

Comment on the Commentary of the Day

by

Donald J. Boudreaux
Chairman, Department of Economics
George Mason University
dboudrea@gmu.edu
<http://www.cafehayek.com>

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.

24 February 2007

The Editor, New York Post

Dear Editor:

Your editorial "Lying for Fidel" (Feb. 24) reminds us that collectivism is both evil and pathetic. A further example is provided by Richard Pipes in his book Communism. Discussing Cuba's rise as a popular sex-vacation destination, Pipes relates that "In 1992, in a speech to the National Assembly, Castro touted the advantages of Cuban prostitution by declaring his country to have the lowest incidence of AIDS."

So what do Cubans get in return for their blood being brutally spilled, their freedoms crushed, and their prosperity destroyed?

A "leader" serving as the people's pimp.

23 February 2007

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

Dear Editor:

Jerry McCoy is disturbed that the National Memorial Project Foundation's new statue of Martin Luther King, Jr., will be carved by a Chinese sculptor from granite quarried in China (Letters, Feb. 23). Mr. McCoy wants the statue to be carved by an American sculptor from granite quarried in America.

He should be less prejudiced. To paraphrase Dr. King, I have a dream that one day the goods and

services that Americans enjoy will be judged not by the nationality of their producers but by the character of their content.

22 February 2007

Editor, Baltimore Sun

To the Editor:

You rightly criticize the Justice Department's requirement that, as a condition of merging with Arcelor, Mittal Steel sell its Sparrows Point mill ("Getting the Point," Feb. 22). But you miss an acute incongruity behind this requirement: the world steel market is so competitive that U.S. steel makers must sometimes be protected from it.

Or, at least, the Bush administration thought so in 2002 when it raised

tariffs on steel imports in the hope that protection from low prices on the world market would enable U.S. steel producers to "restructure." Do these producers now have such dreadful market power that Arcelor Mittal cannot be trusted to keep the mill at Sparrows Point? I doubt it - but if so, doesn't part of the blame rest with President Bush?

21 February 2007

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

To the Editor:

Donald Kalff asserts that the "deterioration of the current account deficit will burden the U.S. for years" (Letters, Feb. 21). I disagree.

The real burden is created by Uncle Sam's reckless budget deficits. Any resulting increase in the current-account deficit is merely a symptom of this fiscal irresponsibility.

More importantly, other factors that increase the current-account deficit - such as foreign direct investment in the U.S. - make Americans wealthier and, hence, better able

than otherwise to bear the burdens foisted on us by wastrel politicians.

20 February 2007

Editor, Business Week

To the Editor:

Surely economist "Vladimir Masch" - author of "A Radical Plan to Manage Globalization" (Feb. 14) - is the nom de plume of a satirist.

No one REALLY believes that free trade is the right-wing equivalent of the Soviet Union, a regime that routinely murdered millions of its citizens and crushed the rest into poverty. No economist SERIOUSLY suggests that for every job created in firms that export to the U.S. the number of jobs in the U.S. falls permanently by one. No one with enough expertise to write an essay on globalization for Business Week can TRULY be unaware that the per-capita foreign direct investment currently going to China is a mere seven percent of the per-capita foreign direct investment coming to the U.S. - a pattern of investment wholly at odds with Dr. "Masch's" thesis that free trade encourages capital to flee to low-wage countries such as China until ordinary Americans are impoverished.

20 February 2007

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

To the Editor:

Bill Johnson interprets the Anna Nicole Smith saga as cause for pessimism about American culture (Letters, Feb. 20). I dissent.

As my colleague Tyler Cowen argues in his book **IN PRAISE OF COMMERCIAL CULTURE**, rich and vibrant cultures feature lots of experimentation. Much of what goes on today is indeed shabby, even sometimes disgusting. But

soaring cultural achievements and discovery are possible only through such wide-ranging experimentation, and by recognizing that inspiring culture is not limited to what was bequeathed to us by our ancestors.

19 February 2007

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

Dear Editor:

Even if Sebastian Mallaby is right that government programs - such as efforts to retrain workers - are justified as the price to pay to weaken political

resistance to freer trade, he's wrong to argue that these programs must be funded by higher taxes ("Matching Free Trade With Taxes," Feb. 19).

Uncle Sam today takes from Americans' pockets more than \$2.5 trillion per year. In real dollar terms, this sum is 50 percent higher than what Bill Clinton's government took during its first year in office and 25 percent higher than what George W. Bush's government took during its first year. Surely, Uncle Sam already has on hand more than sufficient funds to pay for whatever programs are needed to mute opposition to trade.

