

Limbaugh v Arnie - We Tentatively Endorse Arnie

Knowing little about California politics and less about Arnold Schwarzenegger's politics, we were going to pass on this momentous issue of the day – until **Rush Limbaugh** told us just enough:

Here [sic] me now and believe me later, my friends: all these conservative orgasms over Arnold Schwarzenegger are - like the "Gorbasm" liberals experienced over Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev - fake. I know that (R) next to Schwarzenegger's name excites the White House, but his own words prove he's not a conservative.

Hmm. Well, not a *Limbaugh* conservative ... that may not be a fatal flaw. We're **not conservatives** either. Let's hear more.

[...]

He said that he wanted businesses to come back to California so that the state government could collect enough tax revenues to provide social programs. This is the sort of obtuse comment middle-of-the-road Democrats always make, forgetting that businesses are leaving the state because they are tired of paying high taxes for those big government social programs."

Yeah, well politicians talk like that. What are you going to do? For what it's worth, he put it better when talking to **Fox News**:

"[We have to] bring businesses back to California. We have the most unfriendly business environment right now in California of any state. Businesses are leaving every day. They're expanding outside of the state. That means that people are getting laid off. Jobs are lost."

And if he believes in balanced budgets and is an **admirer** of **Milton Friedman**...

Anyway, back to Rush:

[...] "He has told the press he is 'very liberal' about social programs

Again, does that mean increased programmes entrenching poverty?

Or:

supports abortion

Hurray!

and homosexual adoption,

Cool.

and advocates 'sensible gun controls.'

Well, we're not going to shoot a guy for that, are we?

His entree into politics last year was a proposition Democrats endorsed because it raised state spending for what amounted to state babysitting - before-school and after-school programs that cost the state up to \$455 million a year.

"Up to" \$455 million? That means "less than", right? Well, taxation is far too high already, that's for sure. But ... well, in some countries, \$455 million is a lot of money. In California it's the cost of the extra air conditioning needed for right-wingers to cool down after hearing about it. Peanuts. Let's move on.

He has complained openly about the party's conservatism....

Good.

Talk magazine described him as 'impatient' with the religious right....

Wahoo!

[H]e expressed disgust with the Republicans who impeached Clinton. 'That was another thing I will never forgive the Republican Party for,' he said. 'We spent one year wasting time because there was a human failure. I was ashamed to call myself a Republican during that period.'^

Yes, yes! So were we! (No wait, we're not Republicans in the first place, but you know what we mean.)

(No, those weren't Gorbasmis. We just got a little carried away.)

OK Rush, you convinced us. Californians: if this is the worst that can be said by way of trashing Arnie, you're not going to find a better Governor anywhere.

Tue, 08/12/2003 - 13:10 | [permalink](#)

Arnie

For abortion? boo. For homosexual adoption? boo. Arnie is a liberal

claiming to be a Republican. A fake.

by a reader on Tue, 08/12/2003 - 18:17 | [reply](#)

Gay adoption

A reader wrote:

'For homosexual adoption? boo.'

Quite right! Those evil fags, they take our jobs, they take our children, they take our women, oh, wait, nah, strike that last bit, they don't take our women, that's the problem, us heteros are getting all henpecked, it's evil I tells ya, evil!!!

But seriously, what's wrong with gay adoption?

by [Alan Forrester](#) on Wed, 08/13/2003 - 00:20 | [reply](#)

What a weird entry. The Wo...

What a weird entry.

The World says "Hurray!" to the fact that AS "supports abortion", indicating that supporting abortion is prominent or at least significant on **The World's** list of priorities for the next governor of the state of California. The reason why that's weird is that, given Roe v. Wade, in the US as things stand there's not a damn thing the governor of the state of California (or any other state for that matter) can do about *abortion*, so why the heck does **The World** *care*? (By the way, yes: I also think it's weird that social-conservatives care about this position in gubernatorial candidates, as well.)

But overall it's also a weird entry because of the simple fact that it's not at all clear why **The World** would care who becomes governor of California or poo-poo the "Peanuts" which California's taxpayers are shelling out for this or that social program which, as far as I can tell, **The World** knows absolutely nothing about.

I mean, unless I'm wrong in assuming that **The World** does not live in California.

by a reader on Wed, 08/13/2003 - 00:43 | [reply](#)

why care?

we care if he is for or against abortion because it tells us about his views, esp on morality and superstition.

the point of the peanuts comment was simply that any mistake Arnold made on that issue wasn't all that damning.

The World also does have readers who live in California, btw. and even for those who don't live there, it's still interesting. i mean, I

don't live in Israeli, but I didn't object to the history of the region.

nor do i object to posts about the political situation in Iran.

-- Elliot Temple

<http://curi.blogspot.com/>

by **Elliot Temple** on Wed, 08/13/2003 - 02:09 | [reply](#)

Well, it IS the WORLD, neh?

The place may be in disrepair, but California is still a part of it, is it not? I mean, why discuss Iraq, or Israel? **The World** is hardly based out of the Middle East, is it? Very odd happenings are in the works in CA, with the recall, and it's an interesting topic.

Why so weird?

-Dan Frank

by a reader on Wed, 08/13/2003 - 02:10 | [reply](#)

Hmmm...maybe The World is ...

Hmmm...maybe **The World** is glad to see that the current front-runner to replace Davis is quite sensible, not another of the bible-thumping wastes of scarce protoplasm that have well-established parasitic relationships w/ the RP in most of the U.S. Someone who is "economically conservative & socially moderate"- in other words, inclined to allow individual choices in social/cultural matters as long as those involved are consenting and responsible (adults only, but hey, you gotta start somewhere),

and to leave market players free to discover/create/exploit/trade valuable subjective-preferences data to the long-term benefit of all(more widely known as "conducting business for profit") without too much interference.

Someone who will oversee the 4th largest economy on Earth, who will probably not join(at least not too actively) the appalling crusade to deny us all access to proper regenerative medicine. Who does not believe that being elected means that the whole electorate shares his religious/moral/cultural beliefs. Sounds perfectly reasonable for **The World** to take an interest...because, longer term, a "moderate trend" could help loosen the Religious Right's parasitic grip on the RP, and help take the advocacy of truly progressive positions (such as being pro-choice, pro-families of affinity, pro-stem-cell/therapeutic cloning research, pro-sex-without-hangups-and-guilt, pro-autonomy, pro-child, etc.) out of the hands of some of the nuttiest idiotarians in existence, and help place such positions within a more consistent market-oriented framework that will allow individuals to maximize their fulfillment in every conceivable direction, with a minimum of undesired impact on others.

Oh, by the way, you can be a Republican & liberal, or a Democrat & conservative.

Brian

by [bk_2112](#) on Wed, 08/13/2003 - 02:38 | [reply](#)

[curi/Elliot] we care if he i...

[curi/Elliot] we care if he is for or against abortion because it tells us about his views, esp on morality and superstition.

In other words, Support For Abortion is sort of a semi-religious piety test on which you (and **The World**?) find the Correct answer to be essential in all political candidates whether or not "abortion" as such has relevance to the post in question. I understand.

[curi/Elliot] the point of the peanuts comment was simply that any mistake Arnold made on that issue wasn't all that damning.

Right - from **The World**'s perch outside of California, the public outlays Arnold caused us inside of California to pay by that Proposition looks like "Peanuts" to **The World**. Yes, that I understood. It's just that I don't appreciate this kind of comment. (easy for **The World** to say, and all, not helping to pick up the tab..)

P.S. I'm not saying I'm against Arnie's candidacy. Just that these are silly reasons for supporting it let alone caring about the whole thing. Sure I take an interest in Israeli elections, but my opinion is guided by factors of more import than which candidate worships the correct Go.... er, "supports abortion".

by a reader on Wed, 08/13/2003 - 18:11 | [reply](#)

Straw Man

"A Reader", in his/her enthusiasm to get righteously angry, purposely misconstrued what Elliot said.

Posts that respond to imaginary straw men tend not to be particularly illuminating. And no, being indignant doesn't raise your intellectual stature.

by [Daniel Strimpel](#) on Thu, 08/14/2003 - 16:26 | [reply](#)

455 million dollars might be ...

455 million dollars might be peanut for a surplus economy but it could break your neck when you could not find money to pay for all your spending. My advice to you is try to spend MUCH MUCH more than you earn and when billing statement comes, see how \$100 more spending which I assume that is peanut to your income, can break your kneecap. Make sense?

Words can fool men but nature doesn't give a damn!

by [Lan Nguyen](#) on Thu, 08/14/2003 - 18:02 | [reply](#)

Copyright © 2005 Setting The World To Rights