

STOP at NOTHING



by Miles Mathis

First published April 7, 2024

As usual, this is just my opinion, based on easy internet research

I just watched an Australian documentary from 2014 on Lance Armstrong called *Stop at Nothing*. It was for free at Youtube. I didn't know it existed until today. I saw some things in it that may have passed you by.

I am not accusing Lance of anything new here. I *know* nothing. The only evidence I have is what I will show you here, things I discovered for myself. I don't know anyone, no one gave me a tip, I have heard nothing through any grapevines, since I am not connected to any grapevines. I am just speculating. I am telling you what I have seen and you can come to your own conclusions.

But first, let's do a quick rundown of what *is* known. The documentary and other mainstream sources admit Lance is a pathological liar, a cheat, a fraud, and quite possibly a sociopath. He admitted doping in multiple ways on Oprah and admitted to lying about it for many years. He has claimed he had to since everyone else was, too, but it goes beyond that, since it is now known he also paid competitors to stand down. He tampered with witnesses. He perjured himself multiple times. He threatened people. Those aren't just the usual sports “transgressions”, those are crimes.

Just so you know, the reason many people have called him a sociopath or psychopath is that he is such a *convincing* liar. Normal people aren't very good liars, since their consciences are too strong. They break pretty quickly under pressure. Compare him to his teammates, who crumbled under the pressure of questioning. Lance never did, not admitting anything until *after* he had been banned and stripped. He will say that is just more proof he is a tough guy, but most psychologists will tell you that isn't how it works. It isn't toughness, it is a near-total self-absorption and a near-perfect disregard of society and its rules: hence the term sociopath. And let us be clear: Lance wasn't heroically breaking some irrational or unfair societal rules, like Jesus or Gandhi or something. He was breaking pretty sensible laws against rigging events for your own profit. In subsequent interviews, Lance has tried to spin these events by saying others benefitted from his crimes as well as himself: Trek made a lot of money and

cycling grew in the US, etc. But that's just rationalizing. A lot of people also made a lot of money on tobacco. A lot of money is being made on Fentanyl. That doesn't mean it is good. But that is what Lance does: he has this astonishing ability to worm himself out of any crime, reshining it as altruism, as if he was selflessly shooting up all these drugs so Trek could sell more bikes to kids.

If you wonder why sports doesn't get cleaned up, why things just get worse every year in that regard, this is why: beyond his loss of public opinion, Lance skated. He says they made an example of him, but they didn't. He never went to jail and paid minimal fines or restitution, keeping almost everything he had banked. He told Oprah he lost \$75 million, but that was *future* earnings. He lost his endorsements. But he never had to pay back all the money he had defrauded. They admit he made over \$125 million, and those around and behind him made many times that. Almost none of that was touched. So the message to young athletes remains what it was: **fraud pays**. Better to be rich and famous for 20 years than to never be famous, right? If you get rich enough, you can buy your way out of any hole. If you have contacts, you are pretty much impervious, and Lance proved that. In the documentary we see him with four Presidents, movie stars, and billionaires, and we can be sure he called in favors. As I showed in a previous paper, he is likely not just *an* Armstrong, he is from *the* Armstrongs, cousins of all the big names including the Stuarts. Like the rest of these people, he sold himself as coming from the streets, and someone in the documentary calls his upbringing "hardscrabble". I just laughed, since that is the usual line, but we have never found it to be true with these famous people.

You will say they banned him from cycling and stripped him of his titles. Meaningless, since he was already retired and you cannot erase the past. Those things already happened and the Tour de France officials cannot unhappen them. He was feted and famous for many years, and that is all an athlete gets regardless, real or fraud. Even famous athletes that have no big fall still retire, get old, and move out of the limelight. So young athletes will see all this and learn this lesson: it is definitely worth the risk. Let me be clear: that is not the right lesson to learn from this, but that is what they will see. You have to look deeper to see more, which is one reason I am here.

That Oprah interview is where I saw one of the clues that led me to this paper. Oprah jumps in immediately, asking Lance if he juiced. He admits it, including EPO, transfusions, steroids, the whole enchilada. But then she asks him about Betsy, the wife of his teammate Frankie Andreu, who testified against him. Betsy testified that when Lance was in the hospital with cancer, the doctors asked him if he had drugged, and he said yes, listing all the things he was doing. It was about the same as the Oprah list. But when Oprah asks him if Betsy was telling the truth, he balks. Although it would be admitting to the same list he just admitted to, he won't go there. I couldn't make any sense of that. Why was Lance refusing to talk about that? It obviously didn't have anything to do with the list of drugs, so it must have had something to do with the hospital. Why would he be drawing the line there? Tag that in your mind and let it simmer as we move on.

The other thing I keyed on in the film was a tape Greg Lemond made of a phone conversation he had with Lance's Oakley liaison Stephanie McIlvaine. McIlvaine was set to back up Betsy Andreu's story about the hospital in sworn testimony, but at the last minute changed her story, saying she knew nothing about it. It appeared Betsy was being thrown to the wolves until Lemond sent a copy of the tape to prosecutors, proving McIlvaine had lied on the stand. They actually play the tape in the documentary, and we can hear McIlvaine admitting that she knew Lance was doping, and that she was in that hospital room and heard it way back then. But that isn't what leapt out at me. It was when McIlvaine said this:

The part that pissed me off about the whole thing is how many people he has given false hope to. I think that is the most disgusting thing ever for someone to do. You know, coming from someone who has a child with a handicap, you look for hope and for strength, and for him to be doing that to those poor people who look up to him and honestly think he is doing this because he is just a superman.

Hmmmm. What did she just say? At first I couldn't make sense of it, because it seemed to come out of nowhere with no context. Why would McIlvaine say such a thing? It seems kind of mean-spirited of her on a first reading, doesn't it? How was he giving false hope to these kids with cancer? I didn't see it. Kids do beat cancer sometimes, so she wasn't talking about the kids. She seems to be telling us something about Lance, doesn't she? He is *not a superman*, she says. It seems there is something false about the cancer story, which may be why he didn't want to discuss the hospital story with Oprah. He didn't want to go there even for a second, because he didn't want anyone making any connections.

Then I noticed this line at Wikipedia:

In December 2008, Armstrong announced that Hansen was pregnant with the couple's first child. Although it was believed that Armstrong could no longer father children due to having undergone chemotherapy for testicular cancer, the child was conceived naturally.

Wow. That reminds us of Ted Bundy and Tex Watson, who allegedly had children while on death row with no conjugal visits. How does that work? It doesn't, and I have shown you it is the sign of a big fake. But here we find Lance having kids naturally at 37. So that would be a miracle beyond all the other miracles: not only does he survive stage-three testicular cancer in two months, his gonads somehow grew back twelve years later and he regained fertility!

Which leads us back to the section on his cancer at Wikipedia. Let's gloss that again, shall we? In late 1996, at age 25, two months after signing a \$2 million deal with the big French team Cofidis, Armstrong suddenly announced out of nowhere that he had stage-three testicular cancer. The cancer had already spread to his lymph nodes, abdomen, and brain, and his doctors gave him almost no chance of recovery. One day after diagnosis one testicle was removed, and three weeks later he underwent brain surgery to remove lesions. He began chemotherapy around the same time. His final chemo treatment was December 13, 1996, so he was in chemo for only about six weeks. The next month he was back in training camp. Even before that he was back on the bike, since we see video of him on rollers with his head still shaved and the big scars.

Hmmm. That was fast, wasn't it? Into and out of stage-three terminal cancer in just over two months? You may wish to ask your friendly neighborhood oncologist if he has ever heard of that, in anyone besides Lance Armstrong. And the reason Lance may not have wanted his audience to revisit that in the Oprah interview, is that some of them might have asked themselves this question: Lance has admitted being on every drug in the book *after* cancer, and he has now admitted doping back to 1993. His doctors asked him if he was doping, implying they thought the doping caused the cancer. And if that is true, it means Lance jumped out of chemo treatment and went right back on the cocktail of drugs that almost killed him?

Is that what you would have done? You lose a testicle, have your head split open and parts of your brain removed, the doctors tell you it was probably due to your drugging, so when you miraculously beat the cancer you go right back on the drugs? Does that make any sense to you?

I will be told that he only lost one testicle to cancer, so the other one survived and was fine. Which is how he later had more kids. Really? So the cancer was stage-three, moving into his lymph nodes, his abdomen, and all the way up to this head, but it didn't move to the other testicle 1mm away? I am pretty sure there is no impenetrable wall between my two testicles. They are nestled right there together in the same sac, so if one goes gamey with cancer, I doubt the other one is going to escape unscathed.

Then we have this little problem. **Hair doesn't grow over scar tissue.** Yes, if it gets long it will cover the bald lines, but if your hair is short the lines will still show. We saw that with Obama, where his sutures showed through his very short and thinning hair as he got older. That was mysterious enough,



since they have never explained why Obama has multiple large sutures on his skull. Has he had brain surgery? Did he have encephalitis at some point in the past, with them having to open up his skull to relieve the pressure? We don't know. And I am not making this up: *The Daily Mail* in London [reported on it](#) in 2011, asking the same questions I am asking here. But with Lance we have the opposite problem: he should have visible scars, and we know exactly where to look, but we don't see them. His hair is often cut short enough we should see them, but we never do. He has very thick growth all over. You will say it is a wig but it isn't. I have seen him up close in person and it isn't a wig. Or at least it wasn't twenty years ago.

Let us also remind ourselves that the biggest wall Lance hid behind all along was this cancer thing. He used it to generate sympathy and stop all questions, and then he used his cancer foundation to do the same thing. He was now a big philanthropist, so it shielded him from scrutiny. Rich people have been using philanthropy for just that purpose for centuries, so it is known to be a gambit that works. People buy it.

We also know that the Lance Armstrong story was not organic. He didn't come out of nowhere and his rise wasn't a matter of fortune or accident. It was all planned and scripted, with competitors paid to get out the way, officials bribed to look the other way, and a huge team of promoters behind him from the beginning. All this was already in place well before 1996, since Lance had already won the million-dollar bonus in 1993, kicking back \$100,000 to Gaggioli to stand down. He was on drugs at least by 1993. So walk with me. What if one of these promoters said,

Look, we are about to take this drugging thing to a whole other level. And if we get caught drugging, it will point at racketeering, since we aren't just drugging, we are conspiring to rig

the entire sport for our own benefit. So we also need a next-level quality diversion. A wall to block questions and generate sympathy for our man. Lance has a testicular torsion* and it looks like he will lose that testicle, so let's say it was cancerous. He can shave his head and we can draw a scar on him, it is done all the time in Hollywood. We'll show him in a hospital bed looking all sad, then he can jump up a couple months later and claim a miracle recovery. It will bring tears to their eyes.

I am not saying that is what happened. Maybe it did, maybe it didn't. But it does remind us of this further little problem with the film we have seen. I didn't realize we had all this footage from the hospital, but they show some of it in the documentary. At first that film seems to corroborate the story, since you see it with your own eyes. You see the shaved head, the scars, and the hospital bed. But then I asked myself this: if I am Lance and I have just been told I have stage-three cancer and almost no chance of survival, am I going to hire a film crew to come in and document my final horrible days wasting away in the hospital, looking my absolute worst? I can't think of anyone who would do that. If you are dying, the last thing you want is a film crew following you around. Plus, what is the point of filming it, **unless you know for sure you are going to make a miraculous recovery**. You will tell me Lance was just that confident: he knew for an absolute certainty he would beat this and become famous for it, so he wanted to have it all on celluloid. Maybe, but I doubt it.

Some will say, "Nobody would be low enough to fake having cancer, just to create sympathy". Really? I have known other people to do it, and I remind you this is Lance Armstrong we are talking about. Plus, I am just basically saying the same thing Stephanie McIlvaine said. Again:

The part that pissed me off about the whole thing is how many people he has given false hope to. I think that is the most disgusting thing ever for someone to do. You know, coming from someone who has a child with a handicap, you look for hope and for strength, and for him to be doing that to those poor people who look up to him and honestly think he is doing this because he is just a superman.

Do you see what she was saying now? Have the scales dropped from your eyes?

Plus, I am not suggesting he faked the cancer *just* to create sympathy. As you are about to see, there is so much we haven't been told about this story, even skipping the cancer angle. It is another rabbit hole that no one has yet been down.

I will be told his doctors can testify he did have cancer. You mean the doctors who have already perjured themselves with Stephanie McIlvaine, saying Betsy Andreu's story was false when it was true?

So let's use that first section to broaden our critique a bit. I said above that Lance didn't get what he had coming to him. He skated, assuring that sport would not be cleaned up. So what did he have coming to him?

I have had people tell me athletes have been cheating since the beginning. Anquetil was looking for any advantage back in the 1950s and Merckx was on every drug he could lay his hands on in the 1970s (Lance claims Merckx is the one who introduced him to drug pimp Michele Ferrari). Olympic athletes were chewing bull testicles in ancient Greece, so they knew about testosterone even then. These people tell me we just need to quit testing and let them ride. Which we pretty much have in all sports.

My answer to that was this: “So, should we quit testing for motors in bikes?” He was just like, “What?” Like him, you may not know that was the next step after EPO and transfusions: hidden motors in the bikes. And yes, they have been around since the time of Armstrong, so we don't know he didn't use them as well. We don't have any proof he did (that I am aware of), but we don't have any proof he didn't. Motors are the perfect answer to this let-them-ride argument, since they obviously end the sport of cycling. It is no longer cycling, it is motorcycling. My point being this is what happens when you turn a blind eye to corruption: it quickly snowballs until it destroys everything in its path. I could have also used this answer: “So, should we also quit outlawing racketeering, bribery, extortion, blackmail, and conspiracy?” Since that is also all going on in all sports. Let-them-ride then becomes let-the-syndicates fix everything for maximum profit to a few scumbag old families and the glory of their sociopathic children.

I remind you that has happened not just in cycling, but in football, baseball, track and field, and all other sports: a complete and utter meltdown, where just about everyone now looks juiced, down to the little girls in gymnastics. Nor is it just a matter of juicing. It a matter of fixing the outcomes.

Of course this doesn't just apply to sports, it applies across the board, to our entire Modern existence, which is now so corrupt it passes all belief. And the corruption is pouring down on society from the top. I doubt we have enough jails to house all these sociopathic criminals, and jails don't work anyway, so I would suggest we try something else. Armstrong and all his associates and handlers and everyone like them in all fields need to be put into receivership, all assets seized as stolen property, and then permanently quarantined on some remote island, maybe Greenland. Only then will we be saved from their further corruption.

And we don't need to be taxed to house them there, either. I say we just drop them off with some warm clothes, rifles, ammunition, and maybe some saws and nails. We can keep an eye on them with aerial recon, to be sure they don't build any boats.

You will say that seems a little extreme, especially in the case of Lance, who just cheated at a sport. No, get this through your head, he didn't just cheat at a sport where everyone else was cheating. He was the most visible person in a huge racketeering scheme to take over the sport of cycling and reap gigantic profits by dishonest means. Even if we don't include the cancer foundation in that, the mainstream story admits what the Armstrong team did was racketeering:

Racketeering is a type of organized crime in which the persons set up acoercive, fraudulent, extortionary, or otherwise illegal coordinated scheme or operation (a "racket") to repeatedly or consistently collect a profit.

The Australian documentary acts as an extended match to that definition from Wikipedia. So how is it that Armstrong and those behind him were never prosecuted for racketeering by either French or US authorities? Don't ask Wiki that question, since they are still whitewashing the whole thing for Armstrong today. They have three long pages on Armstrong, but they have only one line on the federal prosecution case:

On February 2, 2012, U.S. federal prosecutors officially dropped their criminal investigation with no charges.

I found that line and then backtracked to read about the prosecution: who were the prosecutors and what were the possible charges? Surprise, there is nothing there. Wiki skips right over it as if it never

happened. Finally, I noticed a link to a separate page “Lance Armstrong doping case”. So they have two pages on this? “Lance Armstrong doping case” and “History of Lance Armstrong doping case”? What's the effing difference? But although the second page has a subsection titled 2010-2012 federal inquiry, it is almost empty. Zero information on the case. They admit that *Velonews* filed a FOIA request in October of 2012, in response to the strange dropping of the case, but we have no updates to the page since then. I also found nothing at *Velonews*, implying the FOIA request was ignored for some reasons not given. Same thing on the other page, which ends by telling us Armstrong was fighting to avoid paying back prize money. And how did that turn out? Wiki pretends not to know. The only thing I could discover was that the Dept. of Justice sought \$100 million from Armstrong for defrauding the taxpayers, but settled for \$5 million in 2018. So the usual 5% fine, which wouldn't even cover interest Armstrong had earned on that money over 15 years.

They do however tell us this at Wiki:

The Andreus' allegation was not supported by the eight other people present, including Armstrong's doctor Craig Nichols, [39] or his medical history. According to LeMond, he had recorded a conversation, [40] transcribed for review by NPR, in which Armstrong's contact at Oakley, Inc., Stephanie McIlvain, corroborated Betsy's account. However, McIlvain contradicted LeMond's allegations and denied under oath that the incident ever occurred.

How do you like that spin? The Andreu's allegation (“allegation”, not “eyewitness testimony under oath”) was not supported. Except that it WAS supported by McIlvaine, who is on tape supporting it. How can McIlvaine contradict LeMond and herself when LeMond has her on tape? But notice Wiki says McIlvaine testified under oath, not that she “alleged”. So this is spun heavily against the Andreus and LeMond and for McIlvaine by Wikipedia. Why? I think you know.

When discussing the eyewitness testimony by all of Armstrong's fellow riders like Landis, Andreu, Hincapie, and Hamilton, Wiki does it again, saying there is no documentation to prove their “claims”. This is eyewitness testimony by people who were there, so no documentation is required. What kind of documentation would you expect? Do you think the team had a court reporter taking shorthand of all their conversations? Do you the team had CCTV footage of every bathroom break and dodge into a Winnebago?

With some more digging, I was able to discover that the federal investigation was led by Jeff Novitzky, who is now senior vice president for athlete performance at the UFC. You have to laugh. Because of course no one at UFC is on PEDs. They are too pure to even consider it. Wiki tells us Novitzky has been credited with “changing the face of sports”. Making it wider, more chiseled, and with more acne, I guess. Another one Novitzky went after was Barry Bonds, in the famous Balco scandal, so how did that turn out? Oh yeah, another skate. He was initially indicted on nothing but perjury and obstruction for lying to a jury, but both charges went nowhere. The perjury was dropped and the obstruction was overturned on appeal. So Bonds is “clean”. Wiki assures us he is one of the greatest of all time. All his records stand. How did he manage that? Well, his mother is a Howard, so that may be one answer, I don't know. The Howards are first cousins to the Stuarts, remember. Seeming to confirm that, we find his maternal line scrubbed at Ethnicelebs, and his mother scrubbed completely at Wikitree. I found no page at Geni or Geneanet. She is also scrubbed at Instantcheckmate, where she is related to no Howards. Very strange. Barry's middle name is Lamar, leading in the same direction. He is also related to Whitneys and Kleines, ditto. Just so you know, Barry Bonds' godfather Willie Mays is also a Howard. Most likely this also links us to Howard University.

But back to Lance. I finally found several sources, [including the New York Times](#), saying the 2010 federal investigation was for defrauding the government, drug trafficking, [money laundering](#), and conspiracy. Which confirms what I just told you. Those things together define racketeering. The thing that jumps out at me there is the money laundering. How was this potentially money laundering, you have to ask yourself. It couldn't have been through the prize money or the endorsements, so the only thing I can figure is that they were investigating money laundering through the cancer foundation. That would be the natural and easy way to launder money. Which is probably why we never get any details on this investigation.

This is also suspicious: the case in which Lance ended up paying \$5 million of a \$100 million lawsuit was a whistleblower lawsuit initiated by Floyd Landis. So it was also not what you would expect. Given that Armstrong was being sponsored by the US Postal Service, ie the government, you would have expected the government itself to go after him for fraud. And the government does not have to go through the courts to do that. In other words, no one needed to *sue* Armstrong, since the federal government has its own prosecutorial authority. You will say that is what the Novitzky investigation of 2010 was, but he was a special agent of the FDA. Call me crazy, but the FDA does not seem like the right agency to be investigating fraud against the USPS. You would expect FBI or Justice, or with drugs involved maybe DEA. Having this come out of FDA just seems like another joke.

Then there is the whole never-answered question of why the US Postal Service would be sponsoring a mostly-European bicycle team. A sponsor is normally an advertiser, but the USPS does not require advertising. Everyone already knows who they are and what service they provide. I will be told they were seeing stiff competition from UPS and Fedex, but sponsoring a Tour de France team hardly seems like the best way to address that. So this is just as suspicious as the rest. The whole thing looks like yet another inside job, so the money laundering may have been through this Postal Service sponsorship, with someone in government funneling money out of the Treasury and through the sponsorship, making the money look clean.

Remember, the sponsorship of a bicycle team should not be a huge enterprise. You have nine riders, some bicycles, a support group, and a couple of team cars. Bicycles were far cheaper 25 years ago, before carbon took over. So it is hard to understand how Lance and the team were accused of defrauding taxpayers of hundreds of millions over the years. There is so much we haven't been told. The US Postal Service was a sponsor, not just an endorser, so they weren't just buying their name on the jerseys and bikes. They should have had a piece of the action, meaning that if the team did well some of their earnings should have flowed back to Postal. An endorsement like this should have been an *investment* for the taxpayers, not just a full loss. But of course these things never are. The taxpayer never wins.

Here is another clue in that direction. When Lance retired in 2005, US Postal became. . . team [Discovery Channel](#). My readers know the Discovery Channel is a CIA front, which tells us that after 2004 this was basically Team CIA. Which tells us it may have been team CIA from the beginning, explaining who exactly was using it to launder money. And why Novitzky at FDA dropped his investigation with no charges. CIA outranks FDA, it goes without saying.

That begins to explain everything, doesn't it?

If that is what we have been looking at all along, it means Lance was just the frontman and talking head of this huge operation, paid to take fire as much as anything. We have been expected to believe he was this amazing businessman on top of everything else, running these huge enterprises in his spare time,

but no one really believed it. Or at least I didn't.

Which brings us to Tailwind Sports, which owned the team. Lance has been caught in lies here as well, at first saying he owned a 10% stake, but later denying it, saying he was just an employee and nothing more. So that's as suspicious as everything else. Tailwind has remained in the shadows, with Lance and the other riders taking all the heat. This would explain Lance's appearance on *Oprah*, keeping eyes on him and the drug charges and off these bigger questions and bigger fish. Tailwind was founded in 1986 in Austin, with key players listed a Bill Stapleton, Thomas Weisel, and Barton Knaggs. [CorporationWiki has a page on Tailwind](#) and each of these guys, and we find Stapleton linked to Austin YMCA through Paul Hoffman and Rallyhood Inc. Also a link to Brian Cooper and Rio Grande ATX Investments. Rallyhood, like SCA Promotions, is another one of those nebulous promotional corporations whose websites give any sensible person the willies. Just from a few minutes of browsing I would say we are looking at another web of CIA-front entities. The feeling I got from Rallyhood is that the CIA is now crouching behind the YMCA and the Girl Scouts, which would not surprise anyone. I come across websites like this all the time in my research, and they always give me a sinking feeling, because through them you can feel the spooks nesting in every cranny. They are like insects living in the walls and subfloors and a trillion subterranean passageways, and if you put your ear to the ground you can hear them coughing and chewing and scurrying in the dirt.

Anyway, Stapleton is listed in 23 companies at CorpWiki, though we can see only the first eight without signing up. Stapleton's latest entry at LinkedIN is his company the Laurel Group, which is an executive search firm, I guess a fancy name for a headhunter. Stapleton has links to Aspen, so he is highly connected. One of those connections is easy to make, since his partner at Laurel is John McAvoy, a capital manager previously a bigwig at [Credit Suisse](#). Until 2008, he was [Global Head of Hedgefund Coverage](#) there. So just the sort of person we were expecting to find here. McAvoy may or may not be connected to our events here, but the guys at Tailwind are connected to the big banks in other ways, including through [Trilantic](#), a private equity firm that specializes in leveraged buyouts and growth capital. Meaning. . . more bad news. Turns out, Trilantic was formerly Lehman Brothers, so we now have the possibility the Armstrong saga is linked to the Lehman Brothers saga. Lehman went under in 2008, at the very same time Lance was going under. Coincidence? Only more research will tell, but you can already see this is the line to take. We always knew there was a deeper pool behind Armstrong, and we are finally beginning to sound it. It is the banks, of course.

Thomas Weisel is another clue in that direction, perhaps the biggest, since although I am not allowed to view his page at LinkedIN, Wikipedia has a page on him, where we learn he is the head of Thomas Weisel Partners investment bank, San Francisco. This firm was launched almost simultaneously with Lance's rise in 1999, by Thomas and other personnel from Montgomery Securities.

In 1997, Thom Weisel helped to orchestrate a \$1.3 billion acquisition of Montgomery Securities by NationsBank.[1] The following year, however, NationsBank acquired BankAmerica Corp, which itself had acquired Technology-based rival Robertson Stephens. A culture clash and fight for control ensued at the newly combined investment banking units of what is now known as Banc of America Securities.[1] In the process, senior bankers from Montgomery Securities secured backing from the Silicon Valley Venture Capital community and left to form their own venture: Thomas Weisel Partners.[1]

Ah, so that's just what we were looking for. Weisel is one of the three main guys behind Tailwind, though he normally hides behind Stapleton. You can see why. You may be interested to know that Weisel Partners were diversifying into healthcare in 2000. Hmmm. Who else was diversifying into

healthcare at that time? Lance Armstrong, with his cancer foundation and Livestrong. The Livestrong brand was launched in 2003. Just a coincidence? Whatever you say.

But just be advised: this would again explain why Novitzky's investigation went nowhere. Like the CIA, the banks are normally immune from serious prosecution. They certainly can't be touched by the FDA.

Someone else will have to continue that investigation, since I am not interested in it. But I have shown you the right tunnels to go down. I don't think it will do you any good, though, or at least not until after the revolution. Neither my investigation nor yours will touch their immunity, and I would say there is absolutely no chance the government will reopen any investigation into this. No elected officials, including Trump, will ever go after the bankers, and even if he did there are far bigger crimes to start with than this one.

So let's return to Lance and finish this off. We know Lance himself hasn't learned anything from this, since he was still selling himself as a poor victim in 2020 in the three-hour [ESPN documentary](#), which is so slanted in his favor we might assume he bankrolled it. For instance, he says

"I've told you numerous times, I wouldn't change a thing," the final sentiments on how Armstrong perceives the fickleness of who is and isn't held to account for his generation's sins as flawed.

"When I look at Jan's [Ullrich] situation and I look at my situation, because they're very similar, the timing is very similar... he had all the things I had. He had a wife, children, money, and that wasn't enough to keep him together.

"And the fucking sport did it to him. And the media let him do it.

"The country of America idolises, worships, glorifies George Hincapie, invites him to races, gives him jobs, buys his shit and they disgrace and destroy me. That's why I went [to visit Ullrich], because that's fucking bullshit."

As for the last example, Armstrong had already answered an hour earlier why he is scapegoated above all.

Yeah, Armstrong is still trying to sell the idea he is a scapegoat, a sacrificial lamb on the altar of cycling. Boo hoo. But knowing what we now know, we have to consider the possibility this is the continuation of a long act, with Armstrong knowingly playing a part assigned to him. His job has always been to keep our eyes on him and off these other people like Weisel, and if that is what is going on you have to admit he has done a pretty good job of it. Here we are ten years on, Lance still has his money and his yellow jerseys hanging on his walls, and any time the subject comes up all eyes remain on him. Absolutely no one ever pulled on these other strings.

*I know about this because I am a cyclist and I have had a torsion. I didn't lose my testicle, but I was told that if I hadn't come in within 24 hours for surgery, I would have. The testicle dies very quickly without blood.