

Death, Taxes, and Inequality

Can a Minimal Model Explain Real Economic Inequality?

John C. Stevenson

Long Beach Institute, Long Beach, NY 11561
jcs@alumni.caltech.edu

Abstract. Income inequalities and redistribution policies are modeled with a minimal, endogenous model of a simple foraging economy. The model is scaled to match human lifespans and overall death rates. Stochastic income distributions from the model are compared to empirical data from actual economies. Empirical data are fit to implied distributions providing necessary resolution for comparison. The impacts of redistribution policies on total wealth, income distributions, and inequality are shown to be similar for the empirical data and the model. These comparisons enable detailed determinations of population welfare beyond what is possible with total wealth and inequality metrics. Estate taxes in the model appear quite effective in reducing inequality without reducing total wealth. Significant income inequality emerges for the model for a population of equally capable individuals presented with equal opportunities. Stochastic population instability at both the high and low ends of infertility are considered.

Keywords: income inequality, income redistribution, ABM

1 Introduction

This research compares empirical measurements of income distributions in modern economies with income distributions that emerge from a minimal model of a foraging economy under various redistribution policies. Income and wealth inequalities are subjects of interest to the general public [32, 41], governments [15, 53], economists [44, 48], sociologists [59], epidemiologists [35, 56], and political scientists [20, 28]. These inequalities are often attributed to a systemic lack of educational and employment opportunities [15, 26] and are also seen as results of politics and policies [15, 42]. Many government policies attempt to address these inequalities through redistribution of income by taxation [9, 53]. The complexity of the economy thwarts any clear assignment of causations and cures for inequality [17, 47], resulting in many contradictory explanations [16, 35, 57].

Conversely, a minimal model of a system [46], in this case an agent-based, endogenous model of a simple foraging economy, provides repeatable, qualifiable, and stochastic explanations of inequality. Resource distributions of entire populations emerge based on simple behaviors of underlying agents and the landscape

characteristics on which they forage. Actual income distributions and redistribution policies are compared with distributions that emerge from the model employing similar redistribution policies and scaled to human lifespans.

First, the baseline model is described and placed in context with the appropriate mathematical models of biology, ecology and genetics. The scaling of the model to human lifespans is described, and implementations of various redistribution policies are detailed. Representative samples of empirical economic data are introduced and the need for implying income distributions is argued. Shortcomings with the sampled data and with inequality metrics are discussed with emphasis on rich tail distributions. The income distributions for the empirical data and the model are compared and discussed under various resource redistributions. These stochastic simulations of population dynamics isolate the effects of particular policies and allow exploration of novel explanations.

2 Methods

A spatiotemporal, multi-agent-based model based on Epstein and Axtell’s classic Sugarscape [21, 49] is used to model a simple foraging economy [50?]. As a minimum model of a system [46], the model does not attempt to calibrate to an empirical objective function. Rather, a population of agents endogenously evolves under evolutionary selection pressures. The foraging resources are evenly distributed across the landscape giving equal opportunity to all. The capabilities of each agent are identical¹. The dynamics that emerge from this simple underlying model have been shown to agree with discrete Hutchinson-Wright time delayed logistic growth model of mathematical biology and ecology [29, 31, 36, 49, 50], with standard Wright-Fisher class, discrete, stochastic, gene-frequency models of mathematical population genetics for finite populations, [7, 23, 34, 49], and with modern coexistence theory for multiple species.[13, 51]. Dynamics of complex adaptive systems emerge with both intra-group and intergroup evolutionary optimizations [60]. Of particular interest are stable, oscillatory, and chaotic regimes determined by the intrinsic rate of growth.

2.1 Configuring the Simulation to Actual Economies

The intrinsic growth rate of the model is modulated by infertility, puberty, and birth-cost configuration parameters. Each affects the regime of population dynamics. Since all three parameters have a similar effect on intrinsic rate of growth, for clarity the birth cost will be held constant at 1 resource per birth and puberty at 1 action cycle. Given the birth cost and free space constraints are met, the probability of reproduction, p_f , is expressed as infertility $f = \frac{1}{p_f}$ and labelled as Fp_f (e.g. F010 has a 10% probability of reproduction if all other criteria are met). Though the chaotic (F001), oscillatory (F005), and stable

¹ The baseline model specifications [52].




Fig. 1. a) Dynamic Population Trajectories b) Annual Death Rates [10].

(F085) regimes are of great interest, they do not reflect the death rates of current human societies as shown by Figure 1b [10]. An increase to infertility F500 achieved death rates comparable with modern human societies.

In the original model, the agents only perished by starvation and were otherwise immortal. Human-scaled lifespans were added by limiting lifespan and by scaling action cycles to human time. A single action cycle was taken to be a deciyar, that is 10 cycles or “months” in a year. The lifespan was then limited to a flat probability of death between 60 and 100 years. The addition of finite lifespan (FL) had no measurable effect of the death rates (Figure 1b F500D), though forty percent of the population was now dying of FL rather than starvation. Two options for inheritance were added, one bequeaths to all direct, surviving offspring, and the other imposes a 100% estate tax.

2.2 Redistribution of Resources

There are numerous approaches for redistribution of income and wealth, both from rich to poor and, surprisingly, poor to rich [9, 53]. Initially, a local sharing tax on neighbors as an income redistribution method was implemented in the spirit of simple, bottom up agent behaviors [52]. To support comparison with modern economies, top down taxing was implemented, with both a monthly tax on the wealthy’s income and an estate tax at death. In empirical studies of inequality and taxation, a strong distinction is drawn between “income” and “wealth” [14, 16]. The categories are also famously described as “labor” and “capital”, respectively [32]. The question then arises, should the surpluses acquired by agents by foraging be considered wealth or income? Though foraging is income, storage over time suggests wealth, as does inheritance. The distinction

that wealth generates additional income and surpluses do not supports treating surplus as income. Adjustments are easily made for gross or disposable income since the metabolism cost each action cycle is uniformly 3 resources.

A top-down redistribution of resources through a monthly tax on the richest individuals was implemented for comparison with local-sharing taxes and actual redistribution economies. Procedure `globalRedistribution` in Algorithm 1 provides the details of this algorithm. A percentage of the total surplus is defined (tax bracket) and those richest agents in that surplus tax bracket contribute one resource each month to a global pool. This pool is distributed to the poorest agents, with preference to the older agents.

Algorithm 1 Global and Local Redistribution

```

1: procedure GLOBALREDISTRIBUTION(tax bracket  $tB$ )
2:   sort all maxAgents live agents  $a[]$  , wealthiest to poorest
3:   find minimum surplus,  $minS$  and total surplus  $totS$ 
4:   total top bracket surpluses  $tR = 0$ 
5:   set sort index  $sI$  to top richest agent,
6:   while  $tR < totS * tB$  do
7:      $tR += a[sI].surplus$ 
8:      $sI ++$  to next less richest agent
9:    $a[sI]$  is now poorest rich agent in  $tB$ 
10:   $tR$  is the total surplus in  $tB$ 
11:  redistribute surpluses:  $rR = 0$ 
12:  rich index:  $i = 0$  poor index:  $j = 0$  (oldest poor first)
13:  if  $a[sI].surplus > m$  (metabolism per cycle) then
14:    while  $i \geq sI$  &  $j < maxAgents$  do
15:      if  $a[j] == minS$  then
16:         $a[i].surplus --$ 
17:         $i ++$ 
18:         $a[j].surplus ++$ 
19:       $j ++$ 

```

An option to allow inheritance was implemented by transferring the surplus of a dying agent equally to all surviving children (but not grandchildren). If there are no surviving children, the surplus is lost. A 100% estate tax option was also implemented in which surplus of any agent dying is lost and not redistributed. There is, by definition, no surplus to bequeath for an agent dying of starvation.

The effect of local-sharing taxes as an income redistribution policy was shown to be ineffective in reducing inequality and destructive of total surplus [52] . Since the population of agents, in even the largest tax bracket, represent less than 2% of the population, and only 33% of the cells are occupied at carry capacity², the odds that at least one of four Von Neumann neighbors would be occupied and

² The carry capacity K_{cc} is $g * N_c / m$ where g is growth rate of each landscape cell per cycle, N_c is the number of cells, and m is the (constant) agent metabolism.

in the tax bracket are very small. Local-sharing taxation is a strongly regressive tax on all those with any surplus.

3 Empirical Distributions

Income distributions for actual economies are almost never published on an individual level. The data are aggregated into either mean incomes for a given income band, or levels of income at which a given percentage of the population is at or below. The resolution of these aggregations is usually quite coarse, and the upper tail suffers from sampling issues, low response rates of the rich, and underreporting, all of which impacts the measurement of income inequality [16]. Inequality is most often measured with the Gini Coefficient (GC), even though there are difficulties of both theoretical and practical nature with this single-valued metric [16, 24, 54, 55]. Accurate comparisons, however, can be made across varying populations sizes by directly comparing implied income distributions from empirical data as probability density functions. Lognormal and Pareto distributions are defined, and fitting algorithms are detailed and applied to three representative income data sets provided by the UK and USA governments. Implied distributions are also fit to emergent population distributions for comparison purposes. A discussion of the sensitivity of inequality measurement to the Pareto fitting process then ensues.

3.1 Functions for Implied Distributions

Underlying income and wealth distributions have been of interest even before Pareto stated that 20% of the population owns 80% of the wealth [33] A useful approach to implying underlying income distributions is to assume a lognormal distribution over most the population with a Pareto distribution for the high income tails [12, 18]

The probability density function pdf_L for a lognormal distribution of positive random variable x is given by

$$pdf_L(x) = \frac{1}{x\sigma_L\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\ln x - \mu_L)^2}{2\sigma_L^2}\right) \quad (1)$$

where σ_L^2 is the variance and μ_L is the mean of the lognormal only distribution. For an aggregated data set of mean incomes by a population variable (e.g. deciles), a root mean squared (RMS) fit of σ_L and μ_L is performed to find the optimum values and to explore the solution space for instabilities.

The probability density function pdf_P for a Pareto distribution of positive random variable x is given by

$$pdf_P(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha x_m^\alpha}{x^{(\alpha+1)}} & x \geq x_m \\ 0 & x < x_m \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where α is the Pareto shape factor and x_m is the threshold for the Pareto regime. The use of inequality metrics such as the Gini Coefficient are very sensitive to the selection of the lower threshold x_m [12]. The collapse of the accuracy and the appearance of instability in the lognormal distribution fitting process when including the top income levels provided a useful level for x_m . The selection of α for discrete distributions such as these implies a maximum income, x_{max} , for the entire population. The sensitivity of the income inequality of the distribution to the selection of α and resultant x_{max} is addressed in Section 3.4.

3.2 Implied Distributions for Empirical Data

The first data set considered provides mean disposable incomes for the UK in 2018 with band widths of £1K from £0 to £79K (number of samples $N_s = 80$) [38]. Therefore, £79K is the reported maximum disposable income. Figure 2a presents the empirical data and the lognormal fit which was stable and accurate for the entire range of incomes provided. (All fitted parameters for implied distributions and RMS errors are reported in Table 1.) While unexpected, this successful fit may be due to the reported maximum disposable income of only £79K, a likely truncation of higher earners.

Economy	N_s	GC_a	σ_L	μ_L	rms_L	GC_L	σ_H	μ_H	α	rms_H	GC_H
UK Income	80	0.466	0.52	10.5	937	0.475	-	-	-	-	-
UK decile	10	0.370	2.5	-0.15	2.6K	0.416	1.36	-0.16	2.0	260.3	0.373
USA	10	0.414	1.9	-0.25	53K	0.412	1.2	-1.1	1.9	3226	0.411
no FL	134	0.364	1.6	-1.6	27.0	0.454	1.7	-1.45	0.6	34.4	0.459
FL no inherit	88	0.325	1.0	-1.1	35.8	0.337	1.1	-1.1	0.6	34.4	0.346
FL inherit	246	0.386	1.9	-1.3	29.6	0.447	2.1	-1.1	0.1	29.2	0.448
FL inherit quad	1741	0.435	3.5	5.48	38.4	0.220	3.55	5.52	0.1	38.5	0.271

Table 1. Implied Distribution Parameters, Fit Errors, and Inequality Measures

Conversely the next dataset, mean gross income by decile for the UK in 2002 [37], attempts to cover the entire mean gross income spectrum, including all the highest incomes in the tenth decile ($N_s = 10$). Large RMS errors and large instabilities were generated when attempting to fit a lognormal distribution to all ten decile mean incomes. A better fit, however, was obtained for the first 9 deciles, leaving the last decile for a possible Pareto distribution. An $\alpha = 2$ was assumed [18], implying an estimated mean gross income of the top 1% of the population as £500K. The empirical decile data and decile aggregation of both this hybrid fit and the lognormal only fit are shown in Figure 2b.

From the United States Census for 2023, data levels of gross income that certain percentages of the population fall at or under were acquired. These gross income levels are at every 10% of the population plus a level at 95% ($N_S = 10$) [58]. The incomes of the remaining top 5% of the population was left as an




Fig. 2. Implied Distributions for UK Data

exercise for the reader. RMS errors for lognormal fits were very large when taken across the full set of income levels. Fitting only the 80% and below gave a better fit with both low RMS errors and stable model parameters. The last two percentile levels (90% and 95%) were fit to the Pareto distribution with the trade off between α and x_{max} . Figure 3a compares the USA data with the implied hybrid distribution and the lognormal only distribution in the aggregated format. With the selected $\alpha = 1.9$, Figure 3b shows the resultant top 1% mean income as \$390K and a maximum income of (only) \$424K.

3.3 Implied Distributions For Simulated Economies

Implied income distributions for three emergent distributions were also generated. The three scenarios were no FL, FL with 100% estate tax (FL no inherit), and FL with no estate tax (FL inherit) (N_s for each scenario is given in Table 1). The implied hybrid distributions are shown in Figure 4a with enlarged detail for the rich tail provided in Figure 4b. Implied distributions for the model's entire population income distributions had unusual Pareto shape factors ($\alpha < 1$) and insignificant improvements in fitting accuracy over the lognormal only fit. Even quadrupling the landscape area and carry capacity did not entice a fatter non-lognormal rich tail as seen by the FL inherit quad attempt in Table 1.

3.4 Sensitivity of Inequality to Pareto Fit Parameters

The process of fitting a Pareto function to the empirical data entails specifying the Pareto shape factor α , the Pareto regime threshold x_m and the length of the discrete Pareto tail as represented by the maximum income x_{max} . Using the




Fig. 3. Implied Distributions for USA Data

income where the lognormal fit has not yet suffered large RSS errors as x_m , then α and x_{max} are explored to find the minimum RSS error for the remaining empirical data points. For the US case, x_m was found to be the 80% level, leaving the 90% and 95% data points for RSS fitting. Figure 3b displays these values as well as the resultant income levels for top 5%, 1%, and 0.1% fractions of the population. The GC metric is a function of population size and has also been shown to be upwardly biased for Pareto tail distributions if the threshold x_{min} is too low [12, 24]. Even GC measurements on entire populations are poor estimators across populations of different sizes or even time-varying populations [24]. Thus the GC metric is not readily available for this analysis.

3.5 Income Inequality and Redistribution in Real Economies

An extensive study of income redistribution across OECD countries gives the changes of inequality due to income redistributions as measured by GC. These studies show significant percentage reductions in GC through income redistribution. The mean OECD GC reduction was 29% due to redistribution [9]. Use of the change of GC among various countries rather than the actual GC is in recognition of the inadequacy of GC for comparisons of populations of different sizes [24].

Estate taxes are not currently employed by actual economies at scale [3, 8], perhaps because they are very difficult to administer and easy to evade. On average, among OECD countries, estate and gift taxes make up 0.1% of GDP, while total tax revenues account for 34.3% [19].




Fig. 4. Model Entire and Implied Distributions

4 Empirical Data and Simulation Comparisons

Comparisons are made between empirical data and the model’s results for the various policies and inheritance scenarios. First the effects on inequality are compared, and then the effects on total income. Finally, the complex interplay between inequality and total wealth on the welfare of the entire population is examined.

4.1 Inequality Comparisons

In the simulations, redistribution effects on total surplus and inequality are given in Figure 6. The solid lines represent data points for local-sharing tax and no tax (baseline) scenarios. The dotted lines represent top-down taxing of various levels (by color) of surplus. The shape of the symbols refer to the presence or absence of FL, with or without inheritance (estate tax). Redistribution by income tax reduces inequality in the model. Obviously, draconian income taxes makes everyone equal but poor. Less harsh income taxes reduce the GCs by as much as 30%, comparable to the mean OECD reduction value of 29% [9, 19]. These no inheritance scenarios showed even greater reductions with, unfortunately, large reductions in total wealth, except for the FL without estate tax, which appear impervious to redistribution efforts to reduce relative inequality until draconian taxation made everyone poor (5% bracket).

4.2 Total Income Comparisons

“Empirical findings in the literature that growth tends to be inequality neutral” ignores absolute inequality [44, 45]. Overall welfare is also dictated by total




Fig. 5. Taxation effects on GDP (PPP)

income as well as its relative distribution. Based on empirical data, studies have shown increased income taxes reduce gross income [43, 57]. The model also shows income taxes (but not estate taxes) reduce total surplus. A rough estimate of the effects of redistribution taxation can also be made using empirical measurements of gross domestic product (GDP) as an estimate of total income. The GDP data used here is based on Purchasing Power Parity (PPP), an adjustment for the cost of living in each country and expressed in international dollars. Using the mean of the multiple sources of per capita GDP PPP [11, 30, 61] and the redistribution of income estimates by country [9], Figure 5 provides country per capita GDP (PPP) by percentage of income redistribution for various sets of OECD countries. Figure 5a highlights the extreme data points, both very high and very low. Figure 5b throws out these five extreme points, hopefully comparing more similar economies. These economies without the extreme samples, show a coefficient of determination (R^2) of 19% as increased redistribution reduces income.

Figure 6 does show significant reductions in total surplus accompanied by reductions in inequality. For the extreme 5% income tax, the total surplus is decimated and inequality is dramatically reduced. As the tax increases, the distinctive shape of the three points of FL options changes from the acute angle “nose” to a straight line with the no FL point showing the greatest decreases in total surplus and inequality.

A successful redistribution approach for the model turned out to be the estate tax. The addition of FL without inheritance (100% estate tax) results in a significant reduction in inequality without a reduction in total surplus. The estate taxes collected are not redistributed but lost. A strong positive correlation between surplus lost (due to estate tax or no living heirs) and higher total surplus is most like an effect, not a cause, though cause does find support in the litera-




Fig. 6. Tax effects on Mean Wealth and Inequality

ture: “improve welfare by increasing taxes and throwing away tax revenues.” [6] Unfortunately, for comparison purposes, estate taxes in real economies do not generate significant revenue and, therefore, do not impact inequality. There is, however, considerable academic literature that strongly suggests estate taxation would be a fair and effective tax to reduce inequality. [1, 3, 8, 19, 27]

4.3 Comparisons of Population Welfare

Untaxed inheritance scenarios showed a strong increase in total surplus with the inequality measure returning to the baseline no FL value. The question to be addressed is whether the increase in total surplus is sufficient to improve the overall welfare of the middle and poor classes. Even the combined use of GC and total surplus does not answer this question. To make a determination, the actual surplus distributions need to be examined.

Figure 4 presents income distributions of entire populations from the model and the hybrid fit to these distributions. In Figure 4a, the vertical dotted lines represent the mean surplus for three configurations: FL with estate tax, no FL, and FL with untaxed inheritance (in order of increasing mean surplus). The FL with estate tax (FL no inherit) scenario (red) has significantly less inequality than the no FL scenario (orange) for essentially the same mean surplus. The much higher mean surpluses of the FL with inheritance (FL inherit) scenario

(blue) highlights the issue. Close examination of the two distributions clearly shows the blue surpluses are all in the rich tail of the distribution and all the agents below the blue mean (the vast majority of the population) are better off with the estate tax policy, even though that tax is a sunk cost and is not redistributed. These actual surplus comparisons over the entire populations are not subject to the errors a single point metric like GC has with these differently sized populations. Thus the difficult question of the interplay of inequality and total surplus under various redistribution policies is addressed.

5 Results

These comparisons between a minimal model of a system and empirical measurements of actual economies highlight the similarities and the difficulties. The former has simple rules, a fixed landscape, easily designed experiments to investigate cause and effect, and clear, quantitative results. It also provides a full picture of the stochasticity of population and income dynamics. The later has multitude of economies; all with different policies, assets, and resources; and varying degrees of transparency. The later also provides only one instance of a stochastic process. The measurement of actual inequality is an inexact science with theoretical shortcomings of metrics, data sampling issues especially in the rich tail, and modeling biases. Both the model and the empirical data show significant and similar reductions in inequality as measured by percentage change in GC for income-tax-based redistribution. The most effective redistribution tax was found to be the 100% estate tax with the model generating substantial inequality reductions without any total surplus penalties though actual economies do not generate significant revenues from this tax. The income distributions emerging from the simulations resemble the implied distributions of the sampled economies. The model's implied distributions lack the Pareto behavior required for good fits for the empirical data. These generative and implied distributions provided insight into the welfare of the population beyond what simple inequality and aggregated mean income measurements can provide. The empirical data supports the model's findings that more income redistribution can result in less total wealth with unclear implications for the welfare of the poor. The model clearly shows that reductions of inequality measures alone do not ensure better welfare for the poor and middle classes.

Significant inequality for all lifespan options emerged even with identically capable agents and equal opportunity landscapes. Though no real economy approaches these ideals, inequality as a result of stochastic population dynamics independent of systemic inequalities is an unexpected explanation [40].

Growth rates have direct effects on the steady state total surplus. High growth rates lead to a "tragedy of the commons" with extinction [25, 39]. Low growth rates with FL result in demographic collapse for an initial population at carry capacity. While increasing infertility at first leads to a higher steady state mean surplus, a transition to a demographic collapse becomes an increasingly likely stochastic event [22]. With very low fertility now a key concern in many

developed countries [2, 4], and the allure of population reduction as a method to solve a variety of economic and ecological problems [5], understanding the impact of low fertility on population stability becomes crucial.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aaron, H.J., Munnell, A.H.: Reassessing the role for wealth transfer taxes. *National Tax Journal* **45**(2), 119–143 (1992)
- [2] Bainbridge, W.S.: Demographic collapse. *Futures* **41**(10), 738–745 (2009)
- [3] Bird-Pollan, J.: Death, taxes and property (rights): Nozick, libertarianism, and the estate tax. *Me. L. Rev.* **66**, 1 (2013)
- [4] Bongaarts, J.: Global fertility and population trends. In: *Seminars in reproductive medicine*. vol. 33, pp. 005–010. Thieme Medical Publishers (2015)
- [5] Bradshaw, C.J., Brook, B.W.: Human population reduction is not a quick fix for environmental problems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **111**(46), 16610–16615 (2014)
- [6] Braun, R.A., Uhlig, H.: The welfare enhancing effects of a selfish government in the presence of uninsurable, idiosyncratic risk. Tech. rep., SFB 649 Discussion Paper (2006)
- [7] Cannings, C.: The latent roots of certain markov chains arising in genetics: a new approach, i. haploid models. *Advances in Applied Probability* **6**(2), 260–290 (1974)
- [8] Caron, P.L., Repetti, J.R.: Occupy the tax code: Using the estate tax to reduce inequality and spur economic growth. *Pepp. L. Rev.* **40**, 1255 (2012)
- [9] Causa, O., Hermansen, M.: Income redistribution through taxes and transfers across oecd countries. *OECD Working Paper* (2017)
- [10] Central Intelligence Agency: The world factbook:country comparisons - death rates. <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/field/death-rate/country-comparison/> (2022)
- [11] Central Intelligence Agency: The world factbook:country comparisons - real gdp per capita. <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/field/real-gdp-per-capita/country-comparison/> (2022)
- [12] Charpentier, A., Flachaire, E.: Pareto models for top incomes and wealth. *The Journal of Economic Inequality* **20**(1), 1–25 (2022)
- [13] Chesson, P.: Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **31**(1), 343–366 (2000)
- [14] Costa, R.N., Pérez-Duarte, S.: Not all inequality measures were created equal: The measurement of wealth inequality, its decompositions, and an application to European household wealth. No. 31 in *OECD Working Paper, ECB Statistics Paper* (2019)
- [15] Dabla-Norris, M.E., Kochhar, M.K., Suphaphiphat, M.N., Ricka, M.F., Tsounta, M.E.: Causes and consequences of income inequality: A global perspective. *International Monetary Fund* (2015)
- [16] Davies, J.B., Fortin, N.M., Lemieux, T.: Wealth inequality: Theory, measurement and decomposition. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **50**(5), 1224–1261 (2017)
- [17] Doran, C.F.: Why forecasts fail: The limits and potential of forecasting in international relations and economics. *International Studies Review* **1**(2), 11–41 (1999)

- [18] Drăgulescu, A., Yakovenko, V.M.: Exponential and power-law probability distributions of wealth and income in the united kingdom and the united states. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **299**(1-2), 213–221 (2001)
- [19] Drometer, M., Frank, M., Pérez, M.H., Rhode, C., Schworm, S., Stitteneder, T.: Wealth and inheritance taxation: An overview and country comparison. *ifo DICE Report* **16**(2), 45–54 (2018)
- [20] Engler, S., Weisstanner, D.: The threat of social decline: income inequality and radical right support. *Journal of European Public Policy* **28**(2), 153–173 (2021)
- [21] Epstein, J.M., Axtell, R.: *Growing Artificial Societies from the Bottom Up*. MIT Press (1996)
- [22] Escudero, C., Buceta, J., de La Rubia, F., Lindenberg, K.: Extinction in population dynamics. *Physical Review E* **69**(2), 021908 (2004)
- [23] Ewens, W.J.: *Mathematical population genetics: theoretical introduction*, vol. 1. Springer (2004)
- [24] Fontanari, A., Taleb, N.N., Cirillo, P.: Gini estimation under infinite variance. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **502**, 256–269 (2018)
- [25] Hardin, G.: The tragedy of the commons: the population problem has no technical solution; it requires a fundamental extension in morality. *Science* **162**(3859), 1243–1248 (1968)
- [26] Hoffmann, F., Lee, D.S., Lemieux, T.: Growing income inequality in the united states and other advanced economies. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **34**(4), 52–78 (2020)
- [27] Hoover, G.E.: The economic effects of inheritance taxes. *The American Economic Review* pp. 38–49 (1927)
- [28] Huijsmans, T., Rijken, A.J., Gaidyte, T.: The income gap in voting: moderating effects of income inequality and clientelism. *Political Behavior* **44**(3), 1203–1223 (2022)
- [29] Hutchinson, G.E., et al.: Circular causal systems in ecology. *Ann. NY Acad. Sci* **50**(4), 221–246 (1948)
- [30] International Monetary Fund: *Imf weo database*. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/weo-database/2024/April/weo-report> (2024)
- [31] Kot, M.: *Elements of Mathematical Ecology*. Cambridge University Press (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511608520>
- [32] Marx, K.: *Das kapital*. DigiCat (1867)
- [33] Merritt, F.D.: *Cours d’économie politique* (1898)
- [34] Moran, P.A.P.: Random processes in genetics. In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*. vol. 54, pp. 60–71. Cambridge University Press (1958)
- [35] Muntaner, C., Lynch, J.: Income inequality, social cohesion, and class relations: a critique of wilkinson’s neo-durkheimian research program. *The political economy of social inequalities* pp. 325–346 (2020)
- [36] Murray, J.D.: *Mathematical Biology*. Springer (2002)
- [37] Office for National Statistics: *Household disposable income*. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/file?uri=/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/incomeandwealth/> (2003)
- [38] Office for National Statistics: *Average household income*. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/personalandhouseholdfinances/incomeandwealth/bulletin> (2018)
- [39] Ostrom, E.: *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge university press (1990)

- [40] Petit, P.: The systemic nature of the rise in inequality in developed economies. *International Review of Applied Economics* **24**(3), 251–267 (2010)
- [41] Piketty, T.: *A brief history of equality*. Harvard University Press (2022)
- [42] Polacko, M.: Causes and consequences of income inequality—an overview. *Statistics, Politics and Policy* **12**(2), 341–357 (2021)
- [43] Prescott, E.C.: Why do americans work so much more than europeans? (2004)
- [44] Ravallion, M.: Income inequality in the developing world. *Science* **344**(6186), 851–855 (2014)
- [45] Rawls, J.: *A theory of justice*. Cambridge (Mass.) (1971)
- [46] Roughgarden, J., Bergmen, A., Hafir, S., Taylor, C.: Adaptive computation in ecology and evolution: a guide for future research. *adaptive individuals in evolving populations*. SFI Studies in the Sciences of Complexity **26** (1996)
- [47] Sharma, R.: The ever-emerging markets: Why economic forecasts fail. *Foreign Aff.* **93**, 52 (2014)
- [48] Smith, J.P.: Why is wealth inequality rising? The causes and consequences of increasing inequality **2**, 83–116 (2001)
- [49] Stevenson, J.C.: Agentization of two population-driven models of mathematical biology. In: *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference of The Computational Social Science Society of the Americas*. pp. 176–189. Springer (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-96188-6_13
- [50] Stevenson, J.C.: Dynamics of wealth inequality in simple artificial societies. In: *Advances in Social Simulation: Proceedings of the 16th Social Simulation Conference, 20–24 September 2021*. pp. 161–172. Springer (2022). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92843-8_13
- [51] Stevenson, J.C.: Competitive exclusion in an artificial foraging ecosystem. In: *ALIFE 2023: Ghost in the Machine: Proceedings of the 2023 Artificial Life Conference*. MIT Press (2023). https://doi.org/10.1162/isa_l_a_00576
- [52] Stevenson, J.C.: Local sharing and sociality effects on wealth inequality in a simple artificial society. In: *Advances in Social Simulation: Proceedings of the 18th Social Simulation Conference, 4–8 September 2023* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2305.17177>
- [53] Taghizadeh-Hesary, F., Yoshino, N., Shimizu, S.: The impact of monetary and tax policy on income inequality in japan. *The World Economy* **43**(10), 2600–2621 (2020)
- [54] Taleb, N.N.: How to (not) estimate gini coefficients for fat tailed variables. arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.04841 (2015)
- [55] Taleb, N.N., Bar-Yam, Y., Cirillo, P.: On single point forecasts for fat-tailed variables. *International Journal of Forecasting* **38**(2), 413–422 (2022)
- [56] Tibber, M.S., Walji, F., Kirkbride, J.B., Huddy, V.: The association between income inequality and adult mental health at the subnational a systematic review. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* pp. 1–24 (2022)
- [57] Trabandt, M., Uhlig, H.: The laffer curve revisited. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **58**(4), 305–327 (2011)
- [58] United States Census Bureau: Income in the united states. <https://www.census.gov/library/publications/2023/demo/p60-279.html> (2022)
- [59] Wilkinson, R.G., Pickett, K.E.: Income inequality and social dysfunction. *Annual review of sociology* **35**, 493–511 (2009)
- [60] Wilson, D.S., Kirman, A.: *Complexity and evolution: Toward a new synthesis for economics*, vol. 19. MIT Press (2016)
- [61] World Bank: Gdp ppp per capita. <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.PP.CD> (2024)