

Title: There's something about the Congressional Hearings that seem... sus.

Author: SoreLoserOfDumbtown

Created 2022-03-12 22:48:08 UTC

Permalink: /r/GME/comments/tcsx1t/theres_something_about_the_congressional_hearings/

Url:

https://www.reddit.com/r/GME/comments/tcsx1t/theres_something_about_the_congressional_hearings/

So something just occurred to me about those Congressional hearings. Yes, they were a year ago. I'm slow. (Just like you, don't kid yourself).

Obviously they were a farce, and there is much to be rightly critical of. But there was something *glaring* that I hadn't considered before now.

We all laughed and complained about who was there. But did you notice who *wasn't* there?

GameStop.

Nobody was there representing GameStop.

Now, these aren't criminal proceedings, they were basically a fact finding mission with a public audience. I understand why they had DFV, even though I think it was unnecessary. He just liked the stock. But by having him there, they made it clear that this investigation *was not really about any of the other stocks that had been changed to Position Close Only.* It was only about GameStop. And DFV does *not* represent GameStop. He speaks for himself alone.

So it's clear Congress wanted to talk about GameStop, not the other stocks. *So why were there no representatives from GameStop at the hearings?*

If something happened in your life where you were the victim (and GameStop is the victim as we know, because of the heavy shorting) then you would *rightly* expect to give testimony - whether that was in a court of law, or before Congress or whatever the authorities may be in that situation. You would be invited there. You would be expected there. Imagine getting beat up at school and the headteacher talking to the bullies, the people watching, the people making bets, the people watching the people taking bets, the people that have seen the bullies do their bullying elsewhere... literally talk to *anyone and everyone but you.* So I ask again...

#Where the actual frick was GameStop?

Obviously, RC was not chairman then, and his associates were not on the board. It was still the old guard that have since been removed... but damn. Thinking about it in this light makes this whole thing seem even more corrupt. It would seem like bringing a board member before Congress was a risk nobody in power wanted. So they just ignored them. They literally prevented a witness from giving testimony.

Now I apologise if this point has been raised before, but I don't remember seeing it.

If there was any doubt that the government didn't know that they had a financial nuclear bomb on their hands, for me that doubt has now gone. It would seem to me, that they deliberately ignored what should be basic procedure when fact finding, which is to say, talk to *all* of the affected parties.

I'm no expert on this stuff, in fact I know very little, so if you guys have more information about procedures etc, I'd love to hear it. But from where I'm standing, it seems to me that in the noise and in the moment, I think we've missed something really obvious.

I need to have a lay down for a while.

■■■

Edit - I just want to add a couple of points for any new comers ...

THERE WERE 3 HEARINGS spread out over a few months. There was ample opportunity to have GameStop board members testify. This isn't an exhaustive list, but here are some of the people that were called in, and some associated thoughts.

Michael Bodson - head of the DTCC, the organisation you have to join if you want to be a bank, a hedge fund, market maker, anything in the financial world basically. They also have all of the shares of every American company and then let other people play with them. He's a dick.

Ken Griffin - financial terrorist. Loves crime, human suffering and mayo. That is all.

Gabe Plotkin - one of many hedge fund managers that was short. Why this one? Why not say, Steve Cohen? (Yes, yes, I know the bailout makes him extra suspicious, but still...)

Vlad Tenev - Robinhood CEO , one of many 'brokers' that switched off the buy button. Why just him?

Keith Gill (DFV) - Speaks for himself. Just likes the stock. Also, legend.

Dennis Keller and associates - Works for Better Markets. Wants wall st to sort itself out. Made clear that Citadel suck. Legends.

Steve Huffman - Reddit CEO. Allows for *fairly* free speech on his platform, but not without its problems and obviously the main channel of communication in this saga. (Tbf, if I was clueless, I would have called him in too).

Gary Gensler - chair of the SEC. He was rushed into that position *after* the sneeze. A bit weird for him to testify when he wasn't there at the time, but the organisation he now represents was tasked with reporting on events, so I guess fair it's game. (Yes, there's *a lot* more that can be discussed on this, but please excuse my simplification).

Another point, is that ahead of time, everyone gives a written statement which allows Congress to prepare. In those statements, as well as the verbal testimony, the Clearing Houses got a lot of blame (I could be remembering wrong but don't think so). However, the Clearing Houses were not questioned. If that's actually the case, imagine someone trying to assassinate you with a bunch of hitmen, failing, and then everyone questioning the hitmen, so the hitmen say 'oh but someone made me do it'... but the person that ordered the hit just gets ignored? Sheesh.

So again, Congress had no qualms calling in a load of spectators, but not the victim. Weird, huh?