

The word “fair” can be used to denote a number of concepts that are not only different, but fundamentally opposed.

The word “fair” has a conveniently vague definition, meaning “marked by impartiality and honest, free from self-interest, prejudice, or favoritism.”

[View source](#)

In the political world, the increasingly popular word is frequently used in a deliberately ambiguous ways. “The beauty of the word, from the point of view of pundits and campaigners, is its elasticity,” explains Daniel Hannan, President of the Initiative for Free Trade. “It can be used to denote a number of concepts that are not only different, but fundamentally opposed. Fairness can mean [equality, entitlement, or need]. Politicians use it to mean all three of these things, sometimes deliberately eliding them.” When politicians say the rich should pay their “fair share,” for example, they really mean they want them to pay extra.

[View source](#)

Related reading: “Inventing Freedom” – Daniel Hannan

[View source](#)

The word “fair” has become a popular statement of moral superiority, tinged, paradoxically, with victimhood.

Talk of “fairness” has grown in popularity in recent decades, particularly among left-wing politicians. A recent Google study shows the usage of the word “fairness” in British books since 1900 shot up in the last quarter of the century.

[View source](#)

The term, as the Initiative for Free Trade’s Daniel Hannan puts it, “isn’t really being used, these days, to signify proportionality, merit, equity, desert or even redistribution. It is used, rather, as a way to signal the speaker’s virtue.” And when the term is used economically, Hannan argues, it is often used to mean

the opposite of “fair.” When politicians and activists say the rich should pay their “fair share,” for example, they really mean they want them to pay extra.

[View source](#)

Related reading: "The New Road to Serfdom: A Letter of Warning to America" – Daniel Hannan

[View source](#)

The rich already pay more than their fair share. Having them pay more would hurt them a little bit, but it would hurt the poor a lot.

America already has the most progressive tax system in the developed world, in which the rich pay far more than the percent of the wealth they bring in.

[View source](#)

Expanding this already heavily progressive tax system would have a significant negative impact on economic growth.

[View source](#)

The most negatively impacted are the very people progressive income taxes are supposed to help: the poor.

[View source](#)

Read UCLA economist Dr. Lee Ohanian and tax expert Kip Hagopian on income inequality and fair taxation.

[View source](#)

Related reading: “Brexit and Free Trade: An Interview with Daniel Hannan” – Austrian Economic Center

[View source](#)

The alternative to a free market-based, wealthy, unequal economy is a socialistic, poor, equal economy.

Income inequality motivates people who want more money to create profitable companies (i.e. companies that provide something people want). As

economist John Tamny argues, “[I]t is gaps in wealth that drive creativity among the citizenry ... their innovations redounding to individuals of all income classes.”

[View source](#)

Capitalism naturally drives entrepreneurs to create increasingly affordable products and services in order to increase their customer base. Consequently, capitalism improves the lifestyle equality of society.

[View source](#)

Related reading: “Equal Is Unfair: America's Misguided Fight Against Income Inequality” – Don Watkins

[View source](#)

Countries with the most economic freedom earn 6 times more than countries with the lowest level of economic freedom.

Countries with the most economic freedom earn more than six times the annual earnings of countries with the lowest level of economic freedom.

[View source](#)

Read Arthur Brooks on the significance of free enterprise.

[View source](#)

The free market caters more to the masses than the economic elite, making things increasingly more affordable for more people.

Economist Joseph Schumpeter on how free market capitalism caters to the masses, not the wealthy: "The capitalist engine is first and last an engine of mass production which unavoidably also means production for the masses. ... It is the cheap cloth, the cheap cotton and rayon fabric, boots, motorcars and so on that are the typical achievements of capitalist production, and not as a rule improvements that would mean much to the rich man. Queen Elizabeth owned silk stockings. The capitalist achievement does not typically consist in providing more silk stockings for queens but in bringing them within reach of factory girls in return for steadily decreasing amounts of effort."

[View source](#)

Related video: "Myths, Lies and Capitalism" – Arthur Brooks

[View source](#)

Curbing the free market in the name of “fairness” isn't standing up for poor people, it's standing in the way of the best way to attain a better lifestyle.

Opposing capitalism and market liberalization doesn't help poor people in the long run, it hurts them. Capitalism creates better goods for cheaper prices. According to economist Milton Friedman: “The great achievements of Western capitalism have redounded primarily to the benefit of the ordinary person.”

[View source](#)

Socialism is dogmatic, capitalism is pragmatic.

[View source](#)

The Left often focuses on the loss of traditional jobs while ignoring the productivity and prosperity gained through innovation.

[View source](#)

Related video: “If You Hate Poverty, You Should Love Capitalism” – Arthur Brooks

[View source](#)

The expansion of free trade, property rights, and entrepreneurship around the world helped millions pull themselves out of poverty.

The expansion of free trade, property rights, and entrepreneurship around the world has helped millions pull themselves out of poverty. Even jobs that have changed very little over the years, such as a barmaid, are enriched by increases in technology.

[View source](#)

Achievements like GPS and Uber have helped the average American the most.

[View source](#)

Meanwhile, socialist states like North Korea, Zimbabwe, and Cuba have remained stagnant.

[View source](#)

Related video: “Capitalism vs. Socialism” – Andy Puzder

[View source](#)