



## 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 syndicated and therefore may have appeared in other publications also.**

---

4 December 2005

Editor, The New York Post

To the Editor:

United Federation of Teachers President Randi Weingarten proclaims that the UFT "will always fight to protect our members and push for meaningful educational reforms that will benefit the 1.1 million children in New York City's public schools" (Letters, Dec. 4).

But what will the UFT do when these two goals conflict with each other? Will it support the firing of incompetent teachers? Will it endorse greater competition among schools - competition that can only benefit students but at the same time extinguish many privileges now enjoyed by UFT members?

Protecting teachers is not synonymous with educating children.

---

3 December 2005

The Editor, New York Times

229 West 43rd St.  
New York, NY 10036

To the Editor:

Many of your readers assume that Wal-Mart can raise its workers' pay but refuses to do so because it is greedy (Letters, Dec. 3).

If this assumption is correct, these readers should open their own retail chains. By paying workers more, these rivals will either bankrupt Wal-Mart by hiring away its workers, or force Wal-Mart to disgorge its idle treasure by finally raising its workers' compensation. If this assumption is incorrect, your readers will learn the vital, if costly, lesson that employee pay is not arbitrarily set by employers.

Either way, the commonwealth would be better served than it is by the incessant ill-informed carping about Wal-Mart.

---

2 December 2005

Editor, USA Today

To the Editor:

Susan Swanton notes that many people correctly perceive politicians as blustering immoral hypocrites ("Politicians Can Work Quickly to Regain Voters' Faith," Dec. 2). But her solution - that politicians "act as statesmen by taking the long view of what is best for all" - is quixotic. Venal dissemblers don't become morally upright upon request.

A better solution is to recognize politicians for the scoundrels that they inevitably are and to strip them of as much power as possible.

---

1 December 2005

Editor, The Boston Globe

Dear Editor:

Paul Nevins says that credit-card companies harm consumers because there isn't "equality of bargaining power among consumers, merchants, and the credit card companies" (Letters, Dec. 1). Untrue.

There are more than 5,000 card issuers in the U.S., which means that each one must compete vigorously for business.

Moreover, consumers can easily compare different issuers' terms and policies on-line (for example, at [www.creditcard321.com](http://www.creditcard321.com)). With so many choices and so much information, even the poorest consumer enjoys enormous bargaining power.

---

30 November 2005

Editor, The Wall Street Journal  
200 Liberty St.  
New York, NY 10281

To the Editor:

Gary Becker is right: preventing peaceful people from immigrating to America makes us poorer ("Give Us Your Skilled Masses," Nov. 30).

Of course, opponents of openness often allege that immigrants come here to free-ride on taxpayer-supplied welfare. That this allegation is a canard is revealed by the innumerable restrictions that Congress puts on immigrants' options to work. If limits on immigration were truly grounded in fears that immigrants are largely shiftless spongers, why would Congress spend so much ink and effort preventing immigrants from finding gainful employment in America?

---

29 November 2005

Editor, The New Yorker

Dear Editor:

Jean Baudrillard declares that "all America is Disneyland" ("Baudrillard on Tour," Nov. 28).

I don't pretend to comprehend the musings of continental philosophers, but I'm sure that M. Baudrillard's accusation would be better aimed at his own country. Far more than America, France aims to preserve a coffee-table-book image of itself. From its efforts to freeze its language so that no creative

neologisms emerge, to its prohibition of non-French noms for children, and (of course) to its stubborn protection of its farmers from economic change, the French government - far more than Uncle Sam - rules over its citizens as an overlord intent on preserving corporate appearance at the expense of spontaneity and even of liberté.