

Infowars and Mises defend obscene levels of Income Inequality with LIES

by Miles Mathis

First published April 17, 2023

[Infowars is today publishing another Mises Institute defense of the rich by David Gordon.](#) This is a common occurrence and it tells us who is really behind Infowars. It tells us on whose side Alex Jones really is. It isn't the little guy. If he were the populist he claims to be, he would never republish dreck like this.

Gordon is selling a new book by the Jewish historian Rainer Zitelmann, *In Defense of Capitalism*, so we aren't surprised to see a defense of the rich here. But we are surprised anyone would dare in 2023 to defend the current levels of income inequality in the US and world, claiming it is just a natural outcome of life and capitalism. Income inequality has been on a steep rise since 1980, going into overdrive after 2000, and no one with any integrity would even think about defending it, much less promoting it. All the government and other “official” charts (like PEW, Worldbank, etc) are hiding most of it, but [I have shown in previous papers](#) it is beyond obscene and continuing to get worse. The rich are getting richer like never before—due mainly to increasingly bold thefts from worldwide treasuries—while the middle class is in an accelerating nosedive.

Gordon actually has the chutzpah to lead with this quote from the book:

I am of the opinion that an increase in social inequality is not at all worthy of criticism if it is accompanied by a reduction in poverty. The Nobel Prize winner for economics Angus Deaton even goes so far as to argue that progress is always accompanied by inequality. The fruits of progress have rarely been equally distributed in history. Thus, between 1550 and 1750, the life expectancy of English ducal families was comparable to that of the general population, possibly even slightly lower.

Can anyone still read sentences like that without puking? What reduction in poverty is he talking about? Is he talking about all those people living on the streets in the big cities, shooting up and defecating? Maybe the reduction in poverty he is talking about is all the poor people dying of Fentanyl overdoses, pushed by rich families. Maybe the reduction in poverty he is talking about is all the poor people murdered by the vaccines, pushed on them by rich families and by WHO, CDC, and FDA, owned by rich families.

And why aren't the fruits of progress distributed equally? He wants you to think it is because the government doesn't seize all those fruits after the fact, giving from rich to poor. But it isn't. It is because the rich distributed the fruits to themselves to start with, stealing everything as it came out of the ground and off the tree and leaving nothing for everyone else. The whole system is rigged to funnel all profits into a few hands, but as usual those such as Zitelmann and Gordon pretend that isn't true. They continue the pretense that the rich are richer because they are smarter and work harder. When of course just the opposite is true: the rich work less and are stupider than any people that ever lived, due to inbreeding and other corruption. If they couldn't rely on the system to do everything for them, they

literally couldn't figure out how to make dinner.

Do you know why the life expectancy of the English ducal families was lower than the general population? It is because they were so corrupt they burned out by age 40, having destroyed themselves with syphilis, obesity, alcoholism, and general dissipation. They were a lot of miserable bastards, with higher levels of murder and suicide as well. And they still are. We could just wish they would all kill themselves, so that we no longer had to read their books.

Zitelmann continues:

With the onset of the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century and the gradual beginning of a social order that is today called capitalism or a market economy, life expectancy also increased for the general population from 40 years in 1850 to 45 in 1900 and almost 70 years in 1950. "A better world makes for a world of differences; escapes make for inequality," Deaton observes.

Except that he misses the main data points and causes, flipping them on their heads. Yes, life expectancy rose up to 1950, but that was due to a rise in the middle class, which was caused by policies suppressing income inequality, including a sharply graduated income tax. Zitelmann forgets to tell you life expectancy is now falling as income inequality goes back to old pre-20th century levels.

Zitelmann then quotes a fellow Jewish historian, Walter Scheidel, to bluff us into believing the price of income leveling is high, blaming the two World Wars and Communism for it. He implies we can't have a more level income without huge levels of destruction. Again a straight reversal of the truth, since neither Communism nor the two World Wars had anything to do with that. The rich manufactured all three to benefit themselves, so they can hardly be the cause or result of income equality. [I have shown that Marxism](#) was just something they invented to wean us off Republicanism, beginning way back in the 1840s. It was created to self-destruct into fascism, and always has, right on schedule. And the two World Wars had even less to do with income leveling, since they were staged to target and drain entire countries and economies by the bankers. Even according to the mainstream fake history, the two Wars weren't revolutionary: they didn't come up from below and weren't based on class struggles. It is difficult to tell what they *were* about from reading history, but they admit that on the surface they were sparked by cousin/kings squabbling about territory or diplomacy. They were definitely not driven by uprisings.

Gordon follows with this misdirection:

We can readily grasp why substantial egalitarian redistribution has such a high cost. The rich will be reluctant, to say the least, to give up their money. Only if a violent revolution gets rid of them or if the tremendous costs of a war require that their funds be taxed away can we take major steps toward equality.

So in war the funds of the rich get taxed away? You have to be kidding me! It is known that in war the rich get far richer, because they tax the middle and lower classes to run the war. The middle and lower classes are also fooled into working harder and donating more of their time and work. While the rich sit back and collect profits from military and industry. Nothing is so profitable as war for the rich.

Then Gordon tells us this:

It might be objected that welfare states like Sweden and Denmark have achieved egalitarian redistribution without violence. Zitelmann counters this contention by noting that these countries remain quite inegalitarian, often as much as or more so than countries with less of a welfare state.

He shows rankings that prove Sweden and Denmark are “market driven”, which means they aren't Socialist. But this is all more blatant misdirection, because despite being “welfare states”, even the richest European countries aren't egalitarian at all. Income inequality is huge. Zitelmann and Gordon want you to think that because these countries have subsidized health and elder care, income has been equalized or we have Socialism, but that is simply not true. As I have shown you using Norway as the example recently, the truth is this: if income were distributed equally, everyone in Norway would be a millionaire and could retire tomorrow. Instead, what you see is a fascist collectivism, where the State collects all proceeds and funnels them directly to the very richest families. They then take a small percentage of total profits and create a nanny state, selling that to the people as Socialism. Selling it to them as fairness. You are supposed to forget you are relatively poor and be happy the State will pay to have your tooth pulled or to have you buried. It is a conjob of major proportions, where citizens are treated like children who can't add.