overcoming, work in general can benefit from technology, social organization, market, trade unions, political system[47], as transformation and quality factors in society in general and in company of any size in particular, although its operating and economic-financial gains continue to overlap on a large scale the common welfare in our society.

Despite the criticism of the excessive financial and economic power and the successive scandals over time, Galbraith [48] recognizes that the global company has become a central factor in the modern economy, where exercise extremely useful role in contemporary economic life. Boldly, Roddick [49] proposes that, in terms of power and influence, we can forget the Church and politics, by advocating that there is no institution more powerful than the company in contemporary society.

A society that aspires growth, innovation, stability and social equity – real benefits for society as a whole – needs to rely on a strong ethical market, innovative and competitive, as well as also needs to rely on a State with constitutionally defined and limited powers, and an ethical, active, efficient and inductor Government. But it is also imperative, the separation, balance and alternation of power and the regulation of both State and market, by local and multilateral organizations, legitimate, articulated, institutionally strong and active.

In thus, the best starting point for growth generator of work, employment and income, still assumes the free choice of individuals, the possibility of quick reaction in the economy, a free

consumer, entrepreneurs free, aware of all the risks and responsible for their actions[50], in a free and competitive market, and a political power which regulates and guarantees the freedom, law and order.

But, Drucker teaches[51]—social and political theory since Plato and Aristotle always focused power. Responsibility, however, should be the principle to inform and organize post-capitalist society, once the organizations and knowledge society demand organization and governance based on it. A company to be considered fully responsible, needs to assume an economic responsibility – profit being the first and the base from which enables it for an environmental responsibility, a prerequisite for its own sustainable growth, and a social responsibility as a good employer, good corporate citizen, good neighbor, integrated in the communities where it operates.

In an entrepreneurial society, unanimity is not necessary nor possible, not even conceivable. It does not assume that all are entrepreneurs nor that all are to believe in companies. But, of course, is a society of trust, where whoever has the power to decide, influence, create, train, teach, judge, serves as a model, mostly adheres to behaviors that constitute a development society [52], the best generator of work, employment and income for society.

NATIONS, COMPANIES AND THE RISE OF CHINA

The revenues of the 500 largest companies have always been greater than the GDP of all 153 emerging and developing countries. However, the GDP 472.5% growth exceeded by large both the 195.8% growth of revenue of the 500 companies and the 101.4% of GDP of the developed Nations.

The gap has decreased though. In this 18 year period, the revenue that surpassed GDP in 114.9% (1994) falls to only 11.0% (2012) mainly due to the insertion of China in the global economy – most important geopolitical fact of the end of 20th century, being confirmed at this early 21st century.

US\$ Billions	COMPANIES GLOBAL 500	EMERGING 153 NATIONS	DEVELOPED 35 NATIONS	WORLD 188 NATIONS
YEARS	REVENUE	GDP	GDP	GDP
2012	30,304.9	27,290.2	44,417.1	71,707.3
2010	26,043.0	21,944.3	41,533.4	63,467.7
2004	16,798.1	9,135.0	33,093.6	42,228.6
2000	14,065.0	6,558.9	25,772.5	32,331.3
1994	10,245.3	4,767.1	22,058.4	26,825.5
% GROWTH				
2000 / 1994	37.3	37.6	16.8	20.5
2004 / 2000	19.4	39.3	28.4	30.6
2010 / 2004	55.0	140.2	25.5	50.3
2012 / 2010	16.4	24.4	6.9	13.0
2012/1994	195.8	472.5	101.4	167.3
Sources: IMF – same [28]; Fortune Global 500 – same [29]				

China's GDP, \$ 559.2 billion (1994), reached \$ 8.2 trillion (2012), increasing share among the 153 emerging countries from 11.7% to 30.1% and from 2.1% to 11.5% among the 188 Nations.

Brazil's 11.5% share (1994) drops to 8.8% (2012) among the 153 emerging countries, whereas China went from 11.7% to 30.1%. However, Brazil won positions among the 188 world nations – from 2.0% (1994) to 3.3% (2012), once influenced by 101.4% growth and greater economic weight of the 35 developed countries, the 188 countries grew only 167.3%.

Share among 153 Emerging and 188 World Nations

US\$ Billions	GDP BRAZIL			GDP CHINA			
	YEARS	US\$	% / 153	% / 188	US\$	% / 153	% / 188
	2012	2,396.0	8.8	3.3	8,227.0	30.1	11.5
	2010	2,142.9	9.8	3.4	5,930.4	27.0	9.3
	2004	663.5	7.3	1.6	1,931.6	21.1	4.6
	2000	644.3	9.8	2.0	1,198.5	18.3	3.7
	1994	546.5	11.5	2.0	559.2	11.7	2.1
GDP % GROWTH							
	2012 / 1994	338.4			1,371.2		
Source: IMF – same [28]							

Due to the rise of China to the global capitalist market, stands the big evolution of the company's global presence among the 500 biggest Chinese in revenue, from 3 (1994) to 89 (2012). Among the 10 largest in 2012 are already 3-in the 4th, 5th and 7th positions.

NUMBER OF COMPANIES		1994	2000	2005	2008	2010	2012
FORTUNE 500 GLOBAL	CHINA	3	12	20	37	61	89
	BRAZIL	2	3	4	6	7	8
FORTUNE 10 GLOBAL	CHINA	-	-	-	1	3	3
Ranking of Brazil largest - Petrobras		169	160	86	34	34	25
Name and ranking of the other seven Brazilian companies in 500 Global 2012 Banco do Brazil 116, Bradesco 168, Vale 210, JBS 275, Itaúsa 366, Ultrapar 420 GPA 449							
Source: Fortune Global 500 – same [29]							

COMPANIES AND DIRECT EMPLOYMENT

The values of the main economic and financial valuation metrics — revenue, net income, assets and shareholders' equity – for the 500 Global largest companies are impressive not only for its size, but also for its sustained growth over the most recent period considered, and there's no reason to imagine that has been different over time in prior periods.

These growth rates illustrate very well its strength and economic power. Between 1994 and 2012 revenues increased 195.8%, profits 447.0%, assets – investments – 293.9% and equity 350.7%.

However, although the number of jobs has increased by 30.3 million (34.5 to 64.9 million), this represents an increase in the period of just 88.0%.

The gain, of course, is fully reflected in productivity, 57.3% in revenues, 190.9% in profits, 109.5% in assets and 139.7% in equity, and entirely appropriated by the invested capital, ensuring its remuneration, feasibility, economic and financial sustainability and investment capacity.

YEAR	RESULTS US\$ Billions				EMPLOYEES		
	REVENUE	PROFIT	ASSETS	EQUITY	TOTAL	AVG	MEDIAN
2012	30,305	1,541	121,514	14,547	64,877,969	129,7	87,0
2010	26,043	1,523	112,482	13,165	60,710,587	121,4	80,0
2004	16,798	929	67,746	7,694	47,956,133	95,4	58,2
2000	14,065	667	45,808	5,527	47,225,289	94,4	60,5
1994	10,245	282	30,848	3,228	34,515,427	69,0	46,1
% GROWTH							
2000/1994	37.3	136.8	48.5	71.3	36.8		31.1
2004/2000	19.4	39.3	47.9	39.2	1.55		(3.75)
2010/2004	55.0	63.8	66.0	71.1	26.6		37.4
2012/2010	16.4	1.2	8.0	10.5	6.9		8.8
2012/1994	195.8	447.0	293.9	350.7	88.0		88.7
% PRODUCTIVITY ON TOTAL EMPLOYEES							
2012/1994	57.3	190.9	109.5	139.7	-		-
Source: Fortune Global 500 - same [29]							

The Global Top 50 employers – 10% of businesses, generate around 38% / 40% of the jobs generated by the Global 500. It is worth noting that in recent years of the first decade of the 21st century, both economic and financial indicators such, and the number of jobs generated, show strong growth due to the presence of the Chinese economy in the global market and the entry of their companies not only in the 500 and 10 global in revenues but also among the 50 top global employers.

In the total direct jobs generated by the 500 largest, the jobs of Chinese enterprises accounted for 1.1% in 1994, 12.2% in 2000, 14.1% in 2010 and 13.3% in 2012. Among the 50 largest employers, China had 2 companies and 3% of jobs (1994), 8 companies and 30.2% (2000), 15 companies with 37.3% (2010) and 15 with 36.8% (2012).

It is also worth pointing out that this significant presence of the Chinese economy and enterprises in the global market generates a statistical distortion of growth, since the large Chinese company is notably State owned and, therefore, generates more direct jobs and lower productivity as consequence.

DIRECT JOBS	1994	2000	2010	2012
FORTUNE GLOBAL TOP 50	13,040,594	19,176,264	22,988,822	23,910,232
FORTUNE GLOBAL 500	34,515,427	47,225,289	60,710,587	64,877,969
TOP 50 / GLOBAL 500	37.8	40.6	37.9	
CHINESE COMPANIES IN TOP 50	2	8	15	15
CHINESE TOP 50 DIRECT JOBS	396,125	5,786,559	8,568,594	8,648,371
% IN GLOBAL 500	1.1	12.2	14.1	13.3
% IN GLOBAL TOP 50	3.0	30.2	37.3	36.8
Source: Fortune Global 500 – same [29]				

EMPLOYMENT AND POPULATION

The first and the most important among the contributions the company and, for sure, the big global corporation can offer to society is the generation of not only direct employment but also work and income for the economically active population of society. However, even considering a period of sustained economic growth since the mid-1990, comes as a surprise the comparison of the evolution of the offer of direct jobs of the 500 largest companies with the evolution of the population from 15 to 64 years, taken as the age of the target population for paid work. Between 1995 and 2010 (these UN statistics for years 0 and 5 only), the number of direct jobs the 500 largest companies grew 25.6 million (72.9%), while the 15 / 64 years world population increased by about a billion human beings (28.1%).

These Global 500 corporations, employed 0.89% - less than 1% (1995) and 1.24% (2010) of the EAP, a very small direct employment when compared with the income-generating needs of society. One can certainly point out also that, not to mention socioeconomic crisis, technology, productivity, outsourcing and informality, do not contribute to overcome this problem.

YEARS	GLOBAL 500	WORLD EAP(1) [53]	% (2)
	DIRECT JOBS	POPULATION 15 TO 64 YEARS	
2010	60,710,587	4,524,850	1.24
2005	50,538,508	4,197,009	1.10
2000	47,225,289	3,851,820	1.13
1995	35,119,851	3,531,208	0.89
% GROWTH			
2010 / 1995	72.9	28.1	35.0
Sources: Fortune Global 500 – same as [29]; UN – same as [31] and [56]			

POPULATION AND WORK

In 2009, the world economically active population around 4.5 billion people [54], participates [55] of a world labour market of 4.2 billion people, where the formal employment is estimated at 1.2 billion and the informal jobs – production and trade of legal and regular products and services, with no registration and without social security – arrive at 1.8 billion. So between 1.2 and 1.4 billion people in active age do not exist in economic terms and are part of the \$1 or \$ 2 a day of the statistics [56] [57].

The participation of direct jobs of 500 largest companies in 2009 in the world labour market of 1.3% and in the formal market of 4.7% and work on economically active population around 1.2%, is very small, even with China, whose insertion into the global market with its state capitalism and large amount of State-owned enterprises, greatly increased the number and growth rate of direct jobs.

Even with the growth of economies and companies from the years 1990, in many developing countries, the informal labour market grows, is broad and pervasive with outsourcing and services, does not generate tax revenue and social protection for workers and their dependents and not rarely is the most dynamic segment of the economy, and also the only generator of jobs and

income on large scale. Until 2020, this market should increase by one-third, retained the current projections of population growth and economies. But this increase may be even greater, if more formal jobs are lost amid the ongoing crisis and, more migrants return to their countries of origin and, mostly, for informal jobs [58].

	EAP	4.5
	TOTAL MARKET	4.2
	FORMAL MARKET	1.2
	INFORMAL MARKET	1.8
	OUT OF MARKET	1.2
	GLOBAL 500 DIRECT JOBS (2009)in Millions	57.8
	% in EAP	1.2
	% in TOTAL MARKET	1.3
	% IN FORMAL MARKET	4.7
Sources: Fortune Global 500 – same as [29]; UN – same as [56]; OECD – same as [57]		

THE ROLE OF THE COMPANY

Beyond the man's behavior with regard to power and wealth, the crisis of the contemporary State increasingly hypertrophied caring more of itself and a wealth accumulator selfish capitalism, make sense to discuss the role of free enterprise – essence and foundation of capitalism, in the generation of work, employment and income and in meeting the needs of human society.

But even with technology, managerial capacity and investment, companies have not been able to make a relevant contribution to cope with the deep problem of global poverty [59], once they do not involve not only the hundreds of millions of people on the sidelines even of the informal market of work but also of those who, in the formal market, are at the base of the social pyramid, where instability and insecurity of employment relationships are larger.

Even though accepting that the companies are part of the most innovative and financially most efficient sectors of all, in his reflections on what should be the role of enterprises in aid to the world's poor, [60] companies still have no direct mechanism to implement its practices in elimination of poverty.

Still, the contribution of large enterprise in generating more jobs, work, income, investment and consumption in the economy, can and should come from private investment, made not with charity and philanthropy, but as business and through their value chains [61] [62] [63][64], heavily focused on supporting the local development of communities where they operate [65] [66] [67] [68] and where else it can generate business, notably in the vast market of the socioeconomic pyramid base on the planet [69].

Some people do not agree. To devise a threading model in structural spaces for study of the problems and needs of society, Santos[70]suggests that political parties, trade unions, social and popular movements, NGOs and a welfare-Statejoin to counter the so-called dominant forces of society.

Quite the opposite, [71] in an entrepreneurial society model, Peyrefitte argues that non-inclusion, co-option or even cooperation notably of the large enterprise of the private sector of

the economy, as another one of organizational forms in the development of actions and solutions, actually generates a huge waste of energy by competition and not an appreciable gain in value as a result of the involvement and collaboration of all these essential social actors.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The participation in the direct jobs market of the 500 Global companies around 1% of the target population and less than 5% of formal employment is disproportionate with its capacity for investment, business, wealth and value generation, and too small for the needs of work, employment and income of the human society. Even its spread in their production chains, brings only a few tens of millions out of these 1.2 billion formal jobs in an estimated 4.2 billion target human beings of the total market.

There is no way out through the generation of direct employment. A large-scale wave of entrepreneurships and the conscious consumption of goods and products that meet specific needs of populations, are at the heart of the eradication of poverty, through the generation of work, employment, income, savings and investment, and credit as financial leverage and not pure and simple indebtedness.

Entrepreneurship – with the consequent generation of work, employment and income, and hence consumption and investment, as a creation of human beings by their natural need and ability to create linkages and value, evolved and has consolidated its position in enterprises, the more complex and sophisticated institution of society in generating goods, material values and quality of life.

Inappropriate economic policies have generated trade and currency exchanges wars, disordered caps, inflation, deflation, more income and wealth inequality, poverty, economic and social instability and produced authoritarian regimes, riots, conflicts, guerrillas and military wars.

To prevent repetition of this tragic sequence, no other action of the business and Government leaders on the planet could have more priority than one focused on the creation and preservation of jobs, mainly in trade and services in general, whose generator and multiplier effect on income and consumption in the economy is much faster.

Society needs active, efficient and inductor Governments, less inclined to create and raise taxes and promote confiscations, and more prone to exemption and modernization of the supply and distribution chains, as well as it needs strong, innovative and competitive markets. Both ethical, limited and regulated by laws and autonomous institutions.

What is not sustainable and cannot continue is this concentration of political power and wealth of Governments and corporations propagating to billionaires and millionaires family fortunes for a few

thousand people in a society that has not been capable to generate livelihoods with a minimum of dignity for some billions of human beings.

At no time in the history of human beings, not with religion, philosophy or science, neither Governments nor companies, mankind managed to overcome inequality, hunger, poverty and extreme misery. Quite the contrary, seems to have them extended. The frustration is not just of our time or of any particular society, but neither should nor can it serve as a mitigating circumstance, consolation or hopelessness, in an attempt to improve today and the future of the human society and the planet.

REFERENCES

[1] PUC/SP Social Sciences: <http://www4.pucsp.br/pos/cienciassociais/index.html>(In portuguese)

[2] CV at <http://buscatextual.cnpq.br/buscatextual/visualizacv.do?metodo=apresentar&iid=K4794439T3> Both [1] and [2] last access 09/2013. (In portuguese)

[3] Deregulation of the international monetary system by the devaluation of the US\$ dollar, the loss of its parity with gold (1971) and the hefty oil price increases (1973 e 1979). See for example [http://www.infopedia.pt/\\$crise-mundial-dos-anos-70](http://www.infopedia.pt/$crise-mundial-dos-anos-70). Access 17/05/2013. (In portuguese)

[4] Non-governmental organizations / Civil society organizations of public interest (In portuguese)

[5] Mises, L. Human action.Original 1949.Rio de Janeiro: InstitutoLiberal, 1995. (In portuguese)

[6] Huerta de Soto, J The Austrian school. São Paulo: Instituto Ludwig von Mises, 2010. (In portuguese)

[7] Rothbard, M. Power and market.Original 1970. Translation: Marcia Brito e Alessandra Lass. São Paulo: Instituto Ludwig von Mises, 2012. (In portuguese)

[8] Boltanski, L., Chiapello, E.The new spirit of capitalism. London. Verso, 2005: 64-70 - The 1960s: Pleas for target management; 86-89, The exhilaration of progress and job security

[9] Gallino, L. Dictionary of Sociology.São Paulo: Paulus, 2005. (In portuguese)

[10] Diamond, J. Guns, germs and steel. New York: W.W. Norton, 1999

[11] Abbagnano, N. Dictionary of philosophy.4th ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003. (In portuguese)

[12] Brundtland, G.Our Common Future. UK: Oxford University Press. 1987

[13] Idem, ibidem

[14] Diamond, J. Guns, germs and steel. New York: W.W. Norton, 1999

[15] Idem, ibidem

[16] Nietzsche, F. The genealogy of the moral. Original 1887. São Paulo: Escala, 2009. (In portuguese)

[17] Mises, L. Human action. Original 1949. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Liberal, 1995: 288. (In portuguese)

[18] Idem

[19] Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. The spirit level. London: Penguin, 2010. Reference cited in the article Inequality and welfare of André Lara Resende in a local newspaper (Valor Econômico, 28/01/2011) later reprinted in his book The boundaries of the possible. (In portuguese)

[20] Resende, A. L. The boundaries of the possible. São Paulo: Schwarcz, 2013). (In portuguese)

[21] Idem

[22] Sen, A. Inequality reexamined. Translation: Ricardo Mendes. São Paulo: Record, 2001; Development as freedom. Translation: Laura Motta. São Paulo: CiaLetras, 2007. (Both in portuguese)

[23] Drucker, P. Post-capitalist society. 1st paperback edition. New York: HarperCollins, 1994

[24] GDP – gross domestic product; measure of economic activity: goods + services by region/period

[25] World Population Prospects: The 2012 Revision.
http://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/unpp/panel_population.htm Accessed 17/07 a 15/08/2013

[26] Human Development Index: arithmetic average of life expectancy at birth, education level and time and GDP per capita. From 0-none to 1-maximum. Gadrey, J. and Jany-Catrice, F. The new indicators of wealth. Translation: Assef Kfoury. São Paulo. SENAC, 2006. (In portuguese)

[27] IMF – International Monetary Fund. World Economic Outlook Database - April 2013.
<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2013/01/weodata/index.aspx>. Access 15/08/2013

[28] Fortune Global 500 Largest Corporations. New York: Time, annual print issues from 1995 to 2013

Also in <http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/global500/>. Last access 15/08/2013

[29] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Study: Is informal normal? 2009.
http://www.oecd.org/document/22/0,3343,en_2649_34487_42529878_1_1_1_1,00.html.
http://www.oecd.org/document/53/0,3343,en_2649_33935_42065141_1_1_1_1,00.html.
Last access 06/2013

[30] United Nations. Population aged 15–64. World Population Prospects: The 2010 Revision. <http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?q=world+population&d=PopDiv&f=variableID%3a88%3bcrID%3a900> Last access 08/2013

[31] It varies from 0 (all have the same income) to 1 (only one individual has all income)

[32] Inequality and Poverty – May 13, 2013 Report. <http://www.oecd.org/els/soc/OECD2013-Inequality-and-Poverty-8p.pdf>. Access 06/06/2013

[33] OECD papers: Growing unequal? (2008); Divided we stand: why inequality keeps rising (2011); Crisis squeezes income and puts pressure on inequality and poverty (2013)

[34] Prahalad, C. K. The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid. New Jersey: Wharton, 2005

[35] Dowbor, L. Economic democracy. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2008. (In portuguese)

[36] Yunus, M. Creating a world without poverty. New York: PublicAffairs/Perseus Books Group, 2007

[37] Santos, B. Criticism of the indolent reason. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005. (In portuguese)

[38] National survey by sample of domiciles/Geography and Statistics Brazilian Institute. (In portuguese)

[39] The 2010 revision. <http://www.ipeadata.gov.br>. Access 08/2013

[40] Applied Economics Research Institute. (In portuguese)

[41] Governmental assistance program of redistribution and transfer of income

[42] Family Development Index: internal use of the Ministry of Social Development, to measure access to facilities and effective satisfaction of the needs of beneficiaries of Bolsa Familia in 60 vulnerabilities in 6 dimensions: family, knowledge, work, income, child development and housing conditions.

It ranges from 0 (none) to 1 (full). IDF – text for discussion nº 986 / IPEA. Rio de Janeiro: 10/2003).

Text and 2012 results in <http://www.folha.com/no1285016>. Access 29/05/2013

[43] Abbagnano, N. Dictionary of philosophy. 4th ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003. (In portuguese)

[44] Betbeze, J.P. Economy: 100 keywords. 1st ed. Porto Alegre, RS: LPM, 2009. (In portuguese)

[45] Abbagnano, N. Dictionary of philosophy. 4th ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003. (In portuguese)

[46] Gallino, L. Dictionary of Sociology. São Paulo: Paulus, 2005. (In portuguese)

[47] Idem

[48] Galbraith, J. K. The economics of innocent fraud. Translation: Paulo Barbosa. São Paulo: Schwarcz Ltda, 2004. (In portuguese)

[49] Roddick, A. Business as unusual. Rio de Janeiro: Campus, 2002 (in portuguese); West Sussex, UK: AR Books, 2005

[50] Mises, L. Human action. Original 1949. Rio de Janeiro: Instituto Liberal, 1995. (In portuguese)

[51] Drucker, P. Post-capitalist society. 1st paperback edition. New York: HarperCollins, 1994

[52] Peyrefitte, A. The trust society. Translation: Cylene Bittencourt. Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 1999

[53] (1) The Economically Active Population in thousands; (2) % relation between jobs and population

[54] UN – United Nations. Population aged 15–64. World Population Prospects: The 2010 Revision. <http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?q=world+population&d=PopDiv&f=variableID%3a88%3bcrid%3a900> Last access 15/08/2013

[55] OECD study: Is informal normal? 2009. Links: same as [27]. Last access 06/06/2013

[56] Yunus, M. Creating a world without poverty. New York: PublicAffairs/Perseus Books Group, 2007

[57] Prahalad, C. K. The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid. New Jersey: Wharton, 2005

[58] Same as reference [57]

[59] Prahalad, C. K. The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid. New Jersey: Wharton, 2005

[60] Yunus, M. Creating a world without poverty. New York: PublicAffairs/Perseus Books Group, 2007

[61] Prahalad, C. K. The fortune at the bottom of the pyramid. New Jersey: Wharton, 2005

[62] Porter, M. e Kramer, M. Strategy and society: competitive advantage and corporate social responsibility. Harvard Business Review: 52-66. Boston: HBS, 12/2006

[63] Bruggmann, J e Prahalad, C.K. New social pact: a joint creation. Harvard Business Review: 50 – 60. Boston: HBS, 02/2007

[64] Kelly, M. Not just for profit. Paper in S+ B strategy-business. Edition 26/02/2009 <http://www.strategy-business.com/article/09105?pg=all>. Access 08/2013

[65] Vasquez-Barquero, A. Endogenous development. New York: Routledge, 2002

[66] Yunus, M. Creating a world without poverty. New York: PublicAffairs/Perseus Books Group, 2007

[67] Local developments support policy. São Paulo: Instituto Cidadania, 2008 <http://dowbor.org/09dlfinalnovaedica63p.doc> Accessed 12/2008, 04/2011 e 08/2013. (In portuguese)

[68] Yunus, M. Building Social Business. New York: PublicAffairs / Perseus Books Group, 2010

[69] WRI. World Research Institute. Estudo The next 4 billion. 2007. <http://www.wri.org/publication/the-next-4-billion>. Accessed 2007, 2009 e 05 e 06/2013

[70] Santos, B. Criticism of the indolent reason. São Paulo: Cortez, 2005. (In portuguese)

[71] Peyrefitte, A. The trust society. Translation: Cyl Bittencourt. Rio: Topbooks, 1999. (In portuguese)