Title: Why we didn't see the big "cycle" run-up this month, but it still happened right under our noses.
Author: ZaddyToTheMoon
Created 2022-03-02 16:05:29 UTC
Permalink: /r/GME/comments/t53dvo/why_we_didnt_see_the_big_cycle_runup_this_month/
Url:
https://www.reddit.com/r/GME/comments/t53dvo/why_we_didnt_see_the_big_cycle_runup_this_month/

Ladies and gents,

Think for a sec. Why didn't we see the big boom boom for our beloved GME that everyone was expecting? The obvious answer is they know that we know.

So why then would Kenny and co. just keep the same gameplan and let her rip on or near the 23rd again, when that's what we're expecting? They wouldn't. Did we not learn that lesson in November when they covered the run early, confused everyone, then hit us with a rugpull on the 23rd?

They're constantly changing the gameplan to keep investors confused, guessing, and discouraged.

So how did they do it this past 3 months? **They spread and scattered the covering over a longer period of time and shorted simultaneously.**

Take a look at the volume as well as highs vs. lows and open vs. close dating back to early January:

[GME Volume Data](https://preview.redd.it/833zioq3uzk81.png?width=1273&format;=png&auto;=webp&s;=d3061522c08c58b98dace55a09c3e755a4b8031c)

[GME Volume Data](https://preview.redd.it/pdgiq846uzk81.png?width=1319&format;=png&auto;=webp&s;=1da5fe86860d2c9a8a3df329a3ddabbafb0d68af)

I'm going to start cherry picking some date ranges here:

1/5/22 - 1/11/22: 29.68M Volume. On the 6th, a spread of $16. The 7th, we all know what happened here, mainly in AH. Note, although the high shows $160, it was actually as much as I believe $174 outside of normal trading hours. On the 10th, a spread of $15. On the 11th, a $9 spread. All of these days (besides the 7th) had relatively similar open to close. The price was run up and shorted back down, or vice versa. I included the 5th on here to show that it was shorted almost $20 in anticipation of the upward movement shown above into the 11th. Ultimately, the price difference on closing between from the 5th to the 11th was $1 ($129.37 - $130.30), after all of that volatility and volume.

1/21/22 - 2/3/22: 44.4M Volume. In chronological order, take a look at the spread of high to low on all of these dates: $18, $16, $10, $19, $14, $10, $12, $8, $3, $9. That's some significant volatility all just to have the change in closing price go down $7 ($106 - 99) in this range. So from the 21st to the 26th, shorted from $110 to $86 back up to a high of $119 in a matter of 4 trading days. Then directly behind that, $119 to $86 back to a high of $116 from the 26th to Feb. 1 (5 trading days). Very sus to me, lots of covering and shorting is my interpretation of the data. They went from $86 - $119 - $86 - $116. +$33, -$33, +$30 in a matter of days. You telling me this is insignificant? What else could it be?

2/8/22 - 2/10/22: 12.54M Volume. A low of $100 to a high of $131 in 3 trading days, for a difference of $7 in closing prices ($115 - $122).

Finally,* 2/24/22: A range of $21 ($104 - $125) on 2.26M volume. I put an asterisk on this one since the entire market had a seriously strange day which was potentially attributed to international conflict.

Total volume between these dates is 85.21M. That seems significant to me, enough volume I believe to chip down heavily at the obligations we were expecting.

Some extra notes:

Again, all of this is my theory based on looking at the evidence in front of me and thinking about decision making and psychology from a SHF point of view.

January 7th, with the fake MSM NFT story, was literally them just covering a large portion of their obligations. I know the big consensus was that it was to induce volatility for options, increase premiums, and entice buying of options, but I believe that this was a secondary benefit for them. The primary reason for that price movement was just to cover, simple as that. This to me is also what happened on Nov. 3 AH. If I remember correctly, the price had already begun running during normal trading hours prior to that. Then it ran AH as well and was attributed to "moving in sympathy." This to me was just another excuse. They wanted to cover a good bit early. They also covered huge portions later, leading up to the 23rd. We went from $210 - $250 in 2 days going into the 23rd, followed by the big rug pull.

We shouldn't be surprised or dumbfounded at this action. Of course they were shorting the crap out of it. Over the last 2 months, we had tons of posts on all of the shorting mechanisms seriously ramping up; where do y'all think it all went? XRT short interest, failure to deliver data, crazy amounts of shares lent out with slight uptick in borrow fees, total short interest, consistent heavier percentage of internalization (dark pools), 100% utilization, etc.

Conclusion: Looking at the price action vs volume over the last 2 months, it looks to me like this past cycle was covered over a window of 2 months, while simultaneously being shorted. This allowed the price to never "rip" to a higher value, and gave the illusion that cycle theory was debunked. Of course, they couldn't just play the same game and let it rip on the 23rd. If they did that, then it would be confirmed that we know and it would be the nail in the coffin for them. Granted, we do still know, they're just trying to hide it still and not make it so obvious.

Disclaimer: This is just my theory, but I wanted to propose it and hopefully spark a discussion. This is also my first post and I am a smoothbrain, so take any of this with a grain of salt. This is my interpretation of the data. If there is any reason why this theory factually cannot be correct, please present to me why.

Let me know what y'all think.

Also, DRS is the way.