



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.

27 October 2007

Editor, The Washington Times

To the Editor:

John Lillpop is offended that anyone suggests that President Bush's visit to charred southern California is a mere publicity stunt (Letters, October 27).

Publicity stunt or not, I have deeper questions about the common practice of high-ranking politicians visiting disaster scenes. What does it say about Americans that we draw comfort from visits of a Governor or a President? Are we so dependent upon the state that we can't get our lives

back to normal unless government is involved? Is our vision of heads of states so distorted that we perceive them to be demigods whose touch or even presence strengthens our powers and enriches our lives? It's unsettling to witness the cult of personality that surrounds nearly all politicians above the level of sewer-board members.

26 October 2007

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

To the Editor:

There's widespread agreement that the

alternative minimum tax - because it is not indexed to inflation - is mistakenly raising the taxes of millions of Americans ("House Democrats Propose Tax Overhaul," October 25). Happily, there's also widespread agreement that this mistake should be corrected.

So, given that the current operation of the ATM is a mistake, why do Rep. Charles Rangel and so many others talk of the need to "pay for" fixing the ATM? A merchant who mistakenly overcharges customers is obliged to refund the money and stop overcharging, period. This obligation kicks in whether or not the merchant devises

some way of replacing the revenue that he loses by correcting his mistake.

25 October 2007

Editor, The Washington Times

To the Editor:

In "Oinking senators" (October 25) you report on the venal and hypocritical Senators who relentlessly buy votes with pork paid for with funds pillaged from taxpayers. I'm reminded of my all-time favorite title for an article about the nature of government: "Malice in Plunderland."

It's shameful that so much of Americans' wealth is commandeered to pass to and through the crooking class.

24 October 2007

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

Dear Editor:

Robert Samuelson unnecessarily weakens his case for globalization by accepting the myth that the trade deficit depresses U.S. employment ("A Villain To Our Rescue," October 24).

It's not that "domestic job creation and destruction

ultimately overwhelm trade's effects." Rather, the trade deficit itself has no negative impact on employment. When foreigners invest their dollars in America (rather than cash them out buying American exports), the trade deficit rises. But these investments create jobs no less surely than do foreign purchases of American-made goods and services. Moreover, these investments - by increasing the size of America's capital stock beyond what it would otherwise be - directly promote greater worker productivity and, hence, higher wages.

23 October 2007

News Editor, All Things Considered
National Public Radio

Dear Editor:

In your series on candidates' stump speeches, you featured today Rep. Duncan Hunter's tirade against China. Mr. Hunter simultaneously accuses China of "cheating" on trade by keeping the value of the yuan too low against the dollar AND alleges that China spends the dollars it earns on its exports to buy military weaponry that threatens U.S. national security.

Like all protectionists, Mr. Hunter is deeply confused.

By spending its dollars, Beijing fails to remove dollars from the foreign-exchange market and thereby fails to raise the dollar's value against the yuan. So the only way Beijing can then reduce the yuan's value is to inflate the supply of yuan. The unavoidable result is higher prices of Chinese-made goods and services - higher prices that offset the lower value of the yuan.

23 October 2007

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

To the Editor:

Forget that Uncle Sam today rakes in tax revenues that are, in inflation-adjusted dollars, 25 percent larger than those that he took in 2001 - thus making a mockery of your claim that Washington's tax take today is "meager" ("The Dearth of Taxes," October 23). And forget that the Wall Street Journal today reports that Congress has increased corporate welfare for the current fiscal year by nearly ten percent, to \$100 billion.

At least keep your story straight. In your editorial you simultaneously blame

government's alleged lack of funds for bringing many U.S. corporations "to the brink" AND you dismiss the

recent growth in tax revenues as being due to "spectacular increase in corporate profits." Such

inconsistency taxes your readers' credulity.