Title: Hypothesis on the Split/Dividend Issuance

Author: DoltBetterThanB4

Created 2022-07-16 03:04:27 UTC

Permalink: /r/DDintoGME/comments/w06hpd/hypothesis on the splitdividend issuance/

Url: https://www.reddit.com/r/DDintoGME/comments/w06hpd/hypothesis on the splitdividend issuance/

I posted this earlier, but an unfortunate misspelling in the title compelled me to delete and start over.

Is it possible that the major institutions/heavy hitters (prime brokers/MM's/banks/et al.) and the GME board have already considered and potentially agreed on how to reduce some of the fallout once this thing pops off...and could that have been a motivating factor in the split?

My thinking is that (hypothetically) if the first big leg upwards jumps up like 250%, is the market more able to absorb the shock as the ticker makes its climb from \$35 to \$123, rather than what it would *look* like if it ran from \$140 to \$490? This isn't a price anchor, and these numbers are nothing more than expanding the percentages based on today's numbers and some other crayon math.

All proportions remain the same as far as investor ownership in the company...but to the general public, the number next to the dollar sign just hits different than percentages, and I'm curious as to what may have been done to prevent the situation from making too much noise when (not if) this thing takes off.

EDIT: Put another way, there would be no major media coverage if a company's share price went from \$1 to \$3.50, because that roughly equates to the price of a cheeseburger, and that price point wouldn't likely capture anyone's attention...the percentage move is what's significant and is the idea around my post.

Does the adjusted split price mute some of the FOMO that would have otherwise occurred when the \$250-\$350-\$480 walls get broken, since that's the scale we've currently been trading on? Could that have been talked about among the adults in the room, knowing that this train is only picking up steam, in order to minimize the damage to pensions and state retirement plans because they had some exposure to the SHF's bad bet?