

If the vanZanden et al estimates used by Max Roser for each "purchasing power parity" dollar level cited were for people's average "income" [in fact share of GDP], then the graph for income distribution (if the figures were reliable) might look something like this.

The vertical axis is each "income" level (in their estimates) multiplied by the number of people the researchers thought appropriate to categorise as at that level. I am not claiming this is the right procedure: I am sceptical about whether the "100k income" population, for example, really reflects higher-income people. What I have done here is purely for illustration of the difference between "distribution" of people, as in Max Roser's graph, and a graph of the kind here, relating to "income distribution" - which would show the viewer something visually clear about amounts of money.

In reality even the 2000 estimates for GDP, inflation, and distribution may be unreliable, in addition to the large problems about comparing the value of housing, clean versus dirty water and so on.

