

# 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.