

## 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.**

---

[http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2005-10-02-new-deal-edit\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/opinion/editorials/2005-10-02-new-deal-edit_x.htm)

3 October 2005

The Editor, USA Today

To the Editor:

In "A New Deal, Part II?" (Oct. 3), Jason Scott Smith praises the New Deal, not for what it accomplished - he admits that it failed to achieve its goal of reducing unemployment - but for spending unprecedented sums of money.

By this criterion, President Bush launched a second New Deal even before Katrina struck. He, too, is spending gobs of other people's money on projects that accomplish no obvious good.

---

2 October 2005

The Editor, New York Times Magazine  
229 West 43rd St.  
New York, NY 10036

To the Editor:

Interviewing William Weld, Deborah Solomon tells him: "But surely I don't have to remind you that the private sector cannot be trusted to act in the interests of society as a whole, which is why government exists" ("Same Job, New Location," Oct. 2).

Although widespread, this worldview is bodaciously distorted. In a data-rich study released last month by the Cato Institute (<http://www.cato.org/pubs/efw/index.html>), economists James Gwartney and Robert Lawson confirm yet again that

prosperity grows greater and more widespread as the private sector expands and government is confined to protecting persons and their property from violence and theft.

---

1 October 2005

Editor, The Washington Times

To the Editor:

I'll never understand right-wing apologists, such as David Limbaugh, for George W. Bush ("Swept Away with the Wind," Oct. 1). With his No Child Left Behind Act, this President unleashed unprecedented centralization of primary and secondary education; he created a vast new prescription-drug entitlement program; government spending grew 33 percent during his first term, making him the most profligate president in 30 years; he sounds downright Nader-ish in publicly calling for enforcement of statutes that prohibit 'price-gouging'; he is "proud" to have signed the pork-stuffed \$286 billion transportation bill; and he bought us to war for no good reason.

What, exactly, does he do for freedom and free markets?

---

30 September 2005

Program Editor, All Things Considered  
National Public Radio

Dear Editor:

Commentator Alexs Pate upbraids corporations for the miserable state of education in inner-city America (All Things Considered, Sept. 29, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/sto>

[ry.php?storyId=4929663](http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4929663)). This is like upbraiding your mailman for Uncle Bill's abuse of Aunt Mary.

Government schools, not corporations, claim (rather gaudily) the responsibility for educating children. Of course, these 'schools' generally are lousy educators - a fact that will not change as long as taxpayers fund their operations and politicians guarantee to them pools of captive students.

Why blame the likes of General Electric and 3M for a problem created by politicians and exacerbated by the flunkies who run their so-called 'schools'?

---

29 September 2005

Editor, The Boston Globe

Dear Editor:

Richard Brauer writes that women today have no choice but to work, for (he says) "otherwise their families would be hungry and homeless" (Letters, Sept. 29). This claim likely is way off base.

Preliminary research by economists at the Dallas Fed shows that, at today's wages and prices, the number of people per family who must work today to earn enough for that family to enjoy the typical lifestyle of the mid-1970s is 0.7. This fact means that the typical household today can achieve with only one worker a higher standard of living than it enjoyed a mere thirty years ago.

---

28 September 2005

Editor, The Washington Post

1150 15th St., NW  
Washington, DC 20071

Dear Editor:

Harold Meyerson criticizes corporations that outsource because he fears an increase in "the vulnerability of these corporations' supply chains to upheavals in distant lands" ("Outsourcing Our Safety," Sept. 28). He overlooks an important point.

Weather woes, labor strikes, and market collapses erupting in one part of the world (possibly including home) will unlikely erupt in all parts simultaneously. By outsourcing to different countries, companies spread their supply risks. The vulnerability of their supply chains is reduced.

