

Monday April 27, 2015

Subject: Again, please judge a man by his enemies. And please don't judge me by any errors in this quick Monday morning email below.

---

After my writing this: <http://www.wsj.com/articles/in-praising-obamacare-they-bury-it-1429137478>

And getting utterly slimed by Chait here: <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/04/cliff-ansness-struggles-to-express-obamacare-rage.html>

And then destroying Chait here: <http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2015/04/22/ive-been-chaited-been-mistreated-when-will-i-101635.html>

I woke up to find myself Krugged here: <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/27/opinion/paul-krugman-nobody-said-that.html?hp&action=click&pgtype=Homepage&module=c-column-top-span-region&region=c-column-top-span-region&WT.nav=c-column-top-span-region&r=0>

Basically a weaker (yes, it is possible) repeat of Chait. Unlike Chait's three weak examples Krugman has one. Of course I was just a drive-by in a longer Krugman rant. Interestingly, like Chait, Krugman believes that calling someone a "hedge fund manager" (only a bit accurate in my case) can be used in place of an actual argument.

But, unlike Chait, Krugman certainly had the advantage of actually seeing my back and forth with Chait (it's even scarier if he didn't, nice research Paul). For instance he ignores me saying I'd happily add the notion that some Republicans did disagree with me. He, of course, doesn't acknowledge any of my piece addressing this, but ups the assertion from some Republicans got it wrong to "everything ever said by anyone in a position of influence on the American right." Wow. Paul, what econometrics package did you use to come up with the answer "everything ever said"?

He ignores the paragraph in my original piece going through things the opponents of HCA got wrong, and where I repeat and highlight this paragraph when responding to Chait. I guess neither want to deal with an adversary who is fair and criticizes both sides. It is both more difficult for them to slime that adversary, and such fairness simply confuses them like an alien trait.

Like Chait he ignores that he is, again, keeping score on predictions (and not an honest score of course) and not arguing the logic. But that's to be expected.

Then, hilariously, he does on to do EXACTLY what I talk about in the part of my original piece he doesn't want to talk about (yeah that sentence was tortured but it's Monday morning and I'm already attacked in the NYT). He says "Oh, and all the good news on costs is just a coincidence" with dripping sarcasm but no argument at all. In my original piece, the part Chait and Krugman ignore totally, as opposed to the part they barely singe, I point out that the slowing in the pace of health care costs is global and started out before Obamacare. I point out that people like Chait and Krugman never make an argument why these are linked, they just mention them both and hope and pray you assume Obamacare is responsible even though given the timing it's a tough argument to make. Krugman, ever shameless, does precisely that

here. Precisely! One sentence of hand waving without an argument. Krugman likes to brag about predictions. I would like then to brag about predicting Krugman, but admittedly that is very easy. The great Nobel winning economist's argument on costs here is "hey, that can't be a coincidence can it?" Is that a Granger can't-be-a-coincidence and in what direction Paul?

Of course the rest of the piece was a litany of the Krugman standard "I've been right about everything and my enemies wrong." He lies about others' faults, and their explanations, and ignores his giant litany of mistakes, and general long list of Keynesian failures, yet again. But, that's just Paul, and it's only Monday morning, he's just getting going.