



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.

31 March 2006

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

To the Editor:

Corinne Maier says that while 1968's Parisian protestors wanted to change society, 2006's protestors "simply want to be part of it" ("French Twist," March 31).

So why do they protest in favor of the status quo? With more than one in five of them unable to find jobs, do these 20-something middle-class French citizens fancy they are now well integrated into society? Key to enabling each young man and woman to become part of society is liberating each person to work on terms mutually agreeable to that person and to his or her employer.

30 March 2006

Editor, The Boston Globe

Dear Editor:

Jan Goriensky repeats many myths about Wal-Mart ("We Pay a Price

for Lower Prices," March 30). Perhaps the most egregious is the claim that "Wal-Mart has caused manufacturing jobs to disappear as fast as you can say 'China.'"

In fact, U.S. manufacturing jobs have been replaced not by workers abroad but, rather, by machines. This mechanization greatly improved worker productivity: today's manufacturing worker in America produces nearly 350 percent more output per hour than did his counterpart in 1962, the year Wal-Mart was founded. One result is that, although service-sector output has increased substantially over this same period, the share of GDP accounted for by manufacturing output is today barely unchanged from its share back then.

29 March 2006

Editor, The Washington Times

Dear Editor:

Observing anti-immigration maneuvers by pundits such as Cal Thomas ("Whose Country...." March 29), I wondered Whose life

is this? Mine? Or government's? Why are politicians and bureaucrats entitled to pre-select the pool of persons from which I can choose my friends, lovers, employees, and associates? Why can't I - an allegedly free American - decide for myself which Mexicans will mow my lawn or break bread with me in my home? Why must my choices in these matters first be approved by government in order to be 'legal'?

28 March 2006

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

Dear Editor:

Charles Krauthammer justifies the U.S. war in Iraq by alleging that "there is not a single, remotely plausible, alternative strategy for attacking the root causes of Sept. 11" ("Fukuyama's Fantasy," March 28).

What about Uncle Sam using his troops and war machines only to defend Americans at home rather than to "build" nations abroad? What about a return to the prudent

non-interventionism endorsed by
George Washington who warned
us against foreign entanglements?
In short, what about U.S. neutrality
- including in the Middle East?
After all, al Qaeda doesn't seem to
be intent on terrorizing the Swiss.