



CNN.com

POWERED BY
Google

SEARCH

-
- [Home](#)
- [World](#)
- [U.S.](#)
- [Politics](#)
- [Entertainment](#)
- [Health](#)
- [Tech](#)
- [Travel](#)
- [Living](#)
- [Business](#)
- [Sports](#)
- [Time.com](#)

- [Video](#)
- [I-Report](#)
- [Impact](#)

[Hot Topics](#) » ['Teddy Bear' Teacher](#) • [Sean Taylor](#) • [Writers' Strike](#) • [CNN/YouTube Debate](#) • [More Topics](#)

[Weather Forecast](#) [International Edition](#)



November 28, 2007

[Commentary: Clinton camp has problems doing their math](#)



Is Obama as unexperienced as the Clinton campaign claims?

from Illinois was elected president, he would have less experience than any president in the 20th century.

Here is what Deputy Communications Director Phil Singer wrote Tuesday after an Obama foreign policy speech:

WASHINGTON (CNN) — I just finished watching the Monday night piece on Sen. [Barack Obama](#) that aired on ABC's Nightline. During the broadcast, anchor Terry Moran read a comment from the Clinton campaign that said if the junior senator

About the CNN Political Ticker

The [CNN Political Ticker](#) is the hottest destination for the latest political news with dispatches, behind-the-scenes reports, and expert commentary, 24-7.

To sign up for our twice daily Ticker emails, visit the CNN.com [member services page](#). If you do not have a CNN.com account, you can register [here](#).

If you have any feedback, suggestions or

"With the critical foreign policy challenges America faces in the world today, voters will decide whether Senator Obama, who served in the Illinois State Senate just three years ago and would have less experience than any President since World War II, has the strength and experience to be the next president. Sen. Clinton, who has traveled to 82 countries as a representative of the United States and serves on the Armed Services Committee, is ready to lead starting on Day One."

Really?

George W. Bush only held elected office for six years before becoming president. He was elected governor of Texas in 1994 and won the presidency – OK, liberal bloggers, the Supreme Court ruled in his favor – in 2000.

Obama is in his 11th year as an elected officeholder – eight years in the Illinois state senate, followed by three as a U.S. senator. Clinton is in her seventh year of elected office.

So the question has to be asked: Is the Clinton campaign struggling with their math, or hoping we all can't add?

If the Clinton camp is saying state experience doesn't matter, does that apply to Bush, who never served at the federal level prior to coming to the White House; President Jimmy Carter, who was governor of Georgia before residing at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue; and even her husband, Bill Clinton, who was governor and attorney general of Arkansas before being elected in 1992?

I sent Singer an email asking for a clarification.

suggestions or news tips, drop us a line [here](#).

CNN State Political Tickers

- [IA Political Ticker](#)
- [NH Political Ticker](#)
- [SC Political Ticker](#)

NEW IN THE TICKER

- [Clinton booed at Iowa forum](#)
- [Clinton's zinger – at Richardson's expense](#)
- [Biden late to Brown and Black forum, weather to blame](#)
- [Techical Difficulties at HDNet Brown and Black Forum](#)
- [Kucinich uncomfortable with Iowa's priority status](#)
- [Fred Thompson talks to CNN's Larry King](#)
- [Giuliani advocates military build-up to counter Putin](#)
- [Democrats vote](#)

I'll let you know if he gets back to me.

– **CNN Contributor Roland Martin**

Filed under [Barack Obama](#), [Hillary Clinton](#)
 Posted 11/28/2007 11:18:21 AM | [Permalink](#)
[211 Comments](#) | [Add a comment](#)

Roland, haven't you learned by now?

The Clintons will say anything, they're not that concerned about the truth or honesty.

Posted By anon New York, NY : November 28, 2007 9:27 am

I thank you cnn for that, and just when I wrote you guys off for the clinton news network

Posted By hubert, Ft. lauderdale Fl : November 28, 2007 9:32 am

This crazy woman will stop at nothing to get the job. Who would elect a candidate that can't even add, much less lead the most powerful nation on Earth! Good luck lady....NOT.

Obama 08!

Posted By John Karsten, Virginia Beach, VA : November 28, 2007 9:36 am

• [Democrats vote to strip Michigan of its delegates](#)

- [Working feverishly, Clinton tried to project image of calm](#)
- [Winter weather keeps candidates off the stump](#)

ARCHIVE

- [December 2007](#)
- [November 2007](#)
- [October 2007](#)
- [September 2007](#)
- [August 2007](#)
- [July 2007](#)
- [June 2007](#)
- [More Archives](#)

RELATED

- [CNN Politics Main Page](#)
- [CNN Election Center 2008](#)
- [CNN Exchange](#)
- [The Situation Room Blog](#)
- [All CNN.com Blogs](#)
- [TIME.com: Swampland](#)

SUBSCRIBE



Thank you for calling the Clinton campaign on this one – I'm so tired of their lies about Mr Obama's level of experience. Especially considering that Mrs Clinton's experience basically boils down to sleeping her way to the top (First Lady this, First Lady that – nothing earned, nothing worked for).

Why is it that the only way they can make her look good is to try to make everyone else look bad?

Posted By Diane, NYC, NY : November 28, 2007 9:37 am

Fuzzy math always seems to rule candidates who are running for any office.

What disturbs me is that all the candidates for both parties seem more interested in attacking one another than in promoting new and fresh approaches to solving some of the real issues Americans face today.

Like it or not, it really is about the economy and affordable healthcare first and foremost in the vast majority of us in the middle. Campaign slogans and posturing are failing to impress most of the electorate. How many times have we seen people wanting to vote for "None of the above" lately?

Were are the Harry Trumans of our generation?

Posted By Jim, Burlington NC : November 28,

2007 9:38 am

Thank you Roland, it seems that you are the only one writing about obvious facts. It's amazing that none of that information has really been discussed in the media in reference to Obama's supposed lack of experience.

Posted By Aaron, Etown, KY : November 28, 2007 9:39 am

First we get fuzzy answers from the Clintons now we get fuzzy math. Whats next. Bill forgetting that he was for the war back in 2003. Oh Yeah we just got that too.

Posted By Patrick, Atlanta GA : November 28, 2007 9:39 am

Wow Mr. Martin, what a great piece! It's good to see someone actually question the Clinton camp's grandiose statements.

Posted By Ryan, Boston MA : November 28, 2007 9:40 am

If you've ever seen a Rocky movie, you know the Clinton machine is extremely vulnerable. NObama will beat her in Iowa, but won't make it to the White House, but the Republicans will.

Posted By lou tulsa : November 28, 2007 9:40

am

I am not a fan of either Hillary or Obama, but do believe that currently they are the two most electable of the Democratic field. However, they are in the process of beating each other to death through personal attacks instead of focusing on their strengths. I believe that this will leave them vulnerable to Republican attacks when the primaries are over. Why should the GOP candidate waste time creating their own attacks when they can just recycle what fellow Democrats are saying? That is what makes choosing a candidate so hard this year, very little good ideas are coming out of the various camps, just attacks. As far as experience, neither one of them has much federal experience, and is that such a bad thing? The experienced politicians of both parties have made a mess of everything, maybe we should have some new blood.

Posted By Trevor, Austin, TX : November 28, 2007 9:40 am

Further proof that the Clinton's will say anything to get her elected. The New York Times reported that Bill came out yesterday and said he opposed the Iraq War before it even started. Funny, I don't remember him saying anything at the time.

Posted By Dave, Evergreen CO : November 28, 2007 9:41 am

Typical.

Posted By Scott, Bethlehem, PA : November 28, 2007 9:43 am

You know, normally I decline to comment on bloviating, but I'd appreciate it if this article would sound a little less self-satisfied for having 'caught' a campaign spokesperson exaggerating and making hay out of very little. Wow, your insight astounds me! If this is where we set the bar, then you have such material to work with as to write a story about every candidate for every day until Iowa, and then until election day 2008.

Posted By Matthew, Houston, Texas : November 28, 2007 9:44 am

I'm sorry, but you can't really compare battling for pork on the local level as a state legislature to serving as governor. A state legislator does not have to manage anything, and doesn't have to deal with foreign policy in the way a US senator or even a govern does.

Posted By Will, Cambridge, MA : November 28, 2007 9:44 am

Cnn,,,you people are really unbelievable....you can not even state the TRUTH , that BUSH won the 2000 election...YOU people are PATHETIC, I am sure you wont show this comment cause the truth hurts but your organization is so

worried about pleasing the left-wing nuts that you are willing to not put out the truth.
SHAMEFUL

Posted By Ryan Indianapolis : November 28, 2007 9:44 am

Thank-you Mr. Martin...it's refreshing to know someone in the media is above simply regurgitating whatever "fact" the Clinton campaign is pushing.
It was irresponsible of Nightline to read that statement, without first doing some quick fact checking.

Posted By Mary K. Clinton, Iowa : November 28, 2007 9:52 am

Ouch! I remember something about fuzzy math!

Posted By Steve in SC : November 28, 2007 9:52 am

Who cares about the math. The point is Obama stinks and we all know it. Per his wife.

Posted By Anonymous – San Antonio – Texas : November 28, 2007 9:52 am

Are you seriously trying to support the Foreign Policy preparedness of George Bush? What the

Clinton campaign is saying is that as First Lady for 8 years, Hillary Clinton had the opportunity to represent the country on major issues in countries around the world. She has further employed her skills as a Foreign Policy maker in the Senate. No, as a state senator, you have very little opportunity to get National Foreign Policy experience. So whether your name is George W., Jimmy Carter (who has since become a credible foreign policy diplomat), Bill Clinton (who did pretty well despite his lack of initial experience) or Obama, if all you've got is state experience and a couple of years in the Senate, Hillary has more experience, hands down. It shouldn't be that difficult for you to understand, you're a smart guy, right?

Posted By Cleave, Orlando, FL : November 28, 2007 9:54 am

Hillary + Striesand – Oprah still equals Zero.

Posted By Walt, Belton, TX : November 28, 2007 9:55 am

Love those analogies. Bush is the worst president who has lived in my lifetime (goes back to Truman.) Illinois politics is as corrupt as Texas politics. The place for math is with the budget.

Posted By John, Michigan : November 28, 2007 9:56 am

Roland,

Are the Clinton mathematicians hitting the doobies now? (Pass me a HoHo....or can I say that? Fine, a DingDong.)

I don't think I'd postpone Christmas shopping waiting on THAT email response!

Posted By Claudette, TX : November 28, 2007 9:57 am

Thank you Roland Martin, for being a journalist with the integrity and courage to stand up to the ridiculous misinformation being shoveled by the Clinton machine on Obama's experience.

It's one thing for them to try and act like she has some experience from being First Lady (for which they cannot offer any backup evidence, since they refuse to unlock millions of pages of documents related to that "experience"). It's an entirely different thing for them to slander and personally attack Obama as – inexperienced–. And make no mistake, CLINTON threw the FIRST STONE way back when she called him "naive and inexperienced" many months ago when Obama was still trying to play nice.

Posted By Ron, TX : November 28, 2007 10:00 am

Hmmm I guess math IS useful in the real world...

Posted By bukky, baltimore MD : November 28, 2007 10:01 am

The clinton campaign will say and do anything to ensure they get elected, such is the norm with politics these days.. too bad CNN will probably delete or bury Roland Martin's commentary once they are done with their morning coffee.

Posted By Andrew, Niagara Falls, NY : November 28, 2007 10:05 am

Is this news? Does this post appropriately belong on the "CNN Political Ticker?" Since CNN Contributor Roland Martin appears to be nothing but a shill for a struggling Obama camp, wouldn't it best to just leave this shinola off the site?

Posted By D. Erbach, Little Rock : November 28, 2007 10:05 am

Hate to burst anyone's bubble, but Dwight Eisenhower had ZERO years' experience in public office before HE was elected president twice.

Posted By Wayne, Greenville TX : November 28, 2007 10:06 am

As much as I dislike Bush, you can't compare

the experience of a governor to that of a state legislator. Obama's experience IS limited.

Posted By Bea, Hoboken, NJ : November 28, 2007 10:08 am

Good job Roland for this outstanding journalistic work. It was just about time someone at CNN steps up and stops acting as the Clinton's campaign mouthpiece.

Posted By Tex Mex, NYC, NY : November 28, 2007 10:08 am

George W. Bush only held elected office for six years before becoming president. He was elected governor of Texas in 1994 and won the presidency – OK, liberal bloggers, the Supreme Court ruled in his favor – in 2000.

First off, Obama is right and Hillary is now in attack mode (thought "Miss America" didn't resort to this?).

The Supreme court did not award him the presidency as you infer, it stopped the stupidity of counting and re-counting votes for Gore that were NOT THERE, liberal newspapers PAID to have the votes recounted by an independent authority and BUSH WON FLORIDA.

This was in spite of Gore (again going to court) to throw out absentee ballots of our BRAVE men and woman who were overseas, must

have missed that in the news.....

How about posting on the ticker Bill Clinton saying yesterday that he opposed the war in Iraq, but in numerous magazine interviews is on RECORD as being for it and PRAISING BUSH FOR HIS ACTIONS.

Nope, we need to know what the candidates favorite TV show is.....

Posted By Tom – Dedham, Mass : November 28, 2007 10:09 am

The CNN Ronald Martin is an Obama supporter, both black from Chicago. You can see his unfair comments towards Hillary in his past TV & commentaries.

The bottom line is that, in the recent Iowa state and national polls, the Dems voters (those who count) consider Hillary has the most relevant experiences and possesses the best leadership qualities of all Dems candidates, including Obama.

If Obama has experience, he is a poor learner or has bad memory because his policies do not show them.

Posted By anon, Ottawa, OH : November 28, 2007 10:10 am

I think that the Clinton campaign is as good at math as they are at definitions "piling on"

"swift boating" "IS" etc. I have been to Cancun several times I guess that makes me an expert in foreign relations with Mexico? of course I wasn't a representative of the U.S. whatever that means, I think it means approved travel at the tax payers expense.

Posted By John Halverson DC : November 28, 2007 10:11 am

The Clinton camp is struggling with math, memory, and misrepresentation!

The Clinton's are running to save **their legacy**. Obama is running to save **America's legacy!**

Posted By LinnieFB, Corona, CA : November 28, 2007 10:11 am

Latest poll by Rasmussen: Hillary leads over Obama by 24 points.

Posted By Jennifer, Des Moines, IA : November 28, 2007 10:15 am

Are you a volunteer or paid Obama staff member? Thus continues the breast feeding of Obama by the media

Posted By Caren : November 28, 2007 10:15 am

Obama CLEARLY has the experience and good Judgment to be President. The question is. Can a candidate claim to have Presidential experience simply from sleeping with a President? If that is the case, then can Jennifer Flowers and Monica Lewinsky also run for president on that basis? (I am being serious not judgmental)

Michelle Obama married to Barack Obama 8 years as Barack was in the State Senate Illinois. Now does that mean Michelle can run for a Senate seat while claiming she has 8 year Senator experience because she slept with Barack during his 8 years?

Posted By Dave, Cheverly MD : November 28, 2007 10:17 am

And Herbert Hoover was appointed to cabinet positions in the Harding and Coolidge administrations, but was never elected to anything other than the presidency in 1928.

Posted By Wayne, Greenville TX : November 28, 2007 10:17 am

Finally, someone steps up with valid points to destroy that ridiculous argument about Obama having no experience. Just because you hadn't heard of him until a couple years ago doesn't mean he wasn't around, Hillary. Not to mention, I personally don't count being "First Wife" as any real political experience.

Posted By Tim, Chicago IL : November 28, 2007 10:23 am

I think you're really missing the point Roland. It's not that an unexperienced official CAN'T run for office—it's that we have so many pressing issues that it would probably be wiser from an economic and diplomatic perspective if we could hit the ground running.

You're telling me 8 years of being first lady and travelling around the globe shaking the hands of foreign diplomats somehow pales in comparison to an Illinois state senator? Please.

Posted By Tyler, Denver CO : November 28, 2007 10:27 am

Who was it that said the Clinton campaign "lies with such ease' its frightening

Now Bill opposed the war in Iraq

Posted By joe : November 28, 2007 10:28 am

IF Texas is not part of USA, Bush Jr. is President of Texas. The highest elected office in every state of the US is governorship; therefor, Bush Jr. has MORE experience running the second largest state of the Union than Obama who was state senator for a number of years.

Why would anyone cast their vote on someone wet behind the ears? I know, I won't. Obama will not get my vote, I'm weighing between Hillary and Joe Biden right now for the primary.

Whoever is the nominee for the democratic party, I'll vote for that person EXCEPT if its Obama. I don't want a feel good stuff President, I want a President to tell me things as is, no more no less

Posted By Les, Bellingham, WA : November 28, 2007 10:30 am

Yeah, she'll do anything. she's seeing her numbers slip and is now in panic mode.

Posted By Gary, Denver, CO : November 28, 2007 10:33 am

I'm no Bush fan and nothing against Obama, but I believe most people would agree that being a state senator is quite different from being the governor of a state. Suffice it to say many people (throughout the country) don't even know who their state senators are so in many ways this is akin to comparing apples to oranges...

Posted By Cindy, Fairborn, OH : November 28, 2007 10:34 am

Pick, picky, where's the concern when candidates throw out numbers about the things that really matter, like the economy, jobs created without mentioning jobs lost, social security, health care, etc.? Bush totes the

jobs created since 2003 but not the jobs lowst in 2001 and 2002.Those numbers you and your fellow media people don't question. Yes, Obama is inexperiance on the national scene, just as Carter and Bush were. Just look at the shape the country was in when Carter left office and will be in when Bush leaves office. Yes, Mr. Roland Martin the type of experiance does matter.

Posted By Ivan, Chicago, Illinois : November 28, 2007 10:34 am

One thing they can do the math right on is ,how many bedrooms in the White House they can rent out to lobbyist's

Posted By Nando, Palm Coast,FL : November 28, 2007 10:36 am

The problem for Hillary and Obama is that Americans prefer Governors as President, not Senators. Our illustrious do nothing partisan 110th liberal Congress, of which both are memebers, is an fine example of why..

Posted By spinstopper : November 28, 2007 10:37 am

To all democrats out there, we need to put our differences aside and be a little more realistic.

Look, I am African American and I like Obama. However, I realistically know that if Obama wins the democratic nomination, he has no chance of winning the general election. Obama is African American, and there is no way he could win a single state in the south. A vote for Obama is a wasted voted and a sure win for the republicans in 08.

Posted By Ike Woodbridge , VA. : November 28, 2007 10:37 am

This is just the Republican spin machine up to their old games. Er, correction: the Democratic spin machine.

Obama 08 – a new face for politics!

Posted By Curtis, Bloomington, IN : November 28, 2007 10:37 am

One more.

Woodrow Wilson was governor of New Jersey for only two years before being elected president in 1912.

Posted By Wayne, Greenville TX : November 28, 2007 10:40 am

The problem with the Clinton's isn't math...
THEY DON'T KNOW HOW TO TELL THE TRUTH.

All they do is lie their way through everything.

Hillary is totally untrustworthy. Why would anybody in THEIR RIGHT MIND consider her Presidential material?

Posted By Lee, Ann Arbor, Michigan :
November 28, 2007 10:42 am

Finally someone in the media is bringing out the obvious! That in the very least there is not a significant difference between Obama and Clinton's experience. The key though is Obama has less baggage and is more trustworthy. I feel like the media hears Clinton say something and all of a sudden it's fact!

Posted By Ron, New Jersey : November 28,
2007 10:43 am

Thank you, Roland "Call-It-As-It-Is" Martin. I agree with the previous poster. The Clintons will go down as the biggest panderers and liars in American political history.

If Biden, Richardson and Dodd had some spine, Hillary Clinton would not be talking about experience.

Posted By Grace, Washington, Iowa : November 28, 2007 10:43 am

George W. Bush will also go down in history as the worst president to ever hold the office.

Posted By C. K. Justus WI : November 28, 2007

10:44 am

Kudos!, Roland "Call-It-As-It-Is" Martin. I gree with the previous poster. The Clintons will go down as the biggest panderers and liars in American political history.

If only Biden, Richardson and Dodd had some spine. Hillary Clinton would not be talking about experience. What a farce!

Posted By Grace, Washington, Iowa : November 28, 2007 10:45 am

Obama and Clinton both seem determined to "win" by discrediting the other instead of running on their own merit and track record of success. Oh right- neither has success in anything other than raising taxes.

Posted By xtina chicago IL : November 28, 2007 10:47 am

If my math is correct, Hillary Clinton hasn't even had a job for eight of the last fifteen years.

Posted By Shawn, Boston, MA : November 28, 2007 10:47 am

Mr. Martin,

I enjoy reading your editorials; they are cogent and thought-provoking. I wonder whether you believe the reparte that's occurring between Ms. Clinton and Mr. Obama will hurt Obama's campaign the way similar bickering hurt Howard Dean's campaign in 2004.

Posted By John New Haven, CT : November 28, 2007 10:48 am

Thank you very much for pointing out her fallacious assertion, Roland! Besides the fact that she doesn't REALLY have more experience than Obama, if one looks at her record, one would understand that (despite visiting several countries and leaders and whatever "experience" she had as First Lady) she has not made very good decisions in her time in the Senate...

Posted By Step Montgomery, AL : November 28, 2007 10:48 am

Barack Obama was already a State Senator for FOUR years before Hillary Clinton ever held her first office.

Secondly, Barack Obama became a US Senator through hard work – following 8 years impressive achievements as a State Senator. Hillary Clinton became a US Senator following ZERO achievements – sorry I found one achievement – she married Bill Clinton.

Nancy Pelosi was party chairwoman for

Northern California for 10 years before she was elected to the US House of Representatives, Barbara Boxer was a member of US House of Representatives for 10 years before becoming a US Senator, Diane Feinstein was Mayor of San Francisco for 10 years before becoming a US Senator, Barack Obama was State Senator for 8 years before becoming a US Senator. Hillary Clinton was the wife of Bill Clinton.

I agree. If Biden, Richardson and Dodd had some spine, Hillary Clinton would not be talking about experience.

Posted By Diamond, Bradenton, FL : November 28, 2007 10:48 am

Not to worry Clinton will just claim she went to public school and didn't learn proper math.

Posted By Terry, Lakeland, FL : November 28, 2007 10:51 am

Okay Roland,
You're forgetting about Hillary's 8 years experience in the White House, choosing china patterns and buying new curtains.
Oh yeah, she had to find new "W"'s for all the keyboards.

Posted By Randy S. Lawton, OK : November 28, 2007 10:52 am

Obama sure should compare himself in experience to Bush, since he is the paragon of success (cough, cough)

Posted By Mark C, Virginia Beach VA :
November 28, 2007 10:54 am

I can't wait to hear the HRC team response. Good for you for pointing out this foolishness and asking for a response.

Maybe journalism will return to what it is supposed to be unbiased reporting of the facts and fact gathering, not just opinions.

Posted By Mia, Stafford, VA : November 28, 2007 10:56 am

I think if Sen.Hillary Clinton become a president of united states, it will not only be the same old for me but there will be no change from Bush's administraton!

Posted By jj,dover,DE : November 28, 2007 10:59 am

The real Hillary is "rising to the surface", as many things other than cream will float. For over 15 years the majority of the Press have been willing participants in fomenting Clintonite misinformation. We can thank Tim Russert for finally having the courage to point

out that "the Queen has no clothes", and the momentum has been gaining since.

Posted By Jim in Orlando, FL : November 28, 2007 11:01 am

Tyler, Denver CO

I wonder if you have change for this One Million Dollar bill I'm holding. I hate waiting on long bank lines....

Posted By Karen, NYC : November 28, 2007 11:03 am

Sorry CK...,
Jimmy Carter holds that undisputed title,
followed closely by Bill's preverted sence of
morallity..

Posted By thehistorian : November 28, 2007 11:03 am

Thank you to someone at CNN who is finally not baltently and blindly promoting Clinton!
Much apreciated.

Posted By Anonymous : November 28, 2007 11:05 am

You mention that: “George W. Bush only held elected office for six years before becoming president. He was elected governor of Texas in 1994 and won the presidency”” It means you tell peoples you are another George W. Bush. Don’t you feel you are over confident, how should you compare the Formal president’s son, he has chance by seeing and learning when his father is president, how about you, did your father was the president of USA? You always misleading all American citizens, and claiming that, your foreign experience when you are the age of 6 years old. It is a kind of crazy, if you don’t have brain problem, you are definitely another kind of lie thorough your bone. How should people trust you?

Posted By Christine NJ : November 28, 2007
11:06 am

Great report. Finally some clarity on this big issue.

Posted By Daniel, Anaheim CA : November 28, 2007 11:06 am

Amen!

Clinton = liar, inexperienced, "old news"

Obama = my vote, fresh, experienced, for the people.

OBAMA '08!

Posted By Cory, Pennsylvania : November 28, 2007 11:08 am

The Clinton's have had know problems with fuzzy math and poor judgment while accumulating that vast record of experience.

Posted By therealist : November 28, 2007
11:09 am

George W. Bush will also go down in history as the worst president to ever hold the office.

The title of worst President belongs to Jimmy Carter.

Posted By Dan (Columbia, MD) : November 28, 2007 11:10 am

GREAT!!! Finally some investigative journalism to verify the validity of a claim by a presidential candidate. Too often rival campaigns disagree over an issue that's based on facts and we never know who is telling the truth... Now CNN needs to research and find out who is lying about Giuliani's fiscal record in NYC... Romney says he left a record deficit, Giuliani says he left a surplus... Tell us who is lying!!!

Posted By TJ, Hoboken, NJ : November 28, 2007 11:11 am

GO CNN!!!!

Finally a little hard nose reporting on the misrepresentations and evasions from the Clinton camp.

GO EDWARDS!!!

Posted By Hoosier Values : November 28, 2007
11:17 am

And you're seriously telling me that having traveled and met foreign dignitaries in any way prepares you to be president? No matter who the president is there is going to be a learning curve– Clinton supporters who ignore this are simply naive. She knows where the East Room is so she will be better prepared after inauguration. In your words: please.

Posted By evan, nyc, ny : November 28, 2007
11:18 am

Good for your Roland!!! Go get them! I'm sick of the lies and falsehoods the Clinton campaign are throwing out there. If ever there was evidence of "more of the same" all you have to do is read all the crap that Clinton and her people do from staged questions to false claims to skewed math. Do we really need another liar and fraud in the White House? What "experience" does Clinton have except being able to laugh at questions posed to her, look innocent well, and, most of all, be such a failure on her own abilities she had to call in

Bill to sav her campaign.

Posted By Mike, Fox River Grove, IL : November 28, 2007 11:22 am

Good point Tyler. Traveling by government plane and motorcade to staged photo-op events and staying in five star hotels with a massive Secret Service detail protecting you from anything and everything really gives someone a great perspective of foreign affairs.

Please.

Posted By Dave, Evergreen CO : November 28, 2007 11:22 am

While I find all the bashing between the different candidates humorous, I do have one comment on what Sen. Obama said. While he listed past presidents with out federal level experience, he neglects to mention that they have executive level experience. Sen. Obama has only served on the legislative side of the government, which is very different from the executive side. I would argue that running a state is significantly more related to running the country then representing constituents on Capital Hill. Granted, Sen. Clinton doesn't have the executive experience, but the First Husband would.

Posted By Zach, Washington DC : November 28, 2007 11:23 am

It may be a slight stretch, but Hillary *was* First Lady for eight years, and not as a wallflower either (SEE Laura Bush).

Posted By Steve, Lyons, CO : November 28, 2007 11:25 am

I was going to say that our current, though actually unelected, president had less experience. Judging by his being a complete disaster, I would say experience matters. Obama is lacking. Clinton did more than just traveling about. Saying otherwise is disingenuous. She clearly has more experience.

Posted By Scott from Freehold : November 28, 2007 11:25 am

"Not to mention, I personally don't count being "First Wife" as any real political experience."

Then you're being narrow-minded. I wouldn't, of course, give it the same weight as elected/appointed experience, but she *was* right there and is intelligent enough to learn plenty during that time.

Posted By Steve, Lyons, CO : November 28, 2007 11:27 am

You go Roland! Thank you thank you thank you.

Posted By Scott, Ft. Lauderdale, FL : November 28, 2007 11:29 am

Tyler, Mrs. Clinton always talks about she knows the foreign diplomats on a first name bases from her time as first lady. But they are not in office anymore.

Posted By Patrick, Atlanta GA : November 28, 2007 11:29 am

Good article! This is clearly another incidence of distortion of facts by the Hillary campaign.

The real question is, "Does Obama has enough experiece and the right experiece for the White House?"

My answer is YES. He understand the issues from local (as community organizer), state (as state senator), and federal (as U.S. senator) levels. He understands ordinary people's struggles. His experiece is better than those who have been in the U.S. senate for 30 years or the White House as a wife for 8 years.

We are electing a president who has the judgment, leadership, character, and the right experiece. We are not electing someone who has the longest resume in Washington (If so, Hillary does not win this contest, either). Obama is most qualified.

Sometimes I feel that some politicians as well

as the media (with the exception of this article) have underestimated the collective intelligence of the American people.

Posted By Jen, Gainesville, FL : November 28, 2007 11:29 am

Having been in the White House for 8 years and the Senate for 7 far exceeds any state legislating that Sen. Obama might have done while elected in Illinois. There is no need to cite George Bush's experience before being elected as what qualifies a person to seek the Presidency, we see what kind of trouble his limited experience got us into.

Posted By TJ, Lewisville, AR : November 28, 2007 11:31 am

If the election were held today on only one issue – character – Hillary Clinton would lose by a landslide and Obama would be our next president. Until they step into the Oval Office for the first time no one has any experience.

Posted By Ed Dugan, Ocala, Florida : November 28, 2007 11:32 am

This was an eye-opening revelation. I guess "fuzzy math" is alive and well in the Clinton Campaign. Barack clearly has more experience in a meaningful capacity in public office by far.

I wonder if Bill O'reilly will announce this "revelation" on his show? Lou Dobbs will I'm sure! — Lou Dobbs for president '08!! 😊 (We still can dream right?)

Posted By Bobby – Achille, Oklahoma :
November 28, 2007 11:33 am

Great job, Roland. I can't wait to hear the answer.

Posted By Tammy, Denton : November 28,
2007 11:36 am

Check out the videos from the Obama Foreign Policy Forum yesterday. You'll see, for example, Tony Lake (National Security Advisory to President Clinton) discuss Obama's experiences in comparison to several recent presidents (including Bill Clinton). Obama looks terrific! Obama in '08!

Posted By Laura, Christiansburg, VA :
November 28, 2007 11:37 am

It just occurred to me that Roland Martin is an Obama supporter. I have seen him and his wife (who is a Clinton supporter) speak on Television a few times. Therefore, his comments are bias and I do not feel this article should even be on the Political Ticker. Roland Martin is dishonest by not saying up front on

this article that he is an Obama supporter.

For Obama, being a STATE Senator is nothing and does not show he has FEDERAL experience.

Posted By dmw, roeland park,ks : November 28, 2007 11:39 am

It's hard to read Roland's "objective" comments since he's so obviously skewed toward Barack – his home Senator. Still, whether experience is actually an asset toward Presidential success or not, Hillary wins hands down. The respective years in office for each, is deceptive. The majority of Barack's service has been limited to STATE legislature. Mrs. Clinton has been an exceptional senator for us New Yorkers. However, she's also run successful state and national campaigns for her husband and was intrinsically involved in her husband's administration. I've no doubt Michelle Obama would be an asset, 'should' Barack ever get to The Office – but, she has not and neither has he...and neither will he – at least in 2008.

Posted By Franky, NY NY : November 28, 2007 11:40 am

Thank you so much for writing this. I wish more reporters would talk about things like this!

This isn't the first time her math hasn't added up...

Posted By Dan, Nashville, TN : November 28,

2007 11:40 am

I'm convinced that many Americans are either afraid of the truth and facts or just hate facts. Lol this is nothing new to Obama supporters. And those on this page who hates Obama for whatever reason FACE THE FACTS!

Posted By lavelle Rochester,ny : November 28, 2007 11:41 am

Hahahahahaha! I love this story! Go Obama!

Posted By Erik : November 28, 2007 11:41 am

Ronald Reagan ran for President in 1968 after only 1 year as Governor of California. He was elected President in 1980 with only 8 years as Govenor. Unless you count his time president of the Screen Actors Guild that's less than Barack Obama.

Posted By Mike Gant, Coatesville PA : November 28, 2007 11:42 am

Maybe comparing Obama's length of service to Bush's isn't comvincing evidence that Obama can run the government. Look at how terrible Bush is.

Posted By Brad, Charleston, SC : November 28, 2007 11:44 am

I would like to point out something to most of you. The Governor of Texas does not have that much power or duties. Look it up for yourselves. At this point in his career, Obama has more experience than George W Bush had in 1999.

Posted By Steve, Chicago, IL : November 28, 2007 11:45 am

Mr Martin, let's look frankly at your article. You've hated on the Hillary campaign from day one. I called you a sexiest and compared your piece you wrote on her "woman card" eerily similar to your childhood days (cry baby). There is no problem with the math. Perhaps a sports analogy will help some of your readers. A 10 ft. jumper is not worth the same as a shot behind the arc. That's with good reason—a two point shot by principle is easier than a three pointer. You are trying to compare Obama's years as a state legislator (small fish) to one of two STATE SENATORS. Hillary has not represented less than a few million people for 7 years. She also spent 8 years in the white house as first lady. Don't try and put a junior senator from Illinois on the same experience pedestal as a first lady of Arkansas, first lady of the United States, and a 7 year New York Senator. Really, did you think they were even in the same league?

Posted By Greg Indianapolis, IN : November 28, 2007 11:47 am



Oh come on, you're putting state senator on par with governor? You can't just lump all elected offices together and call them relevant presidential experience, they have to be qualified. For example, Giuliani was only a mayor, but for a city of 10mm people. How can you compare a lowly Illinois state senator's experience to Clinton and Bush's as governors?

So yeah, with her seven years in the Senate, Hillary has more experience than Obama. The debate should be over whether her eight years in the White House count more than his three in the state Senate. My money's on yes.

Posted By atmarquardt : November 28, 2007 11:48 am

You American are about knowing the fact, I follows American Politics than ours here in Canada, But I almost getting tired when I saw those politicians talking about so called Exp'e any one would be a President as long as you follows what is in your heart. Good Luck Guys

Posted By Luke, Camrose AB, Canada : November 28, 2007 11:53 am

They do alot of foreign policy stuff in the Illinois State Senate do they???

Posted By fran, Rochester, NY : November 28, 2007 11:54 am

I'm so sick of people saying that Bush is the worst president in the history of the U.S. Doesn't anyone remember the days of Jimmy Carter? People have such short memories it's sickening.

Posted By Gary, Omaha, NE : November 28, 2007 11:55 am

The real issue is how will Hillary continue to play this if she wins the nomination. Will she then say Giuliani, McCain or Romney have less experience than she does. Will she claim eight years as First Lady trumps the experience of these other three. There is a reason the Republicans are chomping at the bit for Hillary to win the nomination.

Posted By Mike K., Chattanooga, TN : November 28, 2007 11:57 am

Maybe it's time for someone other than a Bush or a Clinton to be in office. There are 20 year old adults that don't remember anyone else but those two names as being a president... It is time for some new blood, not family dynasties!!

Posted By L Jones, Richmond, VA : November 28, 2007 11:58 am

Hillary has less experience than Obama.

Posted By Sternberg, Mauldin, SC : November 28, 2007 11:58 am

President Eisenhower hadn't served in any elected position before eight years in office. Regardless of what side of the aisle you sit on, cannot say that Ike wasn't a successful commander-in-chief.

Posted By Nels, Cincinnati, OH : November 28, 2007 12:00 pm

All this experience argument is all about posturing, spins and no substance. What is federal experience? and What is State experience? Or Legislative experience? Should we include "First lady experience." If all these is confusing, why dont we try clear math like **Good judgement, Honesty and Common sense**" Thats where Obama beats Hillary hands down.

Posted By Daniel O : November 28, 2007 12:02 pm

This is a great article. I never even looked at Hillary's time spent as an elected official. I am always too busy looking at the color of her pants suit for the day. Wow, this is really good information. Thanks

Posted By Derek, Groveland MA : November 28, 2007 12:03 pm

Thanks Roland, I agree. It's also clear that Obama has the skills, integrity, honesty and authenticity to pull our country together and at a time when we're so divided. With all due respect to HRC supporters she seems to be just more of the same old politics. Yes she has learned the tricks of Washington well, and that's the problem.

Posted By monica, rochester new york : November 28, 2007 12:03 pm

Of course this is another piece of typical Clinton misinformation.

Woodrow Wilson was a president of the 20th Century (at least, according to what I've read other than Clintonese History) and the only elected office he held previous to becoming president was a 2 year term as Governor of New Jersey.

Before that, he was in academia and law practice.

Tell me again — why should I believe anything Clinton or her minions say?

Altho I back Bill Richardson, Barack Obama is much more qualified to be president than our former first lady, who has just come from off of her sanctimonious pedestal since her poll

figures have dropped. Now the truth is out:

Bo knows blues.

Hillary knows mud.

Posted By timmy dallas tx : November 28,
2007 12:05 pm

Its clear to me that Hillary expects that voters will just take her word for it and not actually do the math. As long as it makes it on the news, she probably figures its enough to sway some voters. Afterall, in the age of 30 second soundbites, most people won't hear that Hillary can't add. They will only hear her say Obama is the least experienced.

Posted By Kimberli Taylor – Lomita, CA :
November 28, 2007 12:05 pm

Another Clinton in the Whitehouse is the scariest math fact out there. Exactly HOW MANY deaths (ESPECIALLY the "questionable" deaths) happened during the time Bill was in office with Hillary right there beside him?

That is a scarier math fact than how many years experience someone has in office.

Posted By Grim Reaper's Bookkeeper, AR :
November 28, 2007 12:05 pm

roland, I most say you are right and you are wrong. It depends on how you want to

interpret the data. experience at state level doesn't quite match up to congressional experience...they deal with two different scope of issues....so while you are right in that he has been in an elected office for longer he still doesn't win the argument over more experience with your math.
anyways good of you to present facts always good

Posted By wale azeez boca raton florida :
November 28, 2007 12:06 pm

I haven't seen a single site, that allows comments, that even shows Clinton with 5% approval. Wake up people! If all the real folks that read these articles show no support for her, then where is her support?

Posted By James, Forest Grove : November 28, 2007 12:06 pm

There is a big difference between experience in the executive branch of a state government and the legislative branch. In that respect I think Presidents Bush, Carter, and Clinton have more relevant experience. While Obama has more experience if you do the math, he really does not when you do the science.

Posted By Mohit, Chicago IL : November 28, 2007 12:07 pm

Why would anyone want 4 more years of Clintons. Please America for the love of God. No more Clintons. We are finally on the threshold for a better and stronger America. Our dollar is not worth a dime. The rest of the world is leaving us behind in so many ways. Our Healthcare is in shambles both for citizens and veterans.

We have really hard working immigrants here illegally that just want a better life for their families.

And if I can remember. Bin Laden is not nor was he ever in Iraq.

Need I go on with crime, corporate mismanagement and the global warming issues.

Obama is a good man and no one can touch his character. As we can Hillary's.

Edwards, Biden and Richardson heck even Kucinich. but as president

Obama. I would like to see

Obama/Edwards '08 or

Obama/Richardson '08 or... well you all get the point

Posted By localjim, Ft. Lauderdale, FL :
November 28, 2007 12:07 pm

It is true Clinton is ready to lead on day One but, where would she lead? Surely not where she has been afraid to go this last 7 years. We have had 7 years of siding with GWB when it comes time to cast her vote in the senate. We need someone who is not the statue quo. We need someone that can not only take the heat in the kitchen but willing to turn the heat up some more.

Posted By Joe Brookfield IL : November 28, 2007 12:08 pm

Barack Obama is the right person for this job. He brings a perspective and world view that no other candidate even comes close to offering. It is not a matter of Hillary being the wrong candidate (which, by the way, she is), it is a matter of Obama being the right one.

Posted By Tim Sunderland, Rancho Cucamonga, CA : November 28, 2007 12:08 pm



I am not currently an Obama supporter, however, I am not supporting anyone else at this time either. But Obama can probably handle foreign affairs at least as well as the current administration. Of course, there are plenty of big businesses that would challenge me on Bush's "successes".

Posted By Old-Man : November 28, 2007 12:09 pm

I really don't mind Barack. I am just tired of Bush, Clinton, Bush Clinton. I want change in this country. Go Barack we have your back!

Posted By jerry, worcester, ma : November 28, 2007 12:15 pm

With what has been going on with the Clinton (Village) camp lately. I would have to say that they have raised a bunch of idiots. By the way Hillary + Anyone = 0.

Posted By B. Christensen, Charleston S.C. :
November 28, 2007 12:16 pm

Mrs Clinton also counts her husbands time served as hers – sort of community property!

Posted By Nancy, South Windsor CT :
November 28, 2007 12:18 pm

Sen. Obama was a state legislator and now he's a federal legislator. There's very little relevant foreign policy or executive experience in his resume. President Bush was a governor before his selection in 2000. From this sentence, you can tell I'm no fan. However, governors, in theory, run states: so at least he had some executive experience. As an advisor to his father, a president with considerable foreign policy skills, Bush certainly had the opportunity to acquire some skills of his own. Unfortunately, he lacked basic intelligence.

Sen. Clinton is both smart and experienced and thus a better pick than Sen. Obama. Incidentally, I hope that Sen. Clinton's critics will continue to ignore the fact that she was President Clinton's closest and most trusted political and (foreign)policy advisor, or treat it as irrelevant because she was also his wife. The American people are smart enough to see

through that.

And for those of you still clinging to the fact that Sen. Obama was against the Iraq War when there was no price to pay for it as evidence of his "superior judgment," just think a little on the quality of his judgment (not to mention his courage) when he ran away from Kyl–Lieberman. And if you can point to a single relevant difference between him and Sen. Clinton, on, say Iran — other than his determination to meet with figurehead Ahmadinejad — I'd love to read about it.

Posted By dawn — Gaithersburg, MD. :
November 28, 2007 12:19 pm

Well, I do appreciate the criticism Mr. Roland. I like someone that looks past the illusions of politics and honestly searches for facts. My question, however, is do you analyze/criticize all of the candidates, or just the ones you don't like? We don't need more biases. We need some level of objectivity. And, honest to God, the last thing this country needs is another biased media voice.

Posted By Bryan, NY : November 28, 2007
12:19 pm

Hillary Clinton has no experience other than being a Senator. She has never run a company, never supervised or managed a group of people in the real world. She has no experience to lead one to believe she can be

the leader of the free world.

Posted By spokane wa : November 28, 2007
12:19 pm

I don't mind Roland's article, it is part of Clinton News Network campaign to bog down Sen.Obama. What I am having problem with is trust in my goverment and that is all what I care this time around. Hillary has not told me truth any one time or her plans

Posted By charles,s.c : November 28, 2007
12:19 pm

Being a governor, or mayor of a large city, is more applicable experience than being a legislator. Fred T. is one with little experience.

Posted By DRQuam, Byron, MN : November 28, 2007 12:21 pm

Just for the record I believe Bush technically wasn't a President in the 20th century as the 20th century ended December 31, 2000.

Posted By Anonymous : November 28, 2007
12:22 pm

Where does Hillary get off stating that she is ready to lead from day one? She is the one with zero experience. Since when does your

spouse's experience count as your own? Are you qualified to perform your spouse's job, or is your spouse qualified to perform yours?

Posted By Tim, Colorado Springs : November 28, 2007 12:22 pm

"If the junior senator from Illinois was elected president, he would have less experience than any president"

This statement doesn't make any reference to years. What it is saying is that as a state senator, you deal with issues very different than those of a governor or national senator. For example, Obama has opposed the war since the beginning, but didn't he have to cast a vote because they don't deal with large issues like that in state senates.

Also, people should look at his election into the senate. He got extremely lucky, both in the primary and against his republican opponent. When facing an opponent who has to drop out due to sexual allegations and child custody payments, it's not going to be a difficult race. He has not truly been tested in a large scale heated campaign.

Posted By Emily, DC : November 28, 2007 12:22 pm

I agree with Dave, Cheverly MD.

Clinton often boasts about her executive experience as First Lady but won't give up the Clinton White House records detailing these

vast "experiences." Her words don't mean a thing. She's attacking Obama because he is rising fast and making her look like the desperate attacking liar that she is. I think it would be cool to have a woman making history in the White House, but certainly not this nasty woman!

OBAMA 2008!!!!

Posted By Linda, Edmond, OK : November 28, 2007 12:25 pm

Obama has the right experience and the right judgment to be the best president since FDR.

He will have the best policy advice from both (all) sides of an issue. He is not a slave to democrat dogma. He has the experience, wisdom, humanity, and judgment to make the right choice from the options available. I don't trust Clinton – at all – to make the right decision. I have studied Obama enough to see that I can trust him to do what is in the best interest of the country. He earned my vote. My great-great-grandfather came to this country from Italy. I love this country. I am moderate down the line, neither democrat nor republican. So voting for Barack Obama is an easy choice.

Posted By Easy choice : November 28, 2007 12:25 pm

I'm telling you now...if Hilary becomes the

Democratic nominee, then this nation will suffer through another 4 miserable years of Republican administration.

Hilary...with her double talk on the issues of the war and immigration..can't be trusted.

Vote John Edwards...by far the most candid, truthful and "real" candidate out there. CNN..you really need to do a better job on focusing on his campaign. The only reason why Hilary and Obama "appear" to be the front runners is because those are the only two candidates the media is really focusing on.

Posted By Allen, Tulsa, Oklahoma : November 28, 2007 12:25 pm

The Clinton definition of truth goes a little something like this:

'I don't say things because they are true, they are true because I say them.'

Posted By K Feild, NY, NY : November 28, 2007 12:26 pm

Cleave, he wasn't praising Bush for anything... he was using his record in comparison to the candidates' to shed light on Hillary's false claims of having 'more experience'. Wake up, everyone with a brain does not care about her first lady crap...since we did not vote for her to be first lady, her experience in that area is irrelevant.

Posted By JJ Jax, FL : November 28, 2007
12:28 pm

I'm an Obama guy, but I think we need to be fair to Clinton, too. It is customary to disregard state offices lower than governor when talking about a presidential candidate's experience. Clinton didn't invent this standard; it is an unwritten rule.

Posted By JD, Tallahassee, FL : November 28, 2007 12:29 pm

Where's the fuzzy math? Bush was elected in the 21st century. You do know we're living in the 21st century, right?

Posted By Jason, Seattle WA : November 28, 2007 12:30 pm

Thank you for the article. I dislike Hillary's condescending and cavalier attitude so much that this gun-owning republican is hoping for Obama if any democrat should win. How come Hillary was never asked about NYS's handgun laws after she said similar laws were too dangerous for folks in MO???? The career woman didn't care once she was on her stepping stone!

Posted By Rick, Albany NY : November 28, 2007 12:31 pm

I actually don't like Hillary, but I do agree with her on this one. Obama has hardly any experience and it's not that state experience doesn't matter. It's just that state experience other than being Governor doesn't matter. The Governorship allows an individual to exercise Executive decisions whereas state senators are more or less a stepping stone to a higher office. In addition, the responsibilities and roles of a state rep or state senator are so tailored to their particular state that any experience garnered from these positions can't possibly be applied to any other state, let alone the entire country.

Posted By Ronald, NYC, New York : November 28, 2007 12:31 pm

Obama is just as experienced as Bush 43 was. Bush worked for the State of Texas' executive branch for 6 years....Obama worked for the state of illinois' Legislative branch. No one brance is more powerful than the other....

Posted By Mike, Milwaukee, WI : November 28, 2007 12:32 pm

The way the Democrats are running their campaign against each other, any Republican candidate will surely win the Presidential Election. Because whoever wins the Democratic Presidential nomination, the other half of democrats are too sick and angry about the other that they will either ended up not voting for their party or vote for the Republican candidate. The Democrats are too busy hating

each other rather than working together to get back the White House. So, if the Republicans regain the White House, the Democrats have no one else to blame but themselves. Get your act together and let's focus on getting back our country's future and not focus on attacking our own candidates. Let us convince the undecided in this country to vote Democrats. Everyone wants change at this time. The Republicans are sitting idle watching the Democrats kill each other.

Posted By Sophie Stevens, SF : November 28, 2007 12:33 pm

Now, I start to think that Clinton isn't that experienced, because if she was having a 35 years public life experience as she claims, why wouldn't she have stopped her unexperienced husband from from ... in the oval office an intern. Experience counts on both personal and professional life

Posted By Mo le Conquérant, IOWA : November 28, 2007 12:35 pm

Look, if you media types are going to start digging for facts instead of parroting the one-liners and soundbites this could turn into the sort of campaign that's decided on objective data. Then where will we be?

Posted By Tom Hayes, Nortfield, MN : November 28, 2007 12:37 pm

people are nit picking everything the clintons say while giving other candidates the pass.if the others come under the same scrutiny we'd find a lot of their slip-ups as well.the media and general public seems to have really hostile views on people they dont agree with. can you not just disagree and not hate.they are our fellow human beings and this kind of hatred /intolerance to a differing view is what is responsible for our isolation from the rest of the world

Posted By sandy : November 28, 2007 12:37 pm

I think we should wait for their response. My feeling is they will have a good rational that will back up what they say. If there is one thing we can say about Hillary is that she does her homework. In regards to President Clinton being against the war everyone needs to read what he said in it's "entirety" and from all sources. The media often wants to "create" then news instead of report it. They have their own agenda too so be carefule and critical in your analysis. The Clintons are widely popular and respected in this country and around the world, that's a fact and the Clinton haters will just need to get used to it. Hey you can join the Repugs who spent all their energy on pursuing impeachment over a bj? Now that's problem solving at it's finest (snark)!

Posted By Tim – El Cerrito Ca : November 28, 2007 12:38 pm

Yes, just 7 years as a Senator but 8 years in the White House where she may not have been a cabinet member but, she sure wasn't Ladybird Johnson or Jackie Kennedy either. I would stack up one year as the First Lady, say 1993 when she was trying to push the Health Care plan through Congress, against all 11 of Obama's do-nothing-but-talk-a-big-game years in public office.

Honestly, what does this guy have to stand on besides saying he was against the war from the start. Didn't we learn our lesson over the past 7 years about electing unproven entities?

Posted By Paul, Tampa, FL : November 28, 2007 12:39 pm

Yeah Hillary was soooo experienced in foreiegn policy that she VOTED TO AUTHORIZE THE WAR IN IRAQ... THE BIGGEST FOREIGN POLICY DISASTER IN AMERICAN HISTORY. Come on Democrats!!!! We aren't seriously thinking about nominating someone who voted for this fiasco are we? Do we really want to walk around defending HER for the next 4 years? I've had it with the Clinton's BS.

Posted By Brad Burklow, Harrisburg, IL : November 28, 2007 12:42 pm

The math here is that Clintons think they are clever enough. We have so much we haven't unearthed and if we do i a sure is a can of

worms. How about those documents Clintons haven't released. How about so much that hasn't come out of Clintons administration and what Hillary did.
or how about Monica Lewinsky come out and say, ahaaaaaaaaaaaaa here I am Clintons!

Posted By obama supporter,american :
November 28, 2007 12:43 pm

There is a very big difference between being a governor or being a US Senator versus being a state senate member. The idea that the years Obama spent as a state senator should be compared to Clinton's time in the US Senate is totally ridiculous.

Posted By Eric, Staten Island, NY : November 28, 2007 12:44 pm

Experience doesn't just mean years in elected office, HELLO? And a state senate should hardly be counted in the same amount as being a U.S Senator. It's pretty simple CNN.

Posted By rigo, Somerville MA : November 28, 2007 12:49 pm

Tyler, Mrs. Clinton always talks about she knows the foreign diplomats on a first name bases from her time as first lady. But they are not in office anymore.

Posted By Patrick, Atlanta GA : November 28, 2007 11:29 am

Good Point. How is knowing former elected officials going to help her when she has to going in front of new officials and discuss real issues. Not how she got her nails done with the other first wives when she last visited there country.

Posted By Carmon, MN : November 28, 2007 12:49 pm

To Ike, Woodbridge, VA

You wrote, “Obama is African American, and there is no way he could win a single state in the south.”

1. Kerry could not get southern states so he chooses Edwards. That’s the way it works as no Candidate can identify with the entire country.
2. What poll are you basing that on? I have not seen anyone poll white southerners about Obama not being their choice because he is African American.
3. Bush had no Foreign Policy experience so he chose Chaney to get the hard core Republican states.
4. Obama will choose a Vice President running mate that will bring in the Southern Votes just like any other candidate would do.

Lets STOP acting like this is so different just because Obama is Black. He is the best

Qualified to be President at this moment in time.

Posted By Dave, Cheverly, MD : November 28, 2007 12:52 pm

Hilary has no chance at bringing swing voters over to her side. She can only bring in Democrats. If elected how is she going to reconcile with republicans in any way when they absolutely despise her. Barack is our best chance to get something done between the 2 parties.

Posted By Tom, Granite City, Illinois : November 28, 2007 12:52 pm

Whoever says CNN means Clinton News (or Nomination) Network has forgotten Roland Martin (a Obama supporter) being a CNN commentator.

Posted By mary, des moines, ia : November 28, 2007 12:55 pm

I believe the references' weren't being directed towards the man's resume—but as to the public's perception of his preparedness for the throne. He indeed has a hefty resume. But honestly—his efforts @ foreign policy discussions have been all over—from weird—to frightening. And of course we all know that he

doesn't understand how to show reverence in a flag ceremony. I still believe he lacks the "knowledge base" to make the cut as Commander-In-Chief.

Posted By Surrealist, Fort Myers, FL : November 28, 2007 12:55 pm

So Hillary is touting her experience as first lady to one of two presidents in history to be impeached.

Posted By anon nc : November 28, 2007 1:03 pm

Thank you, Roland, for raising this important point. I hope this article gets lots of discussion. The Clinton campaign probably thanks you also. They would love to have this debate. No matter how you try to skew the facts, Senator Obama simply does not have the experience and Senator Clinton does have it. A good debate on this by the candidates will make this very clear. You did a fine job, sir.

Posted By Sherm Kader, Ruston, La : November 28, 2007 1:12 pm

Who is counting? The good math shows that Hillary is winning, and Obama is losing.

Hillary has good experience after being first lady of Arkansas for 12 yrs, first lady of USA

for 8 yrs, and US senator for 7 yrs. Hillary and Bill Clinton are a political couple. The powerful people that Hillary met and networked, and the issues that Hillary learned and worked on (e.g., health care in 1990's), far outweigh what Obama would have.

Hillary's better experience over Obama is supported by the dem voters. There is not a single poll or survey of the dem voters that does not say Hillary has most relevant experience over Obama and other dem candidates.

Posted By JD, des moines, IA : November 28, 2007 1:16 pm

[quote]...Obama has opposed the war since the beginning, but didn't he have to cast a vote because they don't deal with large issues like that in state senates.[/quote]

And Hillary, with the benefit of hindsight regarding her vote on Iraq, has now voted to give Bush another loaded gun to use on Iran. Hardly a display of good judgment, is it?

[quote]He has not truly been tested in a large scale heated campaign.[/quote]

And so, Hillary, who was the appointed heir apparent of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, takes New York — and New York is representative of the US electorate?

And a campaign by the very well known Hillary Clinton against — Rick Lazio — is your definition of "a large scale heated campaign?"

Again, running against the mayor of Yonkers (whoever he was) is your definition of "a large scale heated campaign?"

Hmmm.

Posted By timmy dallas tx : November 28, 2007 1:17 pm

I'm sorry, but the by the logic presented in this article the man or woman who has been elected dog catcher for 20 years would have more experience than both Clinton and Obama. I think that we can all agree that there are much better ways to evaluate experience rather than just adding up all the years a person has held elected office. Thank you CNN and Roland Martin for doing yet another great job of oversimplifying and dumbing down an important issue. Keep up the good work.

Posted By Brett Palmer, Philadelphia, PA : November 28, 2007 1:17 pm

Okay, I know I was a fairly young kid when Bill Clinton was elected, but in the eight years that followed, I was never "aware" of Hillary doing a whole lot of foreign policy visits. Has anyone actually done the research on this? How much handshaking and visiting with foreign dignitaries has she really done. My guess is that it's not nearly so much as the Clinton campaign would like us to believe. CNN, sounds like some journalism you could do and

report on....oh...wait.

Posted By Ryan, New Jersey : November 28, 2007 1:18 pm

I try to be an informed voter which means objectively researching the candidates and their resumes and their convictions. I am good a math, so I've known since the Democratic presidential candidates started running what their political experience were. The Democratic presidential candidates with the least amount of elected experience are Edwards (one term senator) followed by Hillary (currently two-term senator).

Hillary serves on the Armed Services Committee. You would think that Hillary would have the most detailed plan out there for the US military withdrawal from Iraq. Also Hillary has traveled to 82 countries as a representative of the US? Barbara Bush and Laura Bush both traveled to many countries (as first ladies) as representatives of the US. They don't consider that relevant strong foreign relations experience. Going to dinner parties in other countries is not strong foreign relations experience.

I agree with a previous responder that Hillary has problems with the 3Ms (Math, Memory and Misrepresentation).

Obama in 08!

Posted By AJ, Chicago IL : November 28, 2007 1:21 pm

"With the critical foreign policy challenges America faces in the world today, voters will decide whether Senator Obama, who served in the Illinois State Senate just three years ago and would have less experience than any President since World War II, has the strength and experience to be the next president. Sen. Clinton, who has traveled to 82 countries as a representative of the United States and serves on the Armed Services Committee, is ready to lead starting on Day One."

That's awesome, Hillary. I've been on a trip to the state of Florida. Does that mean I can run to be their governor?

You know something, Hillary? America needs a change from the Bush-Clinton dynasty. The experience you tout is also the same experience that contributed to much of the problems we currently face. The experience you have helped contribute toward the creation of a political rift within our nation that we have not seen since the Civil War. The experience you tout is full of half-truths, falsehoods and logic twisted to your favor. And that experience isn't going to get this country moving forward again. If anything, that experience will beget further division among Americans, along with further problems. And instead of going forward, we'll have gone backward 10, 15, 20, maybe even a 100 years.

America is in a dire state. Real change is desired from the majority of the public. Who among us really thinks that things are going to change so much if Hillary is our president? Can we really expect to change the system by

going back to someone whose part of the problem rather than part of the solution? The decision rests with you.

Posted By Robb, New York : November 28, 2007 1:27 pm

Why are people so hung up on experience? Experience does not guarantee success. How can Hillary Clinton get anything accomplished, especially when the country is divided, and Republicans do not like her? Hillary = waste of time. This is no longer the 90's. We need someone that can get the job done, not just sit around and talk about a blown-up resume.

Posted By Seam, Philly PA : November 28, 2007 1:28 pm

Obama has more experience in elected office (11 years) than Hillary Clinton (6 years) and John Edwards (4 years) combined. But you'll never hear that fact from the media. For some reason, you're not even hearing that fact from the Obama campaign. Somebody needs to start fact checking Hillary's claims of experience and questioning John Edwards' one-term Senate record (which he's spent his entire presidential campaign so far trying to distance himself from).

Posted By theprofessional : November 28, 2007 1:31 pm

Pretty subjective history by the Clinton campaign, the candidate herself has not had a long electoral career, but several Presidents in the 20th C were short on elected office. Eisenhower was never elected to anything before being President
Neither was Herbert Hoover
Woodrow Wilson was Governor of New Jersey for only two years before being elected President in 1912
FDR was Governor of New York for only one term, 1928–32.
Jimmy Carter served only 4 years in the Georgia State Senate from 1962–66 before running for governor in 1970. He served only one term before running for President.

Obama stacks up reasonably well against them and the Senator from NY.

Posted By Dan, SF, CA : November 28, 2007
1:36 pm

Ryan Indianapolis

Do your homework kiddo. Bush did not WIN the election. Gore had more votes that Bush did. The Supreme Court awarded the presidency to Bush.

Posted By Rodney Dallas TX : November 28, 2007 1:37 pm

THANK YOU! I've been yelling this at anyone who pulls the "experience" card when telling me Hillary is better than Barack. Thanks Roland.

Posted By Daniel, Richmond, VA : November 28, 2007 1:40 pm

Good job Roland! Just one thing... Using Bill Clinton in your defense is OK, maybe, and Jimmy Carter has improved his dismall image, but to use 'W' Bush as an argument that lack of long-term federal experience is OK for Mr. Obama is not helping the Obama campaign at all! LOL

Posted By Michael, Montgomery Alabama : November 28, 2007 1:41 pm

It is obvious Hillary will do and say anything to get elected. She is a fraud and if people can't see that, god help us.

Posted By Pete, Austin TX : November 28, 2007 1:42 pm

Clinton's citing of her "qualifications" follows an embellishment trend by job applicants that seems to be growing and to some extent is encouraged (see CNN's articles on job hunting). I volunteered on my son's baseball team and wrote some checks for some

equipment purchases...so on my resume I put "accountant for local non-profit" and send it off to Enron. At work the V.P. of Marketing asked me where someone sits...resume: "assistant to vice president" and send it off to Tyco for an executive position. Here's one better...I marry someone who becomes important, don't have any real responsibilities or power, also don't have real consequences for my actions because I'm just the spouse, and jet-set around enjoying the perks of my spouse's position...resume: clearly I'm the best candidate when the position becomes vacant (not to mention you get my spouse back...wink wink).

Posted By Jim, IA : November 28, 2007 1:43 pm

Mr Martin, the last example you have to give us is that "George W. Bush only held elected office for six years before becoming president. He was elected governor of Texas in 1994 and won the presidency – OK, liberal bloggers, the Supreme Court ruled in his favor – in 2000." Can't you find anything else? As far as I know Bush is Republican so who cares?

The truth is that it doesn't matter if Clinton campaign is good or not at math, what it matters is that Obama is NOT good to be President right now. He has lots of homework to do.

With no doubt Clinton 08!!

Posted By Mati, WA : November 28, 2007 1:44 pm

How can anyone say Obama has experience being in the Senate? He has missed 80% of the votes including the big one he keeps talking about. I work in a law firm. Does that make me ready for the Attorney General position. Just because your in the room doesn't mean your gaining experience, especially if your not doing the job you were elected to do.

Posted By Rodney Dallas TX : November 28, 2007 1:44 pm

Sen. Clinton is both smart and experienced and thus a better pick than Sen. Obama. Incidentally, I hope that Sen. Clinton's critics will continue to ignore the fact that she was President Clinton's closest and most trusted political and (foreign)policy advisor, or treat it as irrelevant because she was also his wife. The American people are smart enough to see through that.

Posted By dawn — Gaithersburg, MD. : November 28, 2007 12:19 pm

Hi dawn, how you been, haven't "read" you in a while and I hope your Thanksgiving was good and you are well.

Now if we are going to use the rational of her "experience" as first lady, does that include the bad with the good that happened during those eight years?

How are we going to parse through the BS if all of the papers during that time are locked up?

Nothing negative about Hillary in my post, just looking for some answers on how we are going to gauge her "factual" experience on what high level meetings she sat in on and what advice did she give that "helped" Bill.

It's tough to take Bill's word as well, you know..... and then there's that Sandy Berger thing where he STOLE many documents so gaining actual proof is kind of vital.

Glad to have you back dawn, though I mainly disagree with you, I respect you greatly.

Posted By Tom – Dedham, Mass : November 28, 2007 1:47 pm

James, Forest Grove

So those of us that show support for her are not "real folks"? It's funny, I'm here typing an email...I thought I was real.

Posted By Rodney Dallas TX : November 28, 2007 1:47 pm

I suppose the case could be made that most people look at Federal service or serving as a governor, and generally don't consider service in state legislatures, when they take experience into consideration. To extend that argument, you could say that governors have

to play on a national stage, to a degree, while state legislators focus on the needs of their local constituents. I say that because, quite frankly, that's more or less the way I tend to look at it.

Nonetheless, I still don't put governorship at the same level as service at the federal level and the Clinton camp made no such qualifications.

It would be interesting to see the service of all 20th Century Presidents compared. I'd like to see how far off the Clinton camp is – and whether it's an argument with any merit (i.e., did less service make for poorer Presidents?). Perhaps CNN could put those stats together and create a link.

Posted By PS, KC, MO : November 28, 2007
1:49 pm

If you're looking at experience, then Bill Richardson should win hands-down. He has the wealth and breadth of experience that should, by Clinton's logic, make him the best choice. I would vote for him except for that whole "issues" thing. I just don't seem to agree with him on the issues. But, then, I don't agree with Hillary either. Oddly enough, that doesn't seem to make much difference to a lot of voters.

Posted By PS, KC, MO : November 28, 2007
1:56 pm

The math is that 80% of the democrat voters

do not like Obama's experience, as he only gets about 20% support while Hillary Clinton gets over 50% votes.

Posted By GH, syracuse, ny : November 28, 2007 1:58 pm

There is a distinct bottom line here. The Clinton campaign has resorted to lying and distortion to attempt to breathe life into a dying campaign. Bill is on the campaign trail, lying to voters, saying that he opposed the Iraq war from the beginning, in spite of numerous prior videotaped statements to the contrary.

Hillary could have lived in the White House for her entire life, and she would still not possess the judgement necessary to lead this nation. Her war votes, her vote on Lieberman-Kyl, her inability to clearly communicate where she stands on any given issue, tell me that she is not a leader.

Recent polls indicate that she will not succeed in a general election against any of the republican candidates. How much louder can the message to democrats be? A HRC nomination will result in 4 more years of a disasterous republican lead government.

Posted By Ben : November 28, 2007 1:58 pm

Good God!! There is a "huge" difference in Hillary's exp. and Obamas!! She has been in

the senate 6 years and traveled to around 82 countries. She had an inside seat in the Oval Office for 8 years. She has been dealt hard blows by the rabid Republicans and handled it with grace and intelligence!! She is ready to deal with tough issues and dirty nasty Republicans. Obama will be like a deer in the head lights when the Repubs start on him. Especially if Karl Rove is operating on the side lines. Good Grief, people, Wake Up!!! This country NEEDS Hillary right now, especially!!!!

Posted By Lee Garrett, Overland Park, Ks. :
November 28, 2007 1:58 pm

I think perhaps the point is that if you've actually *governed* something, you're already ahead of whoever doesn't have any governing experience at all. So, GW would be ahead of both Obama and Clinton, who have only been in legislative positions.

However, Clinton's had more experience as a legislator at the federal level, forcing her to familiarize herself with foreign and national policy, whereas Obama's experience as a state senator is less relevant to what he'd be doing as President.

But by all means, don't let that get in the way of your specious comparisons. I don't care about any of these people... each is as bad as the other, from what I can see... and I'm perfectly happy to let them eat each other before election day.

Posted By Ali, Ithaca, NY : November 28, 2007
2:02 pm

This discussion is ludicrous! Obama, listen to me — your rebuttal to this stupid claim is EASY! As other VERY bright leaders have stated in the past: No leader can claim an expertise in all areas in which he/she must be effective. No leader can claim relevant experience in all of these areas. The mark of a wise and effective leader is one who has the intelligence to surround him/herself with those who possess the expertise and experience necessary to get the job done. Hello! And, remember, Hillary has little of the experience she is claiming. Come on Obama – hit back with the OBVIOUS!

Posted By Sandy Carey, Sacramento, CA :
November 28, 2007 2:18 pm

Great job, Roland Martin. When are the American people going to learn that Clinton is a bunch of hot, or cold rather, air, and that she just is not the person for president! Obama and Obama campaign needs to take this MATH and run with it! Thanks.

Posted By RuthieM : November 28, 2007 2:43 pm

"Yeah Hillary was soooo experienced in foreiegn policy that she VOTED TO AUTHORIZE THE WAR IN IRAQ... THE BIGGEST FOREIGN POLICY DISASTER IN AMERICAN HISTORY!"

Ok, Brad, I don't normally nit-pick about this sort of thing but....Last I checked, Vietnam was the BIGGEST FOREIGN POLICY DISASTER IN AMERICAN HISTORY! Even one single soldiers' death is unnecessary. But Bushie & Dick made sure that it was misinformation upon which the Congress made their decision, so that Jr could go forth & right the wrongs of his father's administration.

Posted By Angie, CT : November 28, 2007 2:54 pm

Good story Mr. Martin! The Clintons are spinning bigger lies the further she falls in the polls. Yesterday Bill claimed he was against the Iraq war from the start. Outright LIE.

Posted By Jeff, Minneapolis MN : November 28, 2007 2:57 pm

The american voters have spoken on this experience topic. Hillary won over Obama.

Posted By Elaine, syracuse, ny : November 28, 2007 2:59 pm

Elaine, are you pretending to write in the future?

How could American voters have spoken?

Posted By Ernie, Trinidad, CA : November 28, 2007 3:19 pm

The Clintons must not have taken too good a look at the presidents of the 20th century and their elected experience.

And guess what, not one of them is claiming experience because a relative held that position in the past.

Judgement and integrity matter – and the Clintons have neither. I use the plural Clinton since Hillary is running on Bill's experience as president. Even though nothing he did was very profound and a lot of our problems (bin laden) exist due to Bill's mismanagement.

Posted By tired of corruption LV : November 28, 2007 3:21 pm

The article states that Clinton said that Obama "would have less experience than any president in the 20th century." But uses George W. Bush to refute it. While the statement may be misleading, George W. Bush was not President in the 20th century. He was elected in 2000 and took office in 2001. Both of which were in the 21st Century

Posted By Bill, Staten Island NY : November 28, 2007 3:23 pm

IMHO, both Hillary and Obama are extremely intelligent individuals. I've listened to both of them in their speeches (scripted) and in

unscripted interviews and have come away thinking how very intelligent that person is. Both have relevant experience as US Senators and either one of them is much more preferable than any of the GOP candidates.

That being said, let's put this 'experience' thing to bed and admit that it really doesn't matter. History has shown that we get good and bad Presidents from both experienced and non-experienced individuals. It's not even the 'character' of a person that matters as much as how that person will actually do the job. We've had great Presidents that were absolute 'rascals' and absolutely horrible ones that had not a single character flaw.

Personally, my feeling about Hillary is that she is a little too slick and really represents the status quo in politics while Barak doesn't. He seems much more honest and forthcoming and all of the 'attacks' the Hillary fans accuse him of are just responses to her attacks. He either shows how something they said is not true or points out the hypocrisy of the Clinton camp pointing out a 'failing' (haven't heard a valid one yet) of Obama when they have a few skeletons in their own closet.

One thing I've also noticed is that there are quite a few Republicans who either outright support Obama or say that if he is the Democratic nominee, they would vote for him. Even they respect his honesty and openness. I have yet to hear about a Republican supporting Hillary. Who would be more electible? Obama.

My preferred picks (no special order): Obama, Richardson, Edwards. Who would I vote for in the general election? Any of the Democrats

who are running. I want hope, peace and prosperity, not fear, war and a growing national debt.

Posted By Matt, Houston, TX : November 28, 2007 3:30 pm

All candidates use fuzzy math and other tactics as ammunition as the primaries approach – not just Senator Clinton. Roland Martin chooses to highlight this because he is African-American, and automatically supports Senator Obama. Maybe CNN should start hiring contributors that are more neutral.

Posted By Dere, Walpole NH : November 28, 2007 3:34 pm

Amen to CNN for showing some good journalistic integrity and exposing spin. This is the way journalists should respond to spin with fact checks and heavy criticism. I don't care if you criticise any candidate just do it as fairly and objectively as possible. Good catch on this one.

Posted By Steve, South Orange NJ : November 28, 2007 3:34 pm



George Bush only having 6 yrs. of elected office before becoming the president? I don't get the point. Bush being Governor of the 3rd

dumbest state in the Union doesn't qualify him for nothing, let alone the presidency. If you don't think so, take a closer look at the State of our Union.

Posted By byrdlegs : November 28, 2007 3:36 pm

Thank you Roland for reporting the facts. I am a "Ronald Reagan" Republican but I hope Obama gets the Democratic nomination. He is honest and intelligent. I hope I can vote for him for president in the general election next November!

Posted By Howard, Shreveport, Louisiana : November 28, 2007 3:38 pm

This story isn't worth the digital ink it was printed on. There's a presidential campaign going on. Are we going to have to read about it every time a campaign makes a dubious claim about an opponent to make a point? It's not like Clinton is claiming her opponent is a militant Muslim trying to take over the government from the inside or anything (what Republicans are sending out as a lying email about Obama).

What she is doing is more like exaggerating, and it's what they are all doing to some degree. That's what always happens at this point in the campaigns. It's not that big a deal. Listen to the point she is making and see if you agree or disagree.

The person with the most meaningful experience of them all seems to be Joe Biden. I wish people would give him a little more air time and not decide from the beginning who the front runners will be. When the media only focuses on a couple of people and declares them the frontrunners so early in the process, the people follow along with their voting patterns. Allowing the other candidates to appear on the debates is just trying to give the appearance of fairness. There has been zero fairness in the coverage of these candidates.

I would love it if ANY of the Democrats win. But I will not feel too bad even if most of the Republicans win. No matter what happens... No matter who wins...

...it will be better than Bush.

It will be the most satisfying election in the history of this country. No way to lose in this one. They are all better than Bush. It's going to be a win for the country no matter what.

Everyone prepare for the huge collective sigh of relief that the nation and rest of the planet will release. It can't get here soon enough.

And most likely, it will be Hillary being sworn in, Bill on stage at her side. Smiling that smile...

Posted By Robert, Houston TX : November 28, 2007 3:56 pm

Let's not forget that Carter was also a one term

governor from Georgia when he was elected and Ronald Reagan was only a governor from California. Thus, as is well stated, Hillary makes no sense, but idiots will still vote for her.

Posted By AG, Erie, PA : November 28, 2007 4:21 pm

In Texas being governor is primarily a p.r. job. All the legislative agendas are set by the Lt. Governor. So, W. really had very little experience (except for all his failed business dealings) before becoming president.

If you think experience is the biggest deciding factor, vote Richardson. If you think judgment, intelligence, integrity and the ability to work well with people with differing views, are the deciding factors, vote Obama.

Posted By Pam, Dallas, TX : November 28, 2007 4:35 pm

obama will be sworn in as president and i can see America slowly start to heal from all its hurt!!! No more clinton divisive politics, if clinton as president had done his job right he would have gone after bin laden and 9/11 would have never occurred, lets end the bush/clinton power hug/ dynasty, let hope, peace determination and prosperity prevail God bless America, obama 08!!!

Posted By stan pitts p.a : November 28, 2007 5:00 pm

It really depends on how you qualify experience...it could be argued, and should be, that serving as a Governor for six years far outweighs the "rinky dink" dealings of a state legislator (no matter how long he served) and a measly three years as a Senator. Compare experiences and you will get at the correct answer.

Posted By David, Tempe, AZ : November 28, 2007 5:03 pm

Roland, HRC will win. LIVE IT!

P.S. CNN, please stop deleting posts that disagree with your chief shill for Obama.

Posted By Donald, Little Rock : November 28, 2007 5:21 pm

AWESOME!!!!!! THIS IS WHAT THE MEDIA IS SUPPOSE TO BE DOING. MAKING SURE THAT TRUE INFORMATION IS GIVEN. NICE JOB CNN!

Posted By JORGE BRONX NY : November 28, 2007 5:26 pm

Two weeks after Clinton accused other candidates of what she called "mudslinging" she has repeatedly slung negative accusations at Senator Obama. Of course Obama is going to defend himself!

Posted By Katy7540, Cedar Rapids, IA :
November 28, 2007 5:46 pm

Oh, Rodney of Dallas TX, your fuzzy Clintonian math is old news. Everybody knows they just looked at 2 months to come up with that "missed 80% of votes" fake stat. If you really cared about being fair you would demand to see voting stats based on the entire year, which Obama's record was in line with the other candidates. Stop spreading your fuzzy math, it's not patriotic.

Posted By monica, rochester new york :
November 28, 2007 5:47 pm

Experience is important for gaining wisdom and judgment. Some people learn from experience much better than others. Clearly it will take many more years before Clinton can be said to possess good judgment. Obama, though having less time in Washington, has proven he has much better judgment. We aren't electing a president to come up with all the options on their own. As our current president said in his own cute way, the president is the "decider". Obama is clearly going to be a better decider than Clinton.

Posted By Dan, TX : November 28, 2007 5:50 pm

Singer won't get back to you Roland. You point out a simple but effective truth. When it comes to holding an elected public office, Hillary has one of the fewest years of experience for Democrats and Republicans. Phil Singer can't throw 8 years as First Lady as relevant experience without some type of documented backup. Most of us that remember Hillary's leadership in 1992/93 was for National Healthcare, which was a disaster. After that, Hillary was never officially appointed to anything else by Bill Clinton.

Next thing we will hear is that Chelsea Clinton has experience to be President.

Posted By AJ, IL : November 28, 2007 6:28 pm



Can someone tell me how traveling about the world on the taxpayer dime somehow constitutes "experience"?

Clinton is a nutcase.

Posted By bookwisewin : November 28, 2007 7:33 pm

FINALLY! After literally years of the media not even attempting to do their job of reporting fact to Americans, we finally have a story with some actual fact based information. I sure wish this trend would continue, but I'm not holding my breath.

Posted By Ron Nebraska : November 28, 2007 8:18 pm

Response to Rodney Dallas TX.

Of course you're real. My point is if Hillary is the front runner, as most the media states, then why is it that a majority of the comments are negative about her. Surely if her base is so large and active, then we'd see a larger volume of commentors coming to her defense. The only place you'll see a majority base of commentors is on her front groups and campaign site. Face Reality bud, she's the Titanic and all but a few will go down with her.

Posted By James, Forest Grove : November 29, 2007 10:44 am

Not a problem with math, It's just a problem with the truth. The Clintons are unable to tell it for what it is.

The truth never helps a Clinton, so they live in a different reality than the rest of the world. Where Smoking pot is not inhaling, where having sex isn't having sex if someone else is doing it to you, where campaign funds aren't taken, they are given freely and checked etc etc etc

Posted By Been there, seen that : November 30, 2007 9:58 am

After reading several all of your comments, I must say that a majority of you missed the real point of the article. Martin made the important assertion that Clinton and Obama probably

have the same amount of foreign policy experience. For you Clinton apologists, being First Lady does not bring about Foreign Policy Experience. This logic seems to tell me that if a woman marries a lawyer she will eventually gain enough experience to also be a lawyer. This simply isn't true. On a final note, I must defend Martin to you ignorant people that would attack him as being a apologist for Obama. The last time I checked, Obama was leading the polls in Iowa, and Clinton's lead was dropping.

Posted By Sal Espino, Jr., Fort Worth, TX :
November 30, 2007 8:15 pm

[« Read more of the Political Ticker](#)

CNN Comment Policy: CNN encourages you to add a comment to this discussion. You may not post any unlawful, threatening, libelous, defamatory, obscene, pornographic or other material that would violate the law. Please note that CNN makes reasonable efforts to review all comments prior to posting and CNN may edit comments for clarity or to keep out questionable or off-topic material. All comments should be relevant to the post and remain respectful of other authors and commenters. By submitting your comment, you hereby give CNN the right, but not the obligation, to post, air, edit, exhibit, telecast, cablecast, webcast, re-use, publish, reproduce, use, license, print, distribute or otherwise use your comment(s) and accompanying personal identifying information via all forms of media now known or hereafter devised, worldwide, in perpetuity. [CNN Privacy Statement](#).

[Home](#) | [World](#) | [U.S.](#) | [Politics](#) |
[Entertainment](#) | [Health](#) | [Tech](#) | [Travel](#)
| [Living](#) | [Business](#) | [Sports](#) |
[Time.com](#)
[Podcasts](#) | [Blogs](#) | [CNN Mobile](#) |
[Preferences](#) | [Email Alerts](#) | [CNN Radio](#)

| [CNN Shop](#) | [Site Map](#)

POWERED BY
Google

SEARCH

[CNN en Español](#) | [Arabic](#) | [Japanese](#) |
[Korean](#) | [Turkish](#)

[International Edition](#) | [CNN TV](#) | [CNN
International](#) | [Headline News](#) |
[Transcripts](#)

© 2007 Cable News Network. [Turner
Broadcasting System, Inc.](#) All Rights
Reserved.

[Terms of service](#) | [Privacy guidelines](#) |
[Advertise with us](#) | [About us](#) | [Contact
us](#) | [Help](#)

Powered by [WordPress.com](#)