

1/12/2009

BUSH'S FAILED ECONOMIC POLICIES!

How many times have you heard this phrase uttered by the aspiring "PEERS"? No proof is offered. It is just offered as a statement or fact, with the "peers" secure in the knowledge that they controlled the "preponderance of propaganda". The implication of this statement is that the Bush tax cuts allowed the producers to retain too much of their earnings. According to the "preponderance of the propaganda" the economic performance of eight years of the Bush Administration (during a war) proved all the evidence accumulated since the beginning of the "Industrial Revolution" was false. Politicians and bureaucrats are more adept at investing profits of the entrepreneur than the entrepreneur.

Let's look at the facts. The average February unemployment rate for the 40 years (1950 TO 1990) was 5.84%. For the 8 years of the Bush Administration the average February unemployment rate was 5.11%. Not too shabby for a failed economic policy. The Real Gross Domestic Product increased by an average of 2.32% per year, compared to 3.81% since 1796. The Real GDP per capita increased an average of 1.35% compared to an average of 1.77% since 1796. When you consider the waste of the congressional earmarks and cost of the war on terror total about almost \$280 billion or about 2% of the GDP, this seems like very good performance. So, where is the failure? If the total unproductive 2% of the GDP had been used for economic growth what would have been the effect. The money spent on the war on terror was not wasted, but it provided no economic progress either.

Do you really think that if Pelosi and Reid had made more decisions on how to invest the entrepreneur's profits we would be better off today?

Of course, the collapse of the sub-prime mortgage market and subsequent bank failures occurred on Bush's watch but you can hardly blame the tax cuts for that problem. We all know that the root cause was government pressure to make loans to persons who had little or no prospect of repaying the loan. It was just a matter of time until the policies of the government mortgage agencies caused massive failure in the banking system.

The government, using intimidation and regulations to transfer wealth, ended as it always does. DISASTER!

The disaster occurred on Bush's watch, but policies implemented long before Bush were the cause. Of course, Bush bears much of the blame for not stopping the policies. Even when Bush took office the disaster was inevitable, but he could have mitigated the damages.

Are the people who implemented the "sub-prime" policies really so stupid that they were oblivious to the inevitable results?

THROW THE RASCALS OUT!!!!!!