



## Comment on the Commentary of the Day

by

Donald J. Boudreaux  
Chairman, Department of Economics  
George Mason University  
[dboudrea@gmu.edu](mailto: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.**

---

9 August 2009

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

Dear Editor:

Gene Nelson - "a California-born and -raised holder of a PhD in natural science" - writes that the Golden State's problems are caused by immigrant workers who benefit only "the economic elite" (Letters, August 9). According to Mr. Nelson, immigration's "benefits are privatized while the costs are socialized."

He's mistaken on several counts. For example, by increasing the output of goods and services immigrants benefit not only employers but also all consumers. The deeper problem with Mr. Nelson's hostility to immigration, though, is his hypocrisy. He himself immigrated in 2007 from California to Virginia in search for employment. So does Mr. Nelson feel guilty for hurting innocent Virginians? And would he understand if Virginia tried to close her borders to protect its citizens from the influx of jobless persons fleeing dysfunctional economies?

---

8 August 2009

Editor, Baltimore Sun

Dear Editor:

Nancy Wales argues that the Post Office deserves a bailout because she prefers "real" mail to e-mail and on-line banking (Letters, August 8).

Ms. Wales's argument is weak. The Post Office is losing money despite the fact that it has a government protected monopoly privilege to deliver first-class mail AND is exempt from federal and state taxes.

But I share Ms. Wales's desire for vibrant delivery of physical letters and packages. The key to such delivery, though, is not a government bailout but, rather, an end to the monopoly protection the USPS now enjoys. Once competition is unleashed for all forms of mail delivery, 'hard' letters and other physical items will be mailed and delivered reliably and at much lower cost.

---

7 August 2009

Editor, The New York Times  
620 Eighth Avenue  
New York, NY 10018

To the Editor:

Paul Krugman is appalled that so many Americans continue to resist Obamacare ("The Town Hall Mob," August 7). He cannot comprehend how the unwashed masses are so easily duped by greedy billionaires who are, of course, the only persons who stand to lose from the glorious "reform" that Pres. Obama and Sen. Kennedy propose for America.

But even someone so sure, as Mr. Krugman is, of the goodness of Democrats with enormous political power must be at least mildly disturbed by the White House's request that "If you get an email or see something on the web about health insurance reform that seems fishy, send it to [flag@whitehouse.gov](mailto:flag@whitehouse.gov)".

I can only imagine Mr. Krugman's ire if the Bush administration had made a similar request regarding "fishy" complaints about the war in Iraq. And yet, in today's column, Mr. Krugman says nothing

about this offensive White House move; he chooses instead to impugn the motives and intelligence of ordinary Americans.

---

6 August 2009

Editor, The New York Times  
620 Eighth Avenue  
New York, NY 10018

To the Editor:

Mitchell Adler, understandably upset at today's economic woes, writes that "Unless the regulatory scheme is changed to prevent companies that are 'too big to fail' from taking inordinate risks with the expectation of government bail-outs, I don't see any reason to believe that history won't repeat itself" (Letters, August 6).

He's right. It's intolerable for any entity to use taxpayers' money to subsidize its risky endeavors. Mr. Adler correctly surmises that any entity having such ready access to taxpayer funds will behave irresponsibly - and the bigger is any such entity, the more irresponsibly it will behave.

So I infer that Mr. Adler must also agree that Uncle Sam himself is incurably

prone to behave irresponsibly. After all, this behemoth government is the ultimate entity that is 'too big to fail' - and the ultimate entity that can rely upon its ability to confiscate resources from current and future taxpayers in order to cover whatever losses might ensue from its irresponsible actions.

---

5 August 2009

Editor, Los Angeles Times

Dear Editor:

Dan Witt writes that "The single biggest political phenomenon in the last 30 years is how the right wing of the GOP has been so successful at getting middle-class white voters to enthusiastically endorse policies and leaders who do not have their best interests at heart" (Letters, August 5).

Ignore the question - more open than Mr. Witt presumes - of whether or not greater government involvement in the economy does indeed serve the best interests of middle-class Americans. Let's agree with him that people routinely act irrationally when casting votes. Doesn't this fact itself argue against

entrusting more power to government? After all, if voters are so easily duped by political rhetoric into misperceiving their own best interests, even the fairest of elections will not ensure that government promotes the public welfare.

One important advantage of markets is that they do not foist policies created for persons with mistaken notions about their best interests upon persons who correctly understand their best interests.