

---

Subject: Found it

Posted by [Leland Crooks](#) on Thu, 11 May 2006 11:15:32 GMT

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

---

Here's one of the debt charts I was talking about. There's another that goes back to FDR that I can't find again. Pretty enlightening.

---

---

Subject: It's a misleading chart.

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Thu, 11 May 2006 13:25:48 GMT

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

---

First off it shows the deficit going up under Carter but arrows show it going down. Plus it's blown out of proportion by it's scale. Look at the chart above. It's much more in prospective and shows the debt going on an upswing starting around Nixon to present (Not too convinced this chart is accurate either). Only slight bumps here and there. As I said before, and I believe you agreed with, this is mostly do to the economy and has nothing to do with the President. That said I agree with you that both parties are spending too much. But Reagan had to rebuild the military (money well spent in my opinion) and GW Bush has had a war, a terrorist attack (911 - no small bash to the economy)and what 3 or 4 hurricanes disasters?. Yes these have all made a difference. These were not small expenditures. The debt raised under Clinton's first term and only came down during his last term. Maybe the same will happen for Bush. I believe it will as the economy picks up again. We'll see. Also one must consider where the money is being spent and conditions at the time. Again, I'm not making excuses. Spending has to be cut. I have no hope in that happening. Do you? So to answer your original question. Which would I prefer Tax and Spend liberals or Borrow and spend Republicans. They both are the same. Both end up causing a crisis eventually.

---

---

Subject: Re: Public debt includes your mortgage/ the deficit is the federal govt debt.

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Thu, 11 May 2006 13:50:34 GMT

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

---

The numbers are in the post below; the figures during Clinton's Presidency. The deficit was the lowest since FDR. People can ignore the facts and choose not to see but the federal deficit is listed in that article and thats what it was. These charts include public debt; that means your mortgage and credit cards. The deficit is the govt debt.

---

---

Subject: No hope

Posted by [Leland Crooks](#) on Thu, 11 May 2006 14:34:19 GMT

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

---

And yes it is a misleading chart, I think purposely so. I found the one you show also, and posted the other, just to be contrarian. But useful data can be found in each. If you look at the slope of the chart in yours, the massive changes in slope all come under republican presidents. Been too long since I had statistics to talk about the real interpolative points (rho, sdeviations and such). Even LBJ's great society reforms don't show the kind of swings we see in other terms. But ultimately, it appears we agree, even if we disagree on the path to correction. "I believe it will as the economy picks up again" Until the coporate monopolistic control of our economy is cracked, nothing will change. Even if the economy upticks significantly, the effects won't be felt at the avg middle class level. Wall street has to look beyond next quarter, immediate shareholder profits, and stock prices. The freewheeling days of the 90's set a tone where the manipulation of money became more important than the production of product and services. No capital investment or messy workers, just shuffle numbers in a database. You don't even need paper. And the only vehicle to make that happen is government. Not going to happen. I sincerely hope that 20yrs from now we'll look back and say GW was a visionary. But I'm afraid he'll be relegated to the bin along with Jimmy Carter.

---

Subject: Yes, I believe we do agree...

Posted by [Mr Vinyl](#) on Thu, 11 May 2006 14:45:39 GMT

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

---

Mostly anyway. I don't know about the "Corporate monopolistic control of our economy" but we can leave that for another day. You said:"I sincerely hope that 20yrs from now we'll look back and say GW was a visionary. But I'm afraid he'll be relegated to the bin along with Jimmy Carter." This defines you and me on the same side in this issue. I agree completely with this comment. Time will tell. Thanks for the calm, clear and friendly debate.

---