Title: On the matter of things with curious timing
Author: bongoissomewhatnifty
Created 2022-02-02 20:04:06 UTC
Permalink: /r/GME/comments/siydsk/on_the_matter_of_things_with_curious_timing/
Url: https://www.reddit.com/r/GME/comments/siydsk/on_the_matter_of_things_with_curious_timing/

The GME saga has been a ton of fun from both a stonk perspective, and from a subreddit and crowdsourcing perspective. Seeing the crowdsourcing that's gone into making a mega digital retard brain that snorts crayons for breakfast and buys the dip harder than Cramer at a coke party has been nothing short of sensational. The communal brain has caught so many small details, and is incredible at picking up on so many subtle things that otherwise go completely unnoticed by the general population.

One of the things that it has consistently picked up and pumps the thrills like a redneck in a mudpit is what I will refer to as **the matter of things with curious timing.**

These topics are wide ranging. They range from catching details like noticing every time XRT gets shorted, GME dips right after. And then doing the legwork to discover that the National Financial Services (Fudelity) is the listed counterparty in those XRT short deals. Individually, most of us probably never would have noticed how dirty Fudelity was in this whole scheme, but the initial tip off came from what we can refer back to as **the matter of things with curious timing.**

Specifically, when the initial push came to move hard away from Robinhood because of any number of reasons, who jumped in hot as "the most trusted broker?" None other than Fudelity! Which seemed suspicious, and low and behold after months of digging, it's become clear that they also happen to be the single largest lender of GME shares.

Some of the things discovered through the use of looking for **things with curious timing** are less sensational, and less unique to this sub, but I get just as much of a chub from them as everybody else does. Take Cramer's stock picks - it's no secret across investing subreddits that Cramer is clearly a mouthpiece for some large funds, and his stock picks are almost entirely efforts to either pump a funds long picks, or help them offload their bags. I got an enormous chub seeing him pump netflix and it's subsequent drop, and I got an even bigger chub with paypal.

Another **thing with curious timing** has been the enormous amount of confirmation bias the media has given us. Every time the stock looks to run, I start seeing an influx of articles about what a loser stock it is, and how the time to sell GME is now. TDA as we speak is running adds on yahoo finance, and being the good Samaritan here to let us know that GME stock is down right now and we should sell before it's too late. If that doesn't get your Jellies in a tingle I don't know what will.

I think one of the things that's helped us catch onto so many cases of **the matter of things with curious timing** is that many of us have gotten in the habit of habitually asking ourselves: **who stands to benefit from this objective?**

Which is why there are a few cases of **things with curious timing** that seem to be going unnoticed or called out that seem noteworthy to me, and worth talking about. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there seems to be a concentrated effort going into ***please don't even discuss the matter of this thing with curious timing*** for a few of these topics.

Without further ado, here are some **matters of things with curious timing** that are probably worth spending a minute thinking about: The great splitting of the subreddits. We left one GME sub due to mod drama and proceeded to get far worse mod drama, and then proceeded to make yet another split for even worse mod drama. We now have 3 different GME subs with significant user bases that heavily overlap. But the thing is, while it'd be easy to assume they're all about the same, this is not the case. Mods play a significantly more active roll in steering the direction of discussion within the subreddit than many people realize, and by splitting the subs up you may see 2 positions being advocated by 2 subreddits and a different position being advocated by a third, and not really stop and question it. I'm not really sure what the answer is here beyond "very careful scrutiny of mods, and very careful scrutiny of subs with active banhammers." The reality is, I'm against banning people for most reasons. People that are saying racist shit or advocating specific things that could cross the border into market manipulation for sure, but I'm not on board with banning people who simply think the stock isn't good. If my thesis for investing in GME can't stand up to scrutiny from some meltdowner telling me the stock is going back to $20 fast, I probably shouldn't be invested in the stock. Somebody telling me GME is shit doesn't really get my panties in a twist. I do get the need for striking a balance with banning bots and what I'll refer to as noisemakers who's goal is simply to distract from valuable information though.

My net verdict on this is to take what is being pushed on every subreddit with a grain of salt.

Which leads me to my next topic of conversation: why are mods actively promoting things? For instance, let's talk about some **things with curious timing** that may strike close to home and make some people uncomfortable. In April, Dr. Trimbath told us exactly how to fight naked shorting with a tool called direct registration. During this talk, she explained what computershare and direct registration was, and how to go about direct registering your shares. And it took *considerably* longer than it should have to catch on - in no small part because mods on the other subreddits were making actively false FUD posts about it - which ranged from it not being trustworthy to it being able to lend shares, or being likely to shaft you in the event of the big squeeze. I don't want to get accused of brigading because that's not the intent of this post, so if anybody wants evidence and specific mods you can PM me and I can link you to a good example post of what I'm talking about, but people who have been around for awhile probably already know who and what posts I'm referring to. So what happens next? We get more subreddit dilution, more mod drama, and another subreddit pops up to funnel off users and dilute the userbase. So what questions should you be asking yourself? **Who stands to benefit if people don't drs their shares, and why would you want to delay that effort? Who stands to benefit from diluting the userbase and adding to general noise?**

But, at this point in the story (we'll call it August/September/October range), the DRS conversation is really taking off, and moving on to the new subreddit, what's their angle? Control the narrative and push "only DRS shares for the infinity pool - everything else should stay with the trustworthy broker, fudelity" - I got perma banned for pointing out that it was a bad idea, and told "you're not a true ape" by the lead mod over there for suggesting 100% DRS long share positions. The question to ask here is pretty obvious. **Who stands to benefit if people only DRS a fraction of their shares? Why would mods push a stance advocating that people don't protect their shares and reduce pressure on SHF's at the same time?**

These battles have been losing battles for the SHFs so far, fortunately. DRS took off in a big way. It warms the cockles of my heart to see the determination going into DRS'ing everything possible right now. I'm pretty sure I'm going to see a "how to DRS your kidney and convert it to gamestop shares" post soon, and I couldn't be more excited.

Which leads me to my final topic of discussion for **things with curious timing**. This is the topic of countless amounts of DD, and the almost singular focus of the wrinkle brains for the past year. If you didn't like hearing that Mod's might not be gods, or might not be promoting things in your best interest (and to be clear, sometimes people are doing their best to look out for you, and they're just wrong. I'm not accusing mods of being shills), you're really not going to like hearing about **options.**

Virtually every piece of DD that's come out in the past year has suggested that the method for manipulating the stock price has come from the options chain. The DD has called out specific methods used, ways to create short positions they can mark as longs, figured out how they create more shares to borrow, how lending works, and gotten specific enough to the point where it's making reasonably accurate price movement predictions before they happen. And virtually every piece of DD suggesting options as a tool for leverage that can be used in retails favor has centered on advocating strategies like "**buy long dated ATM or ITM calls to exert leverage on the stock and give yourself breathing room. Do not buy short dated weeklies or OTM calls**"

Which is why I find it to be a **thing with curious timing** that as the stock price bottoms out, and we hit a point where it is theoretically the absolute best time to buy a long dated ITM or ATM call that would exert the most leverage on the SHF's and MM's facing exposure, we get a renewed push of "options are bad, DRS only" posts. And asking myself "**Who stands to benefit if retail buys fewer calls and exerts less upward pressure on the stock in the face of a runup?"** Keeps landing on the same people I land on every time.

Hedgies are omnipotent and can make the price do whatever they want is FUD, and also obviously false. If they could, the price would never have jumped to $483, or $350, or $350 again, or $250, or $250, or $250 again. GME would never have managed to make a share offering and raise capital and get out of debt, and their upper management wouldn't be promised a salary based on shares at $220. The price would have actually dropped to $20 fast. Or lower. And stayed there.

And the "options are bad" posts are full of misleading or even outright false information. Things like "if you can't exercise you might as well not even buy any" type stuff, and other utterly disingenuous claims that should make you think about reasons why they keep getting posted.

For example: say you don't have enough to buy 100 shares of GME trading at it's current price of $105. But you do have enough to buy two $105 strike calls for June, going for $27.43, (which means each call costs $2743 to exert 100 shares worth of leverage). Which exerts more upward pressure on the hedgies with exposure, you buying 52 shares of GME, or you exerting leverage to force MM's to buy 200 shares of GME? We know it's an illiquid stock and that upward pressure creates an exceptionally large movements.

And say we get a runup between now and June - I'll arbitrarily pick sometime in April, and the price goes up to $200. This isn't an outlandish prediction, as we saw pretty regular oscillations last year, so hopefully you're still with me and not jumping straight to (HE'S A SHILL!!!!). If you went with a "buy shares only", you could buy 52 shares of GME for your $5486. If you went with calls, your calls are now worth $14,200 (and the price of the underlying is $200). You now have enough to buy 71 shares of GME at the higher price of $200. You get to accumulate shares this way and GME keeps cycling and becomes more illiquid with higher and higher runups. You can even wait if you think we're gonna cycle again, and buy even more shares at an even lower price point.

The story gets even worse for the hedgies if we see the proverbial squeeze while you're holding calls. Because now your calls will be worth so much that you'll easily be able to sell one and exercise the rest. And if you're holding even more calls, instead of being able to exercise one of your calls, you'll be able to sell a single call to raise the funds to exercise all the others. The more calls there are on the chain that are ITM, the more hedging they have to do, and the riskier it becomes to not hedge. In either scenario, you end up with more shares than you started with, more shares than you could otherwise have bought, and exert more pressure on SHF's and MM's.

This isn't to say DRS is bad or that buying and holding isn't the way. There are clearly risks associated with options. If the price trades flat longer than you anticipate, you lose your money. If the stock gets a trading halt, you could see your options get wrecked. The rules governing options are looser, and more in MM's favor, meaning that you may see your options just arbitrarily closed if we get the squeeze. Going all in on options is extremely dangerous and high risk. But that doesn't mean they're bad, or that it's as good as giving money to hedgies. I think a "both and" solution is probably the answer here. But a renewed set of noise making posts on "Hedgies can make the price be whatever they want and options are bad and all of your money goes right to Citadel" right at the exact time that it would theoretically be one of the strongest times to buy calls based on the year of DD we've accumulated definitely seems like something that fits the **things with curious timing** archetype, and makes me question **Who stands to benefit if retail owns fewer calls during a runup?**

As per usual, this isn't advice. Make your own decisions. But any time I see the sub suddenly start pushing a united message without serious consideration first it makes the hair on my neck rise. And it makes my jellies tingle when it seems to contradict an entire year of DD. If you buy weeklies, you run some risks of things going sideways and losing everything, and this is a great strategy for people who want to lose everything and be idiots. If you buy 3-6 months out, associated risks are lower.