

RedState.com

[links for 2010-01-08](#)

Posted by [Erick Erickson \(Profile\)](#)

Friday, January 8th at 12:03PM EST

3 Comments

- [Oh to be Gregoire](#)
What is it with the Dems? They get unpopular as failed governors then join the Obama administration. It took Bush a while to get to the C and D teams in his administration. Obama is starting out that way.
- [Karl Rove's Hypocritical Call for Fiscal Rectitude](#)
Dan Mitchell does a bang up job with this. I like Rove, but this does need to be said unfortunately. The GOP has a long way to go to regain street cred on fiscal issues and just attacking the other guy for doing what you did, but more so, isn't really the way to get it. Practicing in the majority what is preached in the minority is the ticket.
- [Perry Blogger Summit 2010 | Texans for Rick Perry](#)
Wish I could be there. They asked and I had to decline due to a previous engagement in New York.
- [Snow covers Britain from head to toe](#)
Neat picture of Britain from space. It is as white as Greenland. I blame Al Gore.

3 Comments

But when gregorie led the battle with lawsuits against tobacco companies

[bobojake](#) Friday, January 8th at 12:12PM EST ([link](#))

all Healthcare costs were supposed to be taken care of, another pipe dream of a democrat. Is gregorie ACORN team of recounting votes unemployed?

Will Washington State financial downfall under gregorie be a drag on her buddy murray reelection bid in Nov 2010?

[Log in to Reply](#)

Sorry, but the Cato article slamming Rove

[Flagstaff](#) Friday, January 8th at 1:29PM EST ([link](#))

didn't deserve to be highlighted here.

Bush overspent. We agree.

Obama has taken it to a new order of magnitude.

Besides, the article is filled with misleading language, such as

Yet a quick look at the budget data shows that the burden of federal spending jumped from 18.4 percent of GDP when Bush took office to more than 25 percent of economic output when he left office. Even if the (hopefully) temporary bailout costs are not counted, Bush and Rove are the ones who deserve most of the blame for today's much larger burden of government.

Nice, neat figures are used to condemn Bush (and therefore Rove), but the disclaimer is left conveniently vague behind the words "(hopefully) temporary" and "most of the blame." Both concepts could have been quantified; neither was. And

It should be noted, by the way, that none of the new spending under Bush was imposed over his objection. He did not veto any legislation because of excessive spending.

No, because until 2008 the economy was robust enough to carry the additional spending, no matter how much we fiscal conservatives were opposed to the spending. The TARP fiasco was agreed upon as necessary by PRACTICALLY EVERYBODY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. We taxpayers were assured that it was a measure necessary to avoid the next Great Depression, the meltdown of world financial markets, and the End of Civilization As We Know It. Whether true or not (apparently not), it hasn't been used for the purposes put forth at the time, and *that* is completely the responsibility of Barack Hussein Obama.

Let's go back:

...the federal budget exploded during Bush's eight years, climbing from \$1.8 trillion to more than \$3.5 trillion. More specifically, Rove was a leading proponent of the proposals that dramatically expanded the size and scope of the federal government, including the no-bureaucrat-left-behind education bill, the two corrupt farm bills, the two pork-filled transportation bills, and the grossly irresponsible new Medicare entitlement program.

That was a double of the *budget* in eight years. Obama has plans that will expand the budget to the point that the national *debt* will increase by about \$3.45 through fiscal year 2013. That is, the **debt** will increase to equal the recent **budget**, and it will do it in half the time. (Mitchell blames Bush for the 2009 FY budget, so I see nothing wrong with assigning the FY 2013 budget to Obama. And incidentally, the second half of the 2009 budget was held back by Congress until Obama took office, primarily because they knew Bush would veto it.) And it's that low only if you choose to believe the fantastic claims of Obama that his Health Care Disaster will actually save money, rather than cause the expenditure of additional hundreds of billions of dollars by the federal government.

All in all, my own opinion is that Mitchell's take is far off the mark—there's nothing particularly hypocritical about Rove's column. He's just telling it as it is now. If you asked him, he'd probably say they should have held down spending themselves.

Pluto, the Ninth Planet - Forever!

[Log in to Reply](#)

Kowalski--should have been

Flagstaff Friday, January 8th at 1:31PM EST ([link](#))

“\$3.45 *trillion*through fiscal year 2013.”

*Pluto, the Ninth Planet - **Forever!***

[Log in to Reply](#)