

Let me be blunt: If S&P was a know-nothing agency filled with nincompoops, then they were also a know-nothing agency filled with nincompoops last year... last month... and last Thursday when they had the U.S. credit rating set at AAA. Either they know something or they know nothing. Either the U.S. credit rating deserves AAA or it doesn't.

I think the whole economic system is a joke especially given the fact that almost nothing has changed since the 2008 economic crisis. Thus, I am the last person in the world to care about the good name of rating agencies. They're all shady and should pay the price for their past behavior, if there is such a thing as karma.

However, someone should come up with another form of attack against S&P (Standard & Poors) after they decided to decreased the U.S. credit rating.

I'm sick of hearing the lame a\$\$ excuse that S&P has no credibility.... now that they've done something to draw the ire of every lawmaker in Congress.

IF they have no credibility now that the rating is AA+, AND they had no credibility back in 2008, 2007, 2006 etc when they were giving AAA ratings to subprime \$hit, THEN that also means they had no credibility when they kept the U.S. rated at AAA.

Yes, yes, yes, we know S&P was one of the ratings agencies which slapped a triple A rating on junk. Now that they've downgraded the U.S. rating, suddenly S&P's past is the reason we're not supposed to listen to them anymore.

If the U.S. doesn't warrant a downgrade, argue with S&P's method or decision. But don't come sniveling on TV, acting like S&P doesn't matter if you never took to the airwaves to rake them over the coals when they were giving the U.S. a good grade.

I've heard criticism about everything from the educational background of the person running S&P, to comparisons with the Keystone Cops.

In my opinion, this is like fuming about the past educational background of a teacher who gave you a C-, when you couldn't have cared less about that same background so long as that teacher was giving you A's. They weren't stupid and inept when giving you an A, but magically became stupid and inept when you got that big fat C-? Come on.

It can't be a great company as long as they maintain their AAA stamp on the U.S. rating, AND a terrible company filled with idiots when they slap a downgrade on the U.S. credit rating.

Did the U.S. credit rating deserve a AA+ to begin with after the recent crisis? I don't know. Do they deserve one now? I have no idea.

But jumping down S&P's weaselly throat NOW is incredibly hypocritical... especially if you're a Congressman/woman who didn't open your mouth against S&P so long as they kept that AAA in tact. Worry more about dealing with the Teabaggers' next collective temper tantrum.

Tell me something I don't know

S&P, as craven as they may be, told the political system about itself Friday (Aug 5) . They said a lot of things which were true concerning the people who hold the purse strings of this nation.

According to the press release, S&P stated, **"The political brinkmanship of recent months highlights what we see as America's governance and policy-making becoming less stable, less effective, and less predictable than what we previously believed."**

Yeah. That's true despite from whose mouth it comes.

Congress essentially controls whether or not the debt ceiling is lifted. Those officials control whether or not the entire U.S. defaults on its debts. They literally have a hold of the purse strings. So this is not just some company bi+ching about the same things we all hate concerning our political officials.

Now that S&P is saying something politicians and financial journalists don't want to hear, all of a sudden we're supposed to believe everything is the fault of the terrible, horrible, no good, very bad S&P.

As irrational as S&P may be (or may seem) concerning their ratings over junk preceding the 2008 economic disaster, they weren't lying Friday when they said **"The statutory debt ceiling and the threat of default have become political bargaining chips in the debate over fiscal policy"**;

Again, that's true no matter who said it.

S&P, like a lot of people, also felt the latest "deal" in Congress over raising the debt ceiling was ridiculous; maybe for different reasons, though.

S&P said the recent debt agreement "fell well short of the comprehensive fiscal consolidation program that some proponents had envisaged until quite recently." What ISN'T true about that?

In the debt deal, there isn't any serious component of increasing revenue from those who make enough money NOT to catch financial pneumonia each time the stock market takes a dip.

Written by whisperDispatch.com
Tuesday, 09 August 2011 05:17 -

I don't agree on cutting Medicaid, Medicare or Social Security at this point in time. There are simply MORE people around the nation who have become MORE dependent on these programs given the recent economic atmosphere.

What can happen, though, is a rise in revenue. Less people with less jobs making less money makes for a massive decrease in revenue.

On the other hand, if someone making \$5 million in THIS economy can still make \$5 million in THIS economy, it means they won't catch financial pneumonia if their taxes are increased.

However, it would be disastrous to snatch another \$1000 from somebody who is already dependent on governmental help.

What's worse is that S&P wasn't alone in slapping AAA on garbage in previous years. Other ratings agencies like Moody's and Fitch were also slapping AAA ratings on gold-plated crap. So what does it mean that both of those other rating agencies are still giving a AAA rating to the U.S.? And why aren't lawmakers, hosts, and journalists hightailing it to a camera to criticize them as well?

Moody's and Fitch gave AAA ratings to shady financial instruments which essentially caused a financial crisis in 2008. Are they filled with incompetents and amateurs too? If they do some time in the future downgrade the U.S.'s credit rating, will they suddenly turned into nincompoops too??

According to a report, Moody's gave AAA ratings to "subprime mortgage pools that were assembled and marketed by Goldman Sachs and other investment bankers." They also have the US rating at AAA. Care to criticize them in the same way you're going after S&P?

Or does that criticism only flow forth when conventional wisdom is smashed?

Or is Moody's doing the right thing since they haven't downgraded the U.S.? And will they suddenly become devils if they do decide that the nation's political atmosphere is toxic to the stability of the U.S. financial system?

Or will the issue of why this happened continue to be overlooked as people rant about S&P instead of dealing with the very real and stinging rebukes the agency raised in their report about our political system?

Again, you can't respect their decision as long as the results are good, but treat them like low class mental cases when they don't do what you want.

Its not this rating agency's fault that Congress acted a damn fool over the past few months concerning raising the debt limit. For that, Congress only have themselves to blame.

This entire "crisis" over the debt ceiling was created by a bunch of petulant,

hostage-taking Teabaggers, mixed with a Democratic party devoid of a backbone or any serious knowledge of how to protect the American public from being taken hostage in the first place.

A Rudderless Boat?

Added to the mix is a President whose first instinct is to capitulate instead of figuring out how to protect the nation from those who seek to destroy the fundamental way in which government works.

Again, let me be blunt: Hearing my President on TV imploring me to call my local Congressman was a total embarrassment.

I was almost mortified that this was his plan after the debt negotiations broke down. This coming from one of the smartest guys in the room! He gets on TV and the only thing he can tell us is that he can't protect us from being held hostage... AGAIN? That I have to contact my Congressman?! WTF?

What happens if I'm an outnumbered Democrat and my Congressman is a Teabagger? I guess I'm just a\$\$ out if my plan was to depend on the President for which I voted in 2008.

Seriously. I might as well have written in "Booboo The Fool" on my ballot for President and simply planned to contact my local Congressman during times of hard debates in Washington if it were going to play out like this.

Did having Obama as President keep the Republicans from setting a hellish precedent with extending the Bush tax cuts? No. Did voting for the smartest guy in the room keep the Republicans from taking the nation's credit rating hostage to protect their rich donors? No.

If this situation would have happened with any other President, then it didn't really matter who I voted for in 2008.

If this situation would have happened so long as Obama was President, and he didn't know how or couldn't figure out how to protect the American public from these shenanigans, then apparently it also didn't matter who I voted for in 2008.

I had high hopes that Barack Obama would be smart enough to deal with incredibly challenging situations like the ones in which he has been routinely placed.

Obviously I was mistaken. And don't give me any lip about expecting too much. Its time for this President to rise up to the promise of his Presidency. He should have used the health-care debate to get BETTER. He should have used the horrible hostage situation around extending the Bush tax cuts to get BETTER.

Written by whisperDispatch.com
Tuesday, 09 August 2011 05:17 -

Don't sell me hope and change, then expect me to watch you try to figure out whether or not we deserve to receive it in its fullest/richest form... or whether we just deserve whatever we can get so long as you're not seen as a loser after fighting for something you don't know how to accomplish (like ending the Bush tax cuts).

Asking the American public to give you more time in an economy like this is like asking the gas company to give you more time to pay your bill before they whack you off. And that's the point.

People can't ask the power company for more time... until... whenever... to pay that bill. People can't go up to cashier at the grocery store and ask for more time to pay for their family's food. Can you imagine telling a creditor you'll pay your bill as soon as the economy turns around??

Essentially saying to people, 'I promised you change, I just didn't promise you change right now' is a bull\$hit argument. Period. What we want to see are actions.

Asking us to be satisfied with half-a\$sed compromises involving people who would sooner destroy this government than look twice at it, is like asking us to be satisfied with a hunk of soggy bread from table scraps because, hey, at least we got something. Naw. That ain't good enough.

Nobody's asking Obama to turn into Rambo or John Wayne. Asking him to fight for Democratic ideals come hell or high water, is not like asking him to turn into a Chinese communist. (Puhlease, John Harwood.)

There are things which can be done about intransigent, bullheaded lawmakers. Do you really think this is the only time in history a President has had to deal with treacherous situations in this nation??

To take an incredibly extreme case, I'm sure Abraham Lincoln wanted to prevent a full out, civil war which would literally rip this nation in two. Fortunately his uncompromising goal to keep this nation as one nation coincided with the freeing of slaves despite the wretched turmoil which threatened to follow.

Lincoln had to deal with people who literally took the stability of the entire nation as a hostage. They didn't care what his plans were, and they weren't really interested in helping him govern this nation. He was a threat. He was the problem. He didn't deserve one term, let alone two in their eyes. And no matter the hardship, they sought to undermine his very existence.

Thank god he wasn't a total capitulator or else we may have had a freaking compromise where black folk were only slaves for 6 months of the year instead of all year long... Or slaves until they turned 21 as part of a grand bargain... Or slaves only during harvest season... Or slaves for 1 week each month as part of a backroom deal made with the leadership... Or something equally as hideous.

Written by whisperDispatch.com
Tuesday, 09 August 2011 05:17 -

So long as the leader we need to get us out of this fog remains wishy-washy and easily influenced about which way to go, some people won't sit quietly and wait for him to get it right. And those of us watching this whole madness will feel like we're stuck on a rudderless boat.

And you damn sure can't blame S&P for that.

Material:

<http://betweenthe numbers.net/2011/08/what-did-sp-actually-downgrade/>

Video: <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/3036697/#44065600>

<http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700167864/Fitch-US-debt-deal-alone-wont-sustain-AAA-rating.html>

<http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/110805/acd.02.html>