



## 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.**

---

28 June 2009

Editor, Detroit Free Press

Dear Editor:

Mitch Albom is correct that "We're wacko in how we view Jacko" (June 28). But not all of us are wacko. I, for one, am no more touched by Mr. Jackson's death than I am by the death of any of the thousands of other Americans who died last week, all of whom - like Mr. Jackson - are strangers to me and to the vast majority people now so self-indulgently and flamboyantly grieving for a man they never met.

Americans' proclivity to mass hysteria causes me to want government to have as little power as possible. I neither can nor wish to stop other persons from doing with their lives as they wish. But I also damn sure despise the fact that, through their votes, so many persons prone to such childish sentiments and displays have a say in how I lead my life.

27 June 2009

Editor, Boston Globe

Dear Editor:

Scott Lehigh argues that "infidelities shouldn't end

political careers" (June 26) - to which I say: it depends.

A politician who holds himself or herself out as a savior - as such a paragon of virtue that he or she can be trusted with vast swaths of our lives and property - certainly should NOT be suffered to remain in office once that person is revealed to be simply another human being as faulty as the rest of us.

In the case of Gov. Mark Sanford, however, he's that rare politician who does not fancy himself to be more sagacious or virtuous than the rest of us. While not excusing Mr. Sanford's broken promises to his wife

and family, I regret the likely loss to the public of an official who never posed as being worthy to lord it over ordinary human beings.

---

25 June 2009

Friends,

A couple of you asked that I send out this link to a short essay that I wrote, for the Fraser Institute, on globalization - an essay followed by the transcript of a Q&A that I did with some students on this topic.

My obscene vanity compels me to comply:  
[http://www.fraserinstitute.org/education\\_programs/for\\_students/ask\\_professor/Fraser\\_05280901.asp](http://www.fraserinstitute.org/education_programs/for_students/ask_professor/Fraser_05280901.asp)

---

25 June 2009

Editor, USA Today

Dear Editor:

Although you suspect that Steve Jobs received special consideration to move to the front of the line of the many Americans seeking liver transplants, you believe that "Paying for organs is properly banned in the U.S." ("Wanted: organ donors," June 25).

What's proper about a policy that reduces the

supply of life-giving transplant procedures and, thus, artificially raises the cost of such procedures? What's proper about condemning tens of thousands of people to lives of misery, and very often to premature death, when many of them would otherwise agree to mutually beneficial exchanges with willing donors? What's proper about allowing real people to suffer real pain and real death simply to protect an aesthetic sensibility that is hostile to certain kinds of voluntary commercial contracts?

Far from being proper, this ban on organ sales is pitiless.

---

24 June 2009

Editor, Los Angeles Times

Dear Editor:

Harold Meyerson believes that California should more vigorously demand a bailout from Washington ("California has to lean harder on Obama," June 24). And with unintentional irony, he supports his case by quoting the Jewish sage Hillel, who asked "If I am not for myself, who shall be for me?"

I, too, find wisdom in Hillel's question. So taking it to heart, I resist being taxed even further to support a government whose childish inattention to costs and unintended consequences led it into its current troubles. Why should those of us who don't live in California pay to save that state from the ill consequences of its own irresponsibility? After all, if I am not for myself, who shall be for me?

---

23 June 2009

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

To the Editor:

Ryan Bubb and Alex Kaufman conclude that restrictions imposed by the brand new Credit Card Accountability, Responsibility and Disclosure Act will "bring about moderate, and even positive, changes" ("A Fairer Credit Card? Priceless," June 23). This conclusion rests on the fact that cards issued by credit unions (as opposed to investor-owned banks) have long offered terms that meet the requirements of the Act. So if credit unions can profitably offer such terms, so too can investor-owned banks, right?

Not necessarily. As Bubb and Kaufman themselves argue, "Card issuers, after all, need to retain customers. Any bank that attempts to pad its bottom line by, say, levying large annual fees will likely see its customers flee to credit unions or to banks that emulate the credit union model."

So why haven't we seen any such flight or emulation? Could it be that banks' customers have needs and profiles different from those of credit-unions' customers - differences that prevent banks' customers from being profitably served under the terms offered by credit unions?

---

22 June 2009

Editor, Los Angeles Times

Dear Editor:

You want to "Keep the politics out of UC" (Editorial, June 22). Impossible, as the UC system is a government entity. And a government entity free of politics is, as my colleague Russ Roberts says, quite as unthinkable as is a ham sandwich free of pork.