
Subject: Stocks

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 04:50:48 GMT

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

This doesn't really belong in the politics section, but I posted it here anyway. Nothing controversial, but it's better suited here than on the General Discussion forum.

Anyway, can someone explain to me how stocks work and where and how to search for stocks on a certain company.

Thank you.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 04:51:46 GMT

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

Got a year?

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 04:52:48 GMT

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

Go for it

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 05:24:05 GMT

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

Republican in the White House=stocks go up
Democrat in the White House=stocks go down

That's about all you need to know .

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [gibberish](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 06:14:09 GMT

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

In very simplistic terms think of stocks like a foreign currency.

Assume your American and the foreign currency is British pounds for this example.

Lets say you have 10 Dollars and you want to by some Pounds (or stock).

Lets say the value of the Pound (or stock) is currently 2 Dollars.
So you get 5 Pounds for your 10 Bucks.
Then lets say the pound (or stock) increases in value to 3 Bucks.
You can now sell them back to get 15 dollars.
Alternately the Pound could drop against the dollar in which case if you sell them you will loose money.

Just like when you change money at a bank, stockbrokers charge a commission on every trade, so the stock actually has to move in the right direction before you can even break even on the trade.

What stocks actually are is ownership in a company, basically if all of the available stock in a company was made available to the public and you were to buy it all, you would now own the company. When a company is doing well it is perceived to have a higher value so the stocks go up, when it is doing badly the value is perceived to be lower, hence the stock price goes down, but the bottom line is that a stock is only really worth what someone is willing to pay for it, so if no-one is willing to buy the stock, it has no value.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 19:59:11 GMT

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

Ok well how would I find and buy stocks in a certain company? Where would I go for that?

I had a basic idea of what stocks are...but thats all I know. Is there more to it?

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2004 20:31:28 GMT

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

You would need an account with a brokerage... like Charles Schwab or eTrade. Compare brokers by minimum deposits and commission charges first and foremost.

Most brokerage houses also offer online tutorials or live broker assistance before you place your first trade. This industry is extremely regulated and there are a lot of rules in place so you can't have an unfair advantage.

I worked for Charles Schwab for 3 years, so I lived and breathed the stock market, options market, mutual funds... all that jazz for quite a while. I talked to traders every day.

Another thing is, you do have to be 18 to buy or sell stocks because minors aren't allowed to be bound by the contracts you will be under.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 05:39:21 GMT

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

Well I wasn't planning on buying stocks myself...but a friend of my father wanted me to look into buying stocks for the Boeing Airbus A380 early, before it comes into service.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 07 Apr 2004 19:57:06 GMT

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

For our Junior class last year, our economics teacher suggested buying stock in the market like his class had done in previous years. We were all excited about playing the stock market, but yet no one brought any money in. I wanted to buy stock, but I forgot to bring mine in as well.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Fabian](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 01:01:01 GMT

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

hydra1945Republican in the White House=stocks go up
Democrat in the White House=stocks go down

That's about all you need to know .

Bush is a great example of this Republican-led thriving economy! :rolleyes:

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 01:52:10 GMT

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

I wouldn't go investing big right now - the economy is displaying some very weird properties.

For one, the economy is going up without any jobs, and not many people have any idea what is happening.

My thinking is that the economy will eventually partially implode because without the jobs that big bubble is going to pop.

Where are the jobs going? Why, CEOs paying themselves 60 million a year. That's about 4,000 jobs that pay 15,000 a year salary. Outsourcing, schmoutsourcing. Although this is a somewhat radical idea that would never get past the government because of so much rich people influence, a salary cap law would create a lot more jobs in America. Say you can only earn 5 million dollars a year combined. Suddenly, so many more companies have 50 million dollars coming back in. Might as well do something with it.

Oh, and on that Bush attack ad that tries to hurt Kerry about the 50 cents/gallon law he voted for....

He voted for that bill roughly 20 years ago and says he doesn't support it now. And Kerry voting to raise taxes 350 times? BULLSH*T!

Here's there official list, as seen on the GOP website:

<http://commrnc.grassroots.com/resources/KerryVotesForHigherTaxes.pdf>

You can go for pages without actually finding a vote for higher taxes. So many of them are for tax cuts that just weren't as low as Republicans wanted. So many are for repealing tax cuts. Those aren't raises.

And Hydra: you fail to remember how great an economic genius Clinton was. He created 23 million jobs, and created the biggest surpluses in history. And Bush comes, and turns the biggest surpluses into the biggest deficits.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 09:56:59 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiWhere are the jobs going? Why, CEOs paying themselves 60 million a year. That's about 4,000 jobs that pay 15,000 a year salary. Outsourcing, schmoutsourcing. Although this is a somewhat radical idea that would never get past the government because of so much rich people influence, a salary cap law would create a lot more jobs in America. Say you can only earn 5 million dollars a year combined. Suddenly, so many more companies have 50 million dollars coming back in. Might as well do something with it.

Um, that's the most ridiculous, intellectually devoid idea I've ever heard in my life. I don't normally resort to personal insults in this, but shit... this is just, so retarded.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [gibberish](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 16:39:40 GMT

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

Crimson

Um, that's the most ridiculous, intellectually devoid idea I've ever heard in my life. I don't normally resort to personal insults in this, but shit... this is just, so retarded.

Ok, so Crimson makes more than 5 Million a year

But seriously, introducing salary caps or extreme tax rates at the high end simply drives high net worth individuals overseas. This results in less investment in the economy, which results in job losses.

The critical flaw in your argument is that you assume that if companies have more available money that they will pay there employees more (or hire more employees), reality is that companies (theoretically) try to run as lean as possible to minimize costs and maximize profits.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 20:36:27 GMT

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

Whatever, salary caps might work, might not, but so much American money is going to so few individuals.

gibberish: If companies try to run lean, if an executive suddenly starts making 55 million less, then what is the company going to do with that new money?

Although the simple fact is that salary caps will probably never be implemented because rich people have so much control over the government. So it's all irrelevant.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 21:31:05 GMT

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

They'll have to use that money to find another CEO willing to work for that chump change.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 22:10:58 GMT

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

Again, it's irrelevant, but 5 million dollars a year isn't chump change.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2004 22:22:27 GMT

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

Maybe not to you.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [gibberish](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 00:39:10 GMT

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

I don't know what a company would do with \$55 million dollars, but I am pretty sure that they wouldn't suddenly decide to give it all away to there employees.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Battousai](#) on Fri, 09 Apr 2004 16:06:22 GMT

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

just buy microsoft and intel and hold onto them for like 5 years.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2004 04:42:40 GMT

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

You can't buy MS and Intel with 55 million!

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2004 04:49:42 GMT

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

stock. buy stock.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [cokemaster](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2004 04:57:25 GMT

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

IRON-FARTYou can't buy MS and Intel with 55 million!
Sure you can, depends how much weed you are smoking before you 'buy' them

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [frijud](#) on Mon, 12 Apr 2004 19:21:58 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngiWhatever, salary caps might work, might not, but so much American money is going to so few individuals.

May our nation (the USA) never have salary caps on private companies. A private company should be able to do whatever the heck they want with thier money, not be told by the government what to do with it.

And I don't believe that there is American money. You have yours...I have mine...but there is not

"American" money that just go to a few individuals.

IMO...thoes who have money have it because they worked for it (or were born into it). There are exceptions, but as a general rule, I will not worry about others getting more money than me. I will worry about someone taking my "American" money and giving it to people sitting on there butts and not work as hard as I do.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Tue, 13 Apr 2004 05:38:46 GMT

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

SuperFlyingEngil wouldn't go investing big right now - the economy is displaying some very weird properties.

For one, the economy is going up without any jobs, and not many people have any idea what is happening.

About 400,000 jobs were added last month. So what's this jobless growth you speak of?

SuperFlyingEngiWhere are the jobs going? Why, CEOs paying themselves 60 million a year. Name a CEO that makes \$60 million. Then name the company he works for. Then tell how much net profit that company took in during the years since he was CEO. Then look at how much net profit that company took in during the years before he became CEO.

CEOs are CEOs for a reason: they're damn good at running their companies. They know how to make billions of dollars in profit for their companies. That's why they have the most important job at their company.

SuperFlyingEngiAlthough this is a somewhat radical idea that would never get past the government because of so much rich people influence, a salary cap law would create a lot more jobs in America. Say you can only earn 5 million dollars a year combined. Suddenly, so many more companies have 50 million dollars coming back in. Might as well do something with it. Why don't we just take away rich people's mansions and just give them over to homeless people, since, after all, everyone should have the same amount of stuff, right? :rolleyes:

SuperFlyingEngiAnd Hydra: you fail to remember how great an economic genius Clinton was. He created 23 million jobs, and created the biggest surpluses in history. And Bush comes, and turns the biggest surpluses into the biggest deficits.

He created large budget surpluses because the tax burden placed on higher income earners was increased so heavily during his administration. Economic genius? Don't make me puke. Clinton does not create jobs; the economy creates jobs. Tell me what Bill Clinton did to the economy that created 23 million jobs and how it was Clinton's "economic genius" and not Alan Greenspan's that led to the economic boom of the 1990s. Then you can tell me why the economy went into a recession 5 months after George W. Bush took office, which, by the way, is too little time for any Bush economic policy to have taken effect that could have possibly affected that recession. Also explain to me why the stock market started falling during the last months of Clinton's administration. Did his "economic genius" lead to that too?

SuperFlyingEngiAlthough the simple fact is that salary caps will probably never be implemented because rich people have so much control over the government.
No, salary caps will never be implemented because it infringes on people's economic freedom. We use a capitalist system to make money; what you propose is communism.

Besides, who are you to say how much someone should be making? What gives you the right to set a maximum income someone can earn?

frijudIMO...thoes who have money have it because they worked for it (or were born into it). Though I agreed with the rest of your post, this part created some conflict. For the life of me, I cannot think of a rich person who had his money just given to him, though I am not suggesting this does not happen. But I can tell you that the vast majority of rich people are rich because they worked their asses off to earn that money. (this part is directed to SuperFlyingEngi) Why shouldn't a CEO get paid millions of dollars a year? Do you know of anyone else that can run that company better than that man? If the decisions he makes results in the gain of billions of dollars for the company, why shouldn't he get paid millions of dollars? Is he not worth it to the company?

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [frijud](#) on Tue, 13 Apr 2004 19:18:31 GMT

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

hydra1945

frijudIMO...thoes who have money have it because they worked for it (or were born into it). Though I agreed with the rest of your post, this part created some conflict. For the life of me, I cannot think of a rich person who had his money just given to him, though I am not suggesting this does not happen. But I can tell you that the vast majority of rich people are rich because they worked their asses off to earn that money.

I agree with you here. In general (excluding exceptions) people with lots of money sacrifice a lot to succeed. They work hard and are rewarded for thier work. I was just pointing out the exception of people who are rich because of their parents. This is the exception...not the rule.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Tue, 13 Apr 2004 21:52:49 GMT

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

hydra1945About 400,000 jobs were added last month. So what's this jobless growth you speak of?

Whee! Bush matched Clinton's average job growth over 8 years for one month! Victory over the economy!

hydra1945Name a CEO that makes \$60 million. Then name the company he works for. Then tell how much net profit that company took in during the years since he was CEO. Then look at how

much net profit that company took in during the years before he became CEO.

CEOs are CEOs for a reason: they're damn good at running their companies. They know how to make billions of dollars in profit for their companies. That's why they have the most important job at their company.

I don't want to go looking up that many questions about an irrelevant topic that was only met with hostility here instead of adult conversations.

hydra1945Why don't we just take away rich people's mansions and just give them over to homeless people, since, after all, everyone should have the same amount of stuff, right?

I don't mean to be overly critical, but setting a 5 million dollar income cap is not the same thing as taking everything they own and giving it to poor people. Your last 9 words are so hopelessly exaggerated that I'm not even going to touch on them.

hydra194Also explain to me why the stock market started falling during the last months of Clinton's administration. Did his "economic genius" lead to that too?

The market didn't start falling at the end of Clinton's terms, it wasn't going straight up. If you're still referencing that NASDAQ chart, then look at it again. When the market was going up during Clinton's terms, it wasn't going straight up. It went up and down, with the trend of going up.

hydra1945No, salary caps will never be implemented because it infringes on people's economic freedom. We use a capitalist system to make money; what you propose is communism.

I guess it might go against the constitution saying everyone has the right to pursuit of happiness. I did not propose communism, I proposed preventing CEOs from being able to loot companies of stockholder money. You want to know why there are no European investment dollars in the economy right now?

hydra1945Why shouldn't a CEO get paid millions of dollars a year?

Once they get paid hundreds of millions of dollars a year, they start to be stealing from investors. If they privately own the company, then I say take as much as they want. But stealing hundreds of millions from stockholders isn't exactly nice.

frijudAnd I don't believe that there is American money. You have yours...I have mine...but there is not "American" money that just go to a few individuals.

Perhaps I misspoke, but the paychecks of big CEOs largely come from American investors, because those are the people who put their money in to the economy, and they just happen to be American.

P.S. Richard Clarke's book is cool.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 13 Apr 2004 23:39:01 GMT

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

If the companies didn't manage their money to the profit of shareholders, there wouldn't BE any shareholders. Do you have any idea how heavily regulated the stock market is? Do you have any idea how much hardcore investors pore over the numerics?

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Tue, 13 Apr 2004 23:51:29 GMT

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

This chart CLEARLY shows that Clinton was in office when the dot-com bubble burst. It did a free-fall over 2000 points (nearly half its value) BEFORE BUSH EVER GOT INTO OFFICE.

WHY DO YOU BLAME HIM FOR THIS WHEN HE WASN'T EVEN THERE YET?

You can't sit here and state these bold-faced lies without backing it up. I am backing up my words. You can go to bigcharts.com right now and pull the same exact chart.

FURTHERMORE, the rise in the market during the Clinton era was not "straight up". It was a curve that gained momentum during the dot-com boom, which died shortly thereafter in the blatant free-fall during 2000.

BACK UP YOUR STATEMENTS WITH FACTS.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [Crimson](#) on Wed, 14 Apr 2004 00:06:26 GMT

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

Reaganomics at work...

Regan comes into office with the NASDAQ at 150. He leaves office with it at 375 (more than double) for Bush Sr, who takes it up to 675 (almost doubled again, and 4.5 times what it was when Reagan took office).

Just as I say that Bush didn't cause the market continuing to fall for the next year after he took office, Clinton isn't the cause of the rise when he took office. It was on an upswing. Reagan's

economic policies didn't immediately cease to be in effect when he left office. The tax law changes he had made continued to fuel the economy long after the Republicans lost the Presidency.

I also believe that if the Clinton administration hadn't gone after Bill Gates, the bubble might never have burst (at least not as badly as it did). The NASDAQ is made up heavily of technology-related stocks, and the impact of the Microsoft trials had reach far beyond Redmond, Washington. As they fell, other companies went with them. And of course it didn't help that their values were largely inflated for the prospect of future growth.

Subject: Stocks

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Wed, 14 Apr 2004 01:02:48 GMT

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

What does NASDAQ 150 mean?
