

Comment on the Commentary of the Day

by

Donald J. Boudreaux

Chairman, Department of Economics

George Mason University

dboudrea@gmu.edu

Disclaimer: The following "Letters to the Editor" were sent to the respective publications on the dates indicated. Some were printed but many were not. The original articles that are being commented on may or may not be available on the internet and may require registration or subscription to access if they are. Some of the original articles are also syndicated and therefore may have appeared in other publications also.

26 September 2005

Editor, The Washington Post
1150 15th St., NW
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Editor:

Sebastian Mallaby overstates the problem with foreign oil suppliers investing their savings in America ("Why We Should Care About Oil Prices," Sept. 26). A problem exists only insofar as this money is loaned to Uncle Sam, who likely will spend it unwisely. But the portion of these funds invested privately - say, to modernize a factory or fund R&D projects - increases America's capital stock and worker productivity no less so than when Americans themselves make such investments.

What matters is that productive investments take place; what doesn't matter is investors' nationality.

25 September 2005

Editor, The New York Times
229 W. 43rd St.
New York, NY 10036-3959

To the Editor:

In Nicholas Kristof's criticism of health care in the U.S., we read that "Katrina lays bare the system's failure" ("A Health Care Disaster," Sept. 25). The system does have problems, but let's keep perspective.

Of the top ten most intense hurricanes to strike the U.S. since 1900, six occurred between 1960 and today. And yet only one of these storms - Katrina - ranks among the top ten deadliest U.S. hurricanes (currently

third). Fact is, hurricanes today are less deadly than in the past because building materials, roads, communications, and, yes, health care are better today than in the past.

<http://www.renewamerica.us/columns/werich/050902>

24 September 2005

Editor, RenewAmerica.us

To the Editor:

Paul Weyrich wants Uncle Sam to restrict Americans' freedom to trade in order to preserve manufacturing jobs in the U.S. ("The Next Conservative Economics," Sept. 2). His justification is that "Life is not just about getting more stuff."

Indeed. Much more important than "stuff" are freedom and equal treatment under the law.

Protectionism directly attacks people's freedom to spend their money as they choose. And it arms protected industries with special privileges used to extract excess profits from unprotected others - fellow citizens and foreigners, consumers and producers - whose opportunities and liberties shrink as protectionism expands.

24 September 2005

Editor, The Economist
25 St James's Street
London SW1A 1HG
UNITED KINGDOM

Sir:

Appalled by the Katrina catastrophe, Andrew Watt asserts that "it is

inconceivable that an EU member state would abandon the bottom third of its population . . . to natural disasters" (Letters, Sept. 24th).

Katrina killed fewer than 2,000 people. Europe's heat wave of August 2003 killed an estimated 35,000 people, with nearly 15,000 dying in France alone.

(http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1272/is_2708_132/ai_n6019803) Mr. Watt might think twice before smugly applauding Europe's "social model."

http://www.foxnews.com/printer_friendly_story/0,3566,170118,00.html

23 September 2005

Mr. Bill O'Reilly
Fox News

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

Your idea of "Getting to the Bottom of High Fuel Prices" (Sept. 22) is to hunt for the "somebody* who's deciding what Americans will pay for fuel." And you ridicule those who insist that gasoline prices are not arbitrarily set by some identifiable person or cabal.

So who, Mr. O'Reilly, decides what your television ratings will be? If your worldview is correct, their level must be set by somebody. How can I get to the bottom of your high ratings?