

Elliot Wozniak

We should ALL be outraged that 1000 people have more than THE ENTIRE WORKING CLASS

Antonius Torode

If you're going to spend your precious years in outrage, there are many other better things to be outraged about.

Elliot Wozniak

Antonius Torode I'm not sure man. I want a future with financial stability. I feel like us millennials deserve a chance to own a home, have a family, and retire someday. If you're saying I shouldn't care about those things, what should I care about?

Antonius Torode

Elliot Wozniak I do not see those things as synonymous with the original post. I am part of your generation and I see many chances for all of those things. Life is like the game of Monopoly. The rules were set in place long before those 1,000 people were born. The issues are deep and complex and thus there is no sense in outraging when at the end of it, one person will control the board. Why waste the mental energy? Care and outrage are completely different things. The most important lesson of Monopoly is that at the end of the game, it all goes back in the box. Material possessions are all temporary and letting them outrage you will only consume you. So again, if you're going to be outraged, is material disparity really more deserving than, say, the millions of people worldwide who are exploited through forced labor and sex trafficking?

Elliot Wozniak

Antonius Torode I cannot fathom thinking that life is just like the game Monopoly, which is famously about the consequences of unchecked capitalism. This boggles my mind because I know that you learned about exponential growth.

See, I can cut slack to some people on here about not being able to understand the dynamics of the US economy, but I know you've at least had some college math. Given the current distribution of resources in the US, explain to me how tax cuts could produce any form of economic stability... Feel free to think in Monopoly money if that helps.

Antonius Torode

Elliot Wozniak You completely missed my point. 'Like the game of Monopoly' is a metaphor, NOT a literal comparison. The issues I mentioned are deep and complex, as I stated, but instead of engaging with that, you chose to attack me instead.

I have confidence in my understanding of economics and finance - not just in theory but in practice. I own a home in Michigan (paid off), 15 acres in Tennessee where I'm building a compound, and I rent here in TX, where I just spent 50k cash on startup for a new business. I have zero debt, a solid savings, and a retirement plan - all without outside or any family help. These aren't Monopoly numbers; they're the result of focusing on solutions instead of outrage.

If you were genuinely interested in a discussion, I'd be happy to engage. But it seems like you're more interested in arguing and belittling than understanding. Take care.

Elliot Wozniak

Antonius Torode I'm sorry for going into attack mode. I don't care about suffering, sex trafficking, etc., but that's not my focus here. My point is about the mathematical distribution of wealth in the US, which is following a phase space trajectory toward an attractor. It's great that you've experienced upward mobility in your life, but your experience is not the norm.

We have a society of adults with 5 or 6 figure student loan debt who spend >40% of their income on rent. There is no path to long-term stability under the parameters being set by the Trump administration. My frustration is growing because I don't know anyone who will be better off with more inflation, restricted government oversight, and higher income taxes. Yet, so many people want to argue with me in favor of the billionaires.

I still can't quite tell if you think my analysis of the dynamics of the economy is false or if you just think it's not productive to bring attention to the issue. But I am here for to have conversations, so I do apologize for losing my cool.

Jane Kim (Elliot Wozniak's wife)

Hi Antonius, hope you're doing well. I usually don't post on Facebook, but I wanted to share a few thoughts.

Many of the world's most serious problems, like forced labor, sex trafficking, and war, are deeply tied to the flow of money. Becoming complacent about money's role in society doesn't help address these issues long term.

I'm genuinely glad you're financially secure, and I wish the same for everyone. But, with all due respect, this isn't the same scale of wealth Elliot is referring to. Someone with \$100 billion is to a millionaire what a millionaire is to someone with \$10. At a certain point, accumulating more wealth stops being about security, happiness, or health—it becomes about ego.

To be clear, I'm only referring to those at the very top, whose quality of life (and that of their descendants) would remain unaffected even if they chose to give away the vast majority of their wealth. Not saying they should be required to do this, just that they could and it still wouldn't impact their well-being. There's something morally wrong about hoarding wealth to such an extreme knowing others are hungry...

Antonius Torode

Hey Jane Kim, hope you are doing well too! I'll try to address both of you in one post.

Antonius Torode

I usually don't post on Facebook either, and this discussion exemplifies why. I never said I was arguing 'in favor of the billionaires' or that anyone should be 'complacent about money's role in society', nor did I imply anything of the sort - that's a straw man. and yet, it seems for some reason that is what y'all are arguing against? Make it make sense.

Just to be clear - are you saying that outrage itself is productive? If so, can you explain exactly how being outraged leads to meaningful change? Because from where I stand, most of what y'all are bringing up doesn't actually counter anything I've said - it either shifts the focus or states the obvious.

If you're frustrated about student loan debt, rent prices, or taxation, wouldn't your energy be better spent looking for direct solutions rather than blaming billionaires? What exactly do you think needs to happen that isn't already happening? And if outrage is the solution, what has it actually accomplished? If you were to take from the rich and give to the poor, do you not think that money would not just end up right back to a group of rich under the current system in a relatively short period of time?

If extreme wealth disparity is the problem, why do you believe outrage is the best response rather than direct action? If outrage alone solved problems, wouldn't we have seen results by now? Are you actually open to the idea that outrage might not be the most effective way to address this, or is your mind already made up?

Let's take a simple thought experiment: Assume outrage is the correct response to wealth disparity. Well, wealth disparity has existed my entire life, so should I be living in constant outrage? I am certain I would not be where I am now if that were my state of mind. Since your point is about "mathematical distribution of wealth", consider the following. If we shift the focus from a few people to, say, the top 1% globally (since choosing an arbitrary number seems to be the trend), then I myself should be the target of outrage from the other 99% of the world. And assuming you two aren't unemployed, you're likely in that top 1% too. Should we be outraged at ourselves? As you can see, the logic breaks down fast. Nothing is gained from living in outrage. If you disagree, I'd love to hear how you think outrage actually leads to solutions.

Elliot Wozniak

Antonius Torode My concern isn't personal outrage—it's the inevitability of wealth concentration in an unregulated system. The dynamics of capital accumulation follow well-documented nonlinear trends: without redistribution, wealth concentrates due to compounding advantages. The paper "Nonlinear redistribution of wealth from a Fokker-Planck description" is very good. The model is both simple and robust—you should skim through it.

Your argument that "we're all rich to someone" is a common deflection, but it doesn't address the systemic issue. Wealth polarization in the U.S. is accelerating, and policies that reduce tax burdens on the ultra-wealthy exacerbate the effect. Wealth mobility has been declining for decades, another clear indicator of this divergence.

The claim that redistribution is futile because wealth would "just end up in the hands of the rich again" misunderstands the mechanism. Redistribution isn't a one-time wealth transfer; it's a continuous process that counteracts runaway accumulation. Strong economies have higher

capital flow, and redistribution—whether through taxation, wages, or infrastructure investment—improves that flow, preventing stagnation and instability.

This isn't about individual effort. Outliers exist, but they don't disprove statistical trends. If you model wealth mobility as a stochastic process, the variance has been shrinking for most Americans, meaning fewer people escape lower economic strata over time. Ignoring this trajectory isn't pragmatism—it's neglecting an economic instability that will eventually impact EVERYONE.

Also, there's a significant difference between saying "1,000 people are in the top 1%" and pointing out that a MUCH smaller number of individuals control a disproportionate share of resources. The scale of that disparity is the core issue. Conflating those ideas risks obscuring the real concentration of wealth and power.

If you want to engage with the issue itself, I'd be happy to discuss policy mechanisms. A conversation about emotional framing misses the point entirely.

Antonius Torode

Elliot Wozniak You started this conversation by saying we should 'ALL be outraged,' but now you're saying your concern isn't about outrage at all. Which is it? If outrage isn't the point, then you've already conceded my original argument. That is all I was ever trying to 'argue' here. Claiming that your concern isn't about personal outrage when your initial statement states otherwise seems contradictory and more like political theater than anything else. It comes across as if you're more interested in reinforcing a predetermined viewpoint or influencing those who may not have fully explored the complexities of related issues. As I said earlier, they are deep and complex.

As for the paper you referenced, I did take a gander, and I have to strongly disagree with your assessment. It vastly over-simplifies real-world systems. The Yard-Sale Model is an extremely simplified representation of economic transactions. It assumes wealth is exchanged in random pairwise transactions, which does not reflect real-world market dynamics. The Fokker-Planck equation assumes continuous and smooth changes, which do not capture sudden economic shifts. Additionally, it treats wealth accumulation as a stochastic process, but in reality, wealth is influenced by deliberate actions, policies, and institutions. The model does not account for labor markets, financial institutions, or even how money is created, which is an absolutely critical factor in any meaningful economic analysis (I suspect one of the larger factors). While these models mentioned may serve a purpose in illustrating certain economic dynamics, relying solely on them for understanding complex economic systems is unwise.

If you're interested in a more comprehensive understanding of the monetary system, I'd recommend looking at Modern Money Mechanics, a publication by the Federal Reserve. It is a good starting point. I read that back in high school for a paper and it was a great foundation to start with. But at this point, I think we're just talking past each other, so I'm going to leave it at that. If I find some time I may engage with some of your other posts I see where the discussion would be a little more focused. I But I honestly don't have much time to spend typing novels on here, as fun as it can be. 😊

Elliot Wozniak

Antonius Torode Bruh, do you also reject stat mech for using distributions instead of tracking coordinates of each particle? 😊

Of course, the Yard-Sale Model is a simplification, like every other model in physics, economics, or literally anything else. Dismissing it for being a model is crazy. The whole point of modeling is to capture the behavior of a system without reconstructing the universe from scratch.

I looked through 'Modern Money Mechanics', and it has nothing to do with modeling. It's like I'm trying to explain natural selection, and you hand me a book with the names of the animals in the US.

Elliot Wozniak

Antonius Torode If you're serious, show me literally any real model that contradicts my conclusion.

Antonius Torode

I get that you prefer to operate in a bubble of theory and models, but if you genuinely believe that understanding how money is created, distributed, and manipulated by financial institutions is irrelevant to discussions on wealth concentration and redistribution, then

you're either deliberately avoiding inconvenient realities to protect your narrative, or you haven't thought this through as much as you think you have. I'll assume the former, because the latter isn't flattering. And let's be clear - since reading comprehension doesn't seem to be your strong suit, I never dismissed anything nor did I say that document had anything to do with modeling; that's just another fiction you've invented, much like you've done repeatedly in this conversation.