

---

Subject: OT: Political IQ Test

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Mon, 02 Feb 2004 23:11:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's not a 'so-called' poster. It does actually exist. I just can't find it, so I'll have to get another one.

Some more points you'll have to address are:

1) What did Clinton DO to create these jobs? Just because jobs became available, doesn't mean you can pinpoint any real or probable Clinton causes for these jobs.

2) Why do you think a huge spike is such a good thing? I say it's not. While many people were making millions of dollars in that market upswing, many of them lost all it, and much more. I worked at Charles Schwab talking to traders all day long during that market upswing, and plenty of the way into the fall as well (until June 2002 in fact), so I was there day to day knowing what was going on on the trading floors. And most of them were cursing Clinton for it.

3) "3 years into his first term, Clinton had actually created more jobs in America, not lost them." -- Once again, no facts to back this up. If you're going to try and interpret this way, then you'd have to supply some sort of year-by-year comparison. And you're only guessing about the future. If, for example, Bush "loses" 27 million jobs in the first year, then each year after that gains 8 million jobs, then you're looking at a net loss of 3 million jobs at the three-year mark, but if that upward trend continues, you'd look at 37 million net jobs gained at the end of his hypothetical 8 year term.

Note that was an example, created to point out glaring flaws in your logic.

Also, I'd prefer a steady constant gain in the market indicators rather than erratic sharp movements up and down. People lose money that way all too easily, no matter which way it's going. Smooth steady growth is better for everyone, except for the minority who trade short.

---