

[return to updates](#)

THE BILL COSBY STORY IS ALL FICTION



Miles Mathis

First published November 28, 2019

As usual, this is just my opinion.

I won't call anyone a liar here, I will simply say I no longer believe any part of this story, from either side. They can tell us these stories, but we don't have to believe them. Always remember that. No one can ever accuse you of defamation for saying "I don't believe you". You are forever and completely free to disbelieve.

As usual, I don't believe the stories because they don't make any sense. The accusations aren't consistent, sensible, or believable; the trials weren't consistent, sensible, or believable; and the after-trial reports haven't been believable, either. While reading this stuff or listening to it on the news, we have the same feeling we have had again and again, when in the midst of Langley-written theater productions. I have shown you [dozens of prominent and fake trials](#) camped in the middle of prominent and fake events, and this is how this one reads again. It has all the tell-tale signs.

As just the first example, we always see Cosby smiling while coming out of trial or going to jail. Like the Sandy Hook actors, he can't keep a straight face. Why would he be smiling? He allegedly has been dragged into court over and over across two decades for these ridiculous charges. So what's to smile about?

As another example, look at his prime accuser, the person he allegedly assaulted 15 years ago:



We know she is an ex-basketball player, which explains why she is so tall. But why is her neck so large? Something looks very wrong there to me. Her windpipe also looks very large and manly, and we find ourselves checking for an Adam's apple, don't we? We see in video that she also walks like a man. She almost looks like she is transitioning, though we can't say for sure in which direction. The way she dresses is also a dead-giveaway, in my opinion, with the Annie Hall or Camille Paglia sports-coat look. So we have a lot of obvious signs screaming "lesbian". Which means we should ask ourselves why Cosby would be "assaulting" this Amazon lesbian. She is taller and more muscular than he ever was, and could very likely kick his old ass in a heartbeat. So she doesn't seem like the sort of person any sane man would pick for a date-rape. I would be afraid she would come to my door once the pills wore off and beat me senseless. Put simply: this isn't the kind of woman that men prey on. Even if they are bad guys, flabby old men like Cosby don't target giant lesbian athletes. I shouldn't have to be here telling anyone this. Which means this was part of the test: you are always being tested with these fake stories, to see what you will believe. They want to see if your eyes are open, so they give you these obvious clues. Are the drugs working, or are you still awake?

We saw a similar thing with the [Harvey Weinstein stories](#): he has been accused of molesting many women, but it is doubtful he likes women to start with. Which is why the story is such a hoot for insiders. Those who fake these stories have to keep themselves amused.

For another clue, we look to 22-year-old lead juror Harrison Snyder, [who was interviewed by ABC](#) after the 2018 trial and conviction. He says he voted for conviction due to Cosby's own "deposition", in which Cosby allegedly *admitted* he gave many young women quaaludes in order to have sex with them. What? Do you think that someone who pled not guilty would state in testimony that he was guilty? How stupid are we supposed to think Cosby is? Remember, Cosby doesn't have to say anything in court. He has the right to remain silent. This was a criminal trial, not a civil trial, so Cosby could always plead the 5th. So I don't understand why he was on the stand in the first place. It was up

to the prosecution to prove a case, and the defense should have had it easy here, since Constand had already been caught changing her story over and over. This was the second trial on the same charges, and in the first one Constand had been made a fool of by defense. That's why the jury failed to convict. ABC even admits that in this after-trial interview with Snyder. They address Constand's multiple stories by telling us they were explained away by a psychologist, who told the jury this is normal for women who have been raped. So we are supposed to believe those who have been raped can't remember when it happened, on what day or what time, or any of the details? That's convenient, isn't it? Because that means if a woman gets caught in multiple story inconsistencies, she can always call in a psychologist to tell the jury it is normal. You can't expect any consistency from women, apparently, which means you can never catch them in a lie.

But I encourage you to watch Snyder closely in this interview. He also comes across as a very weird person. He never blinks, for one thing. He impresses one as a complete moron, since he admits he doesn't know anything about anything. He never watches the news, didn't know anything about Cosby, didn't know what #MeToo was, etc. And yet this is the sort of person we want making life decisions about those indicted? A 22-year-old blob who appears stoned and knows nothing is chosen as lead juror for this trial? The interviewer asks if he believed Constand. Yes. Did he believe the other ladies? Yes. Well, that rules him out as a rational person from the start. I have read their testimony and I wouldn't trust any of them to tell me the correct time.

As just one example, we are told Cosby took Constand back to his own home, where he gave her a pill for her anxiety, telling her it was Benadryl. What? Since when is Benadryl an anti-anxiety medication? Its an antihistamine, and everyone knows that, even a 31-year-old basketball coach. All it will do besides clear her nose is make her sleepy and possibly dizzy—not what you want on a date. Plus, when was the last time you went over to a new friend's house and started popping unknown pills he gave you? Anyone who does that is just asking for trouble and will get no sympathy from me. So we have the writers at Langley stirring your mind here with absurdities. They know if they stack enough of these idiotic claims on top of each other, you will stop asking questions.

Notice that they admit Cosby didn't secretly slip her a rooie in a drink or something. She *willingly* took a pill that he gave her, and she admits that. So she's alone with this old guy *who is not a doctor* and is taking pills he is giving her. I just wanted to be sure you were clear on that.

Another thing I noticed in that video is that when Cosby is walking out of court (min. 1:52), his attorney has to take his hand and guide him, as if he can't think for himself. Since Cosby is now past 80, we have to ask if he even knows what is going on. He may have Alzheimer's and may think he is just making a movie—which he pretty much is. I encourage you to listen closely to Cosby's alleged [interview from prison](#). The excerpts they allow us to hear are all gibberish. He sounds like a guy who doesn't know where he is or what he is saying. They have to cut him off and give us most of it in printed quotes. Nonetheless I beg you to notice the part where he tells you “the jury were imposters”. Yes, they were. But so was everyone else.

Another thing that makes no sense is those five other women brought in to testify against Cosby. I send you back to [my analysis of the USGymnastics trials](#), where a similar thing happened. This isn't how real trials work. Witnesses for the prosecution should be limited to people who can testify about the charges that are up for trial, not to air new charges. In other words, if someone witnessed Constand woozy the morning after, or took her to the hospital, or witnessed injuries, then that person might be called as a witness for the prosecution. But these other women should have separate cases, which must be tried separately. Since their accusations have not been proven or otherwise decided by a court or

judge, their testimony is just hearsay, and should not be allowed. This is because there is no way for the jurors to judge their testimony. Why should Snyder or anyone else believe them? To judge their stories, those stories should be aired under cross examination, with someone taking the other side. Only then can the jurors judge the worthiness of their stories. But in a case like this, that wouldn't be possible, since Cosby's defense would then have to investigate all five women. The defense attorneys should not have to do that, since they have enough to do in defending Cosby on the charges actually on record. Since Cosby was not being charged for the crimes alleged by the other women, their testimony should not have been heard here.

Knowing that, you should take it back to Snyder saying he believed the women. That question and answer session should make you very suspicious, since it should look planted to you. You should ask yourself *on what basis* Snyder believed them. What was his reason for believing them? They seemed trustworthy? That isn't a legal basis for believing someone. It isn't a rational reason. You should believe them only because they have been fiercely cross examined, and have survived that cross examination with flying colors. That didn't happen here, which is evidence the entire trial was a fraud.

Another clue in that direction [is that the trial judge Steven O'Neill](#) failed to file a post-trial opinion for at least a year. At that *USAToday* link, you can see that Cosby's attorneys are saying they can't appeal until that is filed. So they are filing bail motions instead. More BS, since if O'Neill really failed to file an opinion, that wouldn't delay an appeal, it would be *cause* for appeal. Does it make any sense to you that a judge could stall an appeal just by refusing to file his opinion? Of course not. Judges have to file their opinions in a timely manner. If they don't, they would not only open themselves to appeal, they would open themselves to being fired or impeached.

A final problem is the “[aggravated indecent assault](#)” charges. If you weren't following me until now, this should seal it for you. You should have asked yourself why, if what we are told is true, Cosby wasn't tried for **rape**. Why “aggravated indecent assault”? When I first saw those charges, I thought, hmmm, was Cosby accused of causing her severe bodily injury? I thought he was just accused of drugging her and having his way. But the word “aggravated” in conjunction with “assault” normally means “causing severe bodily harm”. It is used for when a rapist not only rapes, but also beats up his victim. Also, Cosby was convicted of three counts of this, but was only given 3-10 years of a possible 30-year-sentence. If the assault were really aggravated, and he was really convicted, he should have gotten more than 3 years (as you know, it is the lower end of these sentences that normally gets served, due to “jail overcrowding” or other excuses). Anyway, this wasn't adding up, so I looked up the term. As it turns out, it is a statutory charge [that is unique to Pennsylvania](#). **And indeed, that is where Cosby's trial was.** Take that link and you will see that the term only applies to a child under the age of 16. Since Constand is now 46 and the event happened in 2004, we do the simple math. She was 31. Therefore, [it is legally impossible](#) that Cosby was charged with “aggravated indecent assault” in Pennsylvania in 2018. The trial was another fake.

This leaves us with two possibilities, as I see it: either Cosby is in on this con, or he is an addled old man being used by the directors. But in the second case, his family would have to be in on the con, which adds up to the same thing. Either way, it looks to me like another great lake of nastiness, dreamed up by the usual suspects to drive ahead their agendas. The agenda here is the same one I have covered many times: the men-are-pigs, split-the-sexes project. Single people spend far more money than happy couples, so the merchants don't want happy couples anymore. They want you home alone and miserable, cramming your face full of pills, and binge-buying from Amazon, Ebay, and every other online outlet down to Pornhub. They have many ways of achieving this, but the spearhead is aimed at women. They want women to think men are all ogres, monsters, psychopaths, and potential or actual

rapists and child molesters. If they can break the link from the female side, it is broken no matter what men think of the matter.

And that is where we are. And *why* we are there.

But if this is all theater, why fail to convict him at first, then convict him later in a second trial? **To draw it out as long as possible.** They need this to remain in the headlines for many years, so they can't fake it too fast. This isn't their first rodeo, you know. They have been pulling these stunts for centuries. See my paper on the [Salem Witch trials](#), or—if you like—the [Lindbergh baby](#) kidnapping. They drew the Lindbergh case out as long as they could, because it was *meant* to cover up more important real news that should have been in the papers. Same for the O. J. Simpson trials. These newer trials are part of men-are-pigs, but they are also a diversion. They keep you occupied with these sexy fake events, so that you never notice or question real events going on in the world all around you. Your eyes are on fake Trump impeachments or fake celebrity show trials or fake Epstein deaths or fake Pizzagate scandals or fake rocket launches or fake foreign wars, so your eyes are off the worldwide treasuries being looted year-to-year and month-to-month and day-to-day, ever more brazenly. They want you to forget you are being robbed in broad daylight, and that no one is being prosecuted. Somehow that never makes the news. Or, it flashes by occasionally, when you are told of a LIBOR scandal or something, but mysteriously it fades from sight, drowned out by the media circus, and you forget to ask for an update. So, trillions were looted from worldwide treasuries. . . what then? Oh that's right, nothing. Nothing happened, except your Congressperson voting to raise the debt ceiling so that more could be stolen.