

TYING HARVEY WEINSTEIN TO THE LAS VEGAS EVENT



First published October 17, 2017

As usual, this is just my opinion, take it or leave it

Yep, you read that right. There is a link between the two events. They didn't come out almost simultaneously by accident.

This is going to be much shorter than my recent Las Vegas comments, but I do have something to say. Be patient, because I will make it worth your while. I'm sure Weinstein is a big creep, and I don't like seeming to defend him, but this whole thing stinks of yet another project. It reminds us of the recent Bill Cosby story, [which is also a lie and a conjob](#). Just ask yourself this: do you think it is possible to fire a man from his own company for sexual harassment *accusations*? This is a country of law—allegedly—not a country of hearsay. Legally, you cannot be fired for accusations. You can only be fired for *convictions*. That is true for little ole you, working at the Five&Dime, but it is also true for CEOs of major companies. The law is supposed to be blind to such distinctions. So even if a company's board of directors had the **power** to fire the majority owner and head of the company—which is doubtful—they still don't have the legal authority to do so based on accusations. Weinstein should be suing for wrongful termination, but mysteriously we don't see that. More logically, we should see him (and his family) firing his board of directors. So all this is fishy in the extreme.

As I said, Weinstein is no doubt a nasty person, but do you really think all these actresses accusing him of touching their tushies or whatever are any less nasty? Why believe them on a first reading? Shouldn't they be required to *prove* these allegations in a court of law? Do you think no woman has ever lied about sexual harassment? Think again. People in the modern world are liars, and the richer they are the better they are at lying. And that includes women as well as men.

To be honest, I don't really give a rat's behind whether Weinstein grabbed someone or not. All the planted feminists are shouting that Affleck and Damon and all the Hollywood males are complicit in this, but—given the story we are expected to believe—do you know who else was complicit? The actresses who were grabbed and said nothing for years. Yeah. Why don't you ask them why they are coming out now? Why not report it when it happened, if it was so awful? We know why: they wanted to get ahead and become famous and rich. Which they did. Which is why they are nasty. They were

free to file charges, weren't they? They were free to work somewhere else, with someone else. But they didn't do that. For that reason, I have trouble taking any of this seriously.

But it is even bigger than that, since *I don't believe any of this happened at all*. I suspect it is just one more big stageplay. That is what these people do. They lie all day about everything. These are actors, actresses, and other Hollywood people, so—like politicians and media people—they are **professional liars**. Some play the heroes in these productions and others play the heavies. Also, remember that all these people in Hollywood—male and female—are **gay**. No guys are grabbing any *woman's* naughty bits, since they are too busy grabbing eachother's. Frankly, I don't think the top actresses are lying here for money, since many of them already have a lot of that. What it looks like to me is that we have signs of a war between major Jewish families here, with some in Hollywood taking one side and some taking the other. Best guess is some big investment group wants control of The Weinstein Company, and this is the form of the hostile takeover. I showed you that this is how it is done now [in my paper on John Lennon](#). There, after proving Lennon is still alive, I showed you how Blackrock/Blackstone wormed its way into Sony/ATV via the Michael Jackson fake molestation charges and later faked death. We also saw it in my analysis of the Aurora/Batman shooting in the same paper, where I showed you these big investment groups used that hoax to apply pressure to billionaire Philip Anschutz, owner of Cinemark theaters—where the fake shooting took place. They wanted to take over his profitable companies (AEG), which they almost did. In a rare turn of events, Anschutz—after appearing whipped—suddenly gave himself a pep talk, drank a Gatorade, and leapt back into the ring swinging. He fired his Blackrock advisors and is now richer than he was then. But that is not how it usually happens.

In the modern world, hostile takeovers aren't just achieved with higher bids, shareholder pressure, or stock buyouts, they are achieved via black ops run against the opposing owners. Since some of the biggest billionaires control parts of the Intelligence apparatus, they can use a cadre of agents to run a project against the owner of a big company. I would say that is what is happening here with Weinstein. He is a lesser billionaire whose assets look tasty to the trillionaires.

Which means. . . the timing of this is no accident. A reader wrote in and asked me if the Weinstein story was meant to pull us off the Las Vegas story, and I said no. I told him it looked like to me both stories were meant to pull us off the truth, as usual. They are both misdirection from bigger things. But, they are also both *clues* to the bigger things, if you can look past the window dressing and dig a bit deeper.

So what is the link? Well, The Weinstein Company has had a distribution pact for its films with **MGM** since 2006. We saw MGM in the Las Vegas hoax as well. MGM Resorts runs the Mandalay Bay Casino. That is no coincidence. Since the Vanguard Group—one of the largest investment groups in the world—now owns a large part of MGM, it looks like the distributor is trying to take over the studio. First Vanguard swallowed MGM and now it wants Weinstein as well. This is how it chose to do that.

Since the two events are linked, it means some financial takeover is going on in Las Vegas as well. Something we didn't uncover in my paper on that. There must be more going on there than the body scanner business. Since Jim Murren recently sold his shares of MGM Resorts, to the tune of \$23 million, we have our first clue. Best guess is he knew the fake shooting was scheduled for October 1, and wanted to get out before the stocks tumbled due to bad publicity. But if that is true, then it indicates to me the stocks were *meant* to tumble. If the stocks temporarily tanked, it would provide the perfect opportunity for Vanguard to buy up more of them, increasing its total share. When they rose again, Vanguard would make huge profits. But then why didn't Murren wait it out and share that

profit? Best guess is he was told not to. He works for these people, you know, so he does what he is told. They apparently wanted his shares, and told him they could do it the easy way—where he got out early and kept his money—or the hard way, where they made him a target as well.

We will have to keep our eyes open to see if Weinstein, like Anschutz, finds a way to weather this, or whether he will cave into this pressure from Vanguard. Right now it looks like Vanguard is winning, but Weinstein may have something up his sleeve.

You will say, “Why doesn't Weinstein counter-attack, outing the trillionaires behind Vanguard and the entire project?” I don't know the full answer to that, but I suspect it is because that isn't the way these people work. The Jewish rules of combat apparently don't allow for that. Anything but the truth, you know. But seriously, I think it is because the entire modern world exists as managed façade, and all the billionaires rely on that façade. We have seen that again and again in previous papers, where both sides in these battles are dependent on the same great lies. They therefore have to limit their fights to specific financial matters, while agreeing to leave the greater structure unquestioned. That is to say, if Weinstein tried to publicize the true nature of his enemy, he would be publicizing his own at the same time, putting the entire machine into jeopardy. Besides, his enemy is the machine itself: they own the media and could probably block any revolutionary statement he planned to make. Most likely, they are blocking his smaller and less revolutionary responses right now. You never heard from Anschutz in the major media after the Aurora event did you? No, he had to buy or create his own outlet—Examiner.com—in order to tell his own side of the story. Possibly Weinstein will do a similar thing.

So that is the raw financial reading. But the Weinstein event serves double duty, since it also plays a part in the longstanding and ongoing “men are pigs” project. These major investment groups own everything now, and they have found that the greatest profits can be made from miserable people. Happy people don't spend as much, but miserable people are a goldmine. One of the best ways to keep people miserable is to keep them from having good sex and good relationships. So these investment groups have hired their people in Intelligence to run big projects targeting women. One of the biggest of these is the “men are pigs” project. If they can turn women off men, they can destroy the heterosexual relationship completely. They have a similar project for men, making them hate women, but since men have a lot of testosterone, that is harder to do. It is far easier to target women, since women have less testosterone and are somewhat easier to manipulate emotionally. So the “men are pigs” project is the major project for that reason. It went into high gear in the 1970s and has been accelerating every decade since then. The media is saturated with this blackwashing of the male sex, and you see it everywhere. Another reason I avoid all major media.

I encourage you not to fall for any of this. Tell all these actors in both events to take a hike. Find a good lover and cling to them. Stop buying all the lies and products. Bankrupt the mainstream media and then bankrupt the investment groups. Or, better, arrest them all, try and convict them, and march them off some Tarpeian Rock into the sea.

Addendum October 3, 2020: I tripped across [a video on youtube](#) that tends to confirm my reading here. It is from the 2000 Golden Globes, and it is Gwyneth Paltrow introducing Jim Carrey as best actor. She leads off by saying “It's not the same without you, Harvey!” with a huge smile on her face. This was indeed directed at Harvey Weinstein, who was sick that week and couldn't attend. Gwyneth was of course one of the most high-profile actresses who later accused Weinstein, being a “critical resource” of the *NYT*. [At first](#) she just accused him of being a bully, saying that she had shouting matches with him, but later she changed her story, accusing him of sexual harassment. You will say the sexual stuff came after 2000, but that is not the story we are told. We are told it happened on the

set of *Shakespeare in Love*, in 1998. So why was Paltrow still so chummy with Weinstein in 2000? Since Weinstein wasn't charged or convicted of anything to do with Paltrow or these other top actresses, those claims are all completely unsubstantiated, and therefore worthless. In 2020, Weinstein was allegedly convicted on only two counts with two women, neither of them top actresses. Claims by actress Rose McGowan were later contradicted by testimony of others.

After allegedly being accused by 106 women, Weinstein was taken to trial and allegedly convicted of raping or molesting only *two* women. But even so the reports of the trials prove they were faked. We are told six women testified against Weinstein, but since there were only five counts on trial concerning two women, that makes no sense. As I [have said before](#), in a real trial you don't open it up to all accusers. You are trying specific charges, so you would have testimony from the women Weinstein actually raped, or from witnesses with direct testimony on those crimes, not from everyone who had a gripe against Weinstein. Please consult my analysis of previous fake trials, including the gymnastics trials I just linked, the [Boston priest trials](#), the [Glen Ridge trials](#), the [Breivik trials](#), and the [Manson trials](#). Once you understand my points there, you will see why I don't buy the Weinstein trials. Also, this saga took place simultaneously with the similar Jeffrey Epstein saga, which was also fake. Even Ricky Gervais admitted he wasn't really dead, while hosting the Golden Globes. And no, he wasn't joking. Same for the [Bill Cosby trials](#), which were also faked for the same reason.

In addition, we aren't told exactly whom Weinstein was convicted of raping. Wikipedia tries to make it seem like it was Paz de la Huerta, but if we go to her page, we find it wasn't. Anyway, Paz is not a trustworthy source, in my opinion, since she has previously been convicted of harassment herself. She is the daughter of a Spanish duke and Judith [Bruce](#). She has been involved in other lawsuits, including one against the producers of *Nurse 3D* for allegedly injuring her and ruining her career. So she was a desperate case long before 2017.

Another way we know the trial was fake is that the statute of limitations had run out on several of the charges. We are told Weinstein was found guilty of rape in the third degree, but the defendant's story was from 2006, twelve years before he was charged in 2018. The statute of limitations in 2018 for rape in the third degree was five years. I will be told Cuomo raised the statute of limitations for that crime in 2019 to ten years, but even so it doesn't work out, both because the gap was 12 years, and because Weinstein was charged in 2018, *before* the new law went into effect. It was not retroactive, though I suspect they ran it through just to answer this Weinstein trial. You should find the timing suspicious regardless, and ask yourself what the odds are that Cuomo and the NY legislature would just happen to change these statutes at the precise time the Weinstein trial was in session.

Rape in the 3rd degree means in New York that no force was used (1st degree), and that incapacity due to drugs or alcohol was not a factor (2nd degree). So some other reason than incapacity to consent had to be found, though we aren't told what that was. Regardless, it makes no sense that Weinstein would be sentenced to 23 years for that. Both that and criminal sexual act are class E felonies, which puts them pretty far down the list. Any lower down and they would be misdemeanors. If this trial had been held in Europe, and had been real, the convicted person would get about a year in jail, if that. Even in New York, we see [here](#) that the normal sentence for class E felonies is “no jail to 4 years”. Also, Wiki tells us Weinstein was convicted of criminal sexual assault, but [New York has no such crime listed](#). It is “criminal sexual *act*”. So we have caught the mainstream changing words to make the crime sound different than what it was. No assault was included.

We have many more clues this is all a fake, including the usual numerology and onomastics at Wikipedia. Weinstein's attorney was allegedly named Charles [Harder](#). Chosen just for his name, no

doubt.

The London investigation has been dubbed Operation Kaguyak. Kaguyak is a huge Alaskan volcano, so we have more bad jokes here.

“More than 80 women had made accusations against Weinstein by October 31”. One charge was dismissed on October 11, 2018: aces and eights, Chai. Weinstein was found guilty on February 24, or 2/24. It adds to eight again. He was sentenced on March 11, or 3/11. He was sent to Wende on March 18, or 3/18.

We are also told Weinstein is being held at the Wende Correctional Facility, which is a maximum security prison. Why would a guy convicted of two class E felonies need to be at a maximum security prison? I guess he is in there with 2nd degree bail jumpers, 3rd degree marijuana sellers, and 2nd degree perjurers.