

Yoram's Principles of the Absurd

1. **Opportunity costs are dumb**
2. **GDP growth is stupid**
3. **Less can be preferred to more (i.e. Choices schmoices, just give me the goods)**
4. **Economists are conspirators**
5. **Trade is bad**
6. **Blah Blah Blah is a great argument!**

Principle #1 Economists get flustered by the concept of opportunity costs and quickly find themselves engrossed in arguments over the absurdity of the concept. Take for example the case where someone gives you a Snickers Bar. Wow, you just got some profit. But wait, if I offer you the choice over two candy bars, if you take into account the opportunity cost of the first candy as the second your net gains have just dropped to zero. (see #3)

I propose renaming opportunity costs "Stupid Costs"... then at least when a smart-ass student calls you on this conundrum you can at least agree that economists are overall pretty stupid.

Principle #2 GDP!?! I don't even know what the D stands for; let alone why it's different than GNP. Why bother recording a country's growth by such a lofty term? Once you mention anything from macroeconomics most people's vision blurs anyway.

I propose using the growth of the countries' oldest trees. Since all investments grow at the same amount, this implies that trees must grow at the same rate as GDP. Hence why go through the bullshit of measuring goods and services and all that other stuff when all you need is a tape measure and a tree...

Principle #3 Aside from ignoring the teachings of our Zen philosophers, economists confuse choices with prosperity. As shown in #1, choices create opportunity costs, opportunity costs create losses. If someone offered to make all my choices for me, clearly any Neanderthal would see that they would be better off! But wait, choosing to "make no choices" is a choice itself! Aw, I am so confused.

I propose not worrying about choice. Go with what you want and let God sort the rest out.

Principle #4 See Thesis (due out this spring).

Principle #5 Trade doesn't make everyone better off. Clearly, unless we are willing to enter the moronic world of Kaldor-Hicks, unless an improvement is Pareto, it is bad. Since not all trade is good, all trade is bad ... see? see? See? The proof is trivial.

MY proposal here could get offensive, so it has been omitted.