



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.

3 March 2012

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

Dear Editor:

You accuse Rush Limbaugh of having violated standards of civility in his criticism of Georgetown University law student Sandra Fluke for her outspoken support for government-mandated provision of "free" contraception ("The GOP can no longer avoid its Rush Limbaugh problem," March 3).

Perhaps you're correct. But Mr. Limbaugh reacted to Ms. Fluke's own violation

of standards of civility. A truly civilized person doesn't demand that other people pick up the bill for her contraception. A truly civilized person - especially one who can afford to be a full-time student at a prestigious law school - would refuse any invitation to publicly play the role of a victim wronged by being told to pay for her own pills or condoms. A truly civilized person does not hold in contempt other people for their resistance to being forced to subsidize his or her 'lifestyle choices' (whatever those choices might be).

When someone violates standards of civility - as Ms. Fluke has done by

self-righteously (and, frankly, also rather incredibly) insisting that she and her fellow students are grievously harmed by the prospect of having to pay for their own contraception - she should not be surprised when other people violate such standards in response.

28 February 2012

Editor, The Wall Street Journal
1211 6th Ave.
New York, NY 10036

Dear Editor:

I share James Taranto's aversion to the economically uninformed pop "Progressivism" woven

throughout many of Bruce Springsteen's lyrics ("What's the Matter With 'Nebraska'?" Feb. 28). But if Mr. Taranto is right - and, presumably, also "pro-American" - to wag a scolding finger at The Boss for trusting Uncle Sam to meddle more deeply in the U.S. economy, why does he allege that The Boss is un-American for wagging a scolding finger at Uncle Sam for meddling more deeply in foreign wars?

Mr. Springsteen is perfectly correct to understand that Uncle Sam had no business sending troops (conscripted ones, at that) into Vietnam. The mystery is why Mr. Springsteen trusts to intervene at home the same agency that he distrusts to intervene abroad - AND why Mr. Taranto apparently trusts to intervene abroad the same agency that he distrusts to intervene at home.