

The Mennonite Ghost Rapes Were Faked



by Miles Mathis

First published September 2, 2024

In 2022 the movie *Women Talking*, directed by Sarah Polley, was heavily promoted, especially in the US. It was a huge bomb, making \$9 million on a \$20 million budget, but they always forget to tell you that. They also don't tell you those numbers are also probably faked, since almost *no one* went to this movie. Why would they? It was about reported rapes in a Mennonite community in Bolivia in which nine men gassed entire households with livestock tranquilizers, raping everyone within including three-year-old children, old ladies, and men. Can you imagine paying to see a movie about that, even if you believed it was true?

But of course it wasn't true. Anyone can tell that already, just by what I have already told you here. It is absurd on the face of it. No one that wanted to rape some pretty girls would also rape the guys, the grandmothers, and the babies. That isn't how it works, so even the bad guys out there can see through this one as another bad script from Langley or somewhere, where the writers are as usual gay or sexless true-crime wannabes stuck in the CIA dungeons.

If you were born yesterday and can't see it, I will walk you through it as usual. But first, it may help to remind yourself we have seen this before. The US government and other governments hate the Amish and Mennonites and are constantly blackwashing them with these ridiculous stories. They are hated because they undermine the "American way" and the whole concept of Modernism. See my 2022 paper on the [Amish School Shootings in Pennsylvania](#), which also never happened. Also see my long critique of *The X-Files*, [where I explode the Amish episode](#) in that propaganda fest.

Your first clue is the picture above, of the alleged perpetrators. They are behind bars, in some kind of detention, but are not wearing prison clothes. The clothes don't match, so we must assume they chose their own clothing. So why aren't they in Mennonite clothing? Those guys look nothing like Mennonites. None have beards, two are in sandals, several are wearing watches, at least three are

wearing belts, so this is just the worst fake ever.

Here is your second clue from the mainstream reports:

The men range in ages from 20 to 48. Four of them, including Weiber, are married. But they don't seem to take the case too seriously: they often joke with guards or fall asleep during trial proceedings, and during one victim's testimony the judge had to reprimand them for laughing and making faces. That may be one reason victims rarely go to the courthouse. "My heart was racing and my head hurt," Susana Banman, 55, tells TIME about her one day at the trial.

That's from [TIME's 2011](#) report. Since they were allegedly about to be sentenced to 25 years in prison apiece, that doesn't make any sense. But it does match many other fake trials we have looked at, where the bad guys are laughing, joking, and making faces. We saw it first in the [fake Manson trials](#), but have seen in many times since, including the [Boston Bombing fake trial](#), where Dzhokhar Tsarnaev couldn't keep a straight face during the ridiculous proceedings.



Your next clue was embedded in that TIME piece: **including Weiber**

Except that there was no one named Weiber there. Here is the current list at Wikipedia:

The men arrested,^[clarification needed] with their ages in 2009:[5]

- Jacob Neudorf Enss, age 36
- Jacob Wiebe Wall, age 24
- Franz Dick Wall, age 21
- David Guenther Banman, age 21
- Abraham Peters Dick, age 18
- Jacob Wiebe Knelsen, age 41
- Johan Bolt Ham, age 18
- Peter Wiebe Wall, age 46
- Jacob Wiebe Lowen, age 23
- Peter Friesen Neufeld, age 38
- Heinrich Knelsen Klassen, age 27

It's now Wiebe, not Weiber, and it's a middle name, not a surname. So here's a question for you: why can't TIME and Wikipedia, two of the biggest propaganda outlets in the world, get their effing story straight? I guess because some people might know *weiber* means women or wives in German, which seems a little on the nose, doesn't it? But they haven't solved that problem, as you see if you look

closely at that current list. One of these rapists is named Dick Wall? Really? Another is named Peters Dick. Hmmmm. Another is named Bolt Ham. Now honestly, do you really think those are Mennonite names? No, this is all the usual CIA joke, written by the arrested adolescents of Langley.

And another problem embedded in that TIME piece: **Susana Banman, 55, tells TIME about her one day at the trial**

Susana “Ban-the-Man”, eh? But that's just another coincidence: it isn't an embedded clue or subliminal message from Langley. Several other problems there, starting with the fact that a victim would spend only one day at the trial. That makes no sense. Even worse is her name, which means she was testifying against a family member, David Banman, age 21. Are we supposed to believe David raped his own mother? Regardless of whether it was his mother or aunt, it is strange that the victims and rapists are from the same families. They tell you it is yet another indication of how heinous this all was, but I can think of an easier explanation: if CIA is paying these people to make this stuff up, it is simpler to bundle the payments to families. One lying family can supply multiple actors to these staged events, as we have seen again and again.

And guess who broke this story for TIME? A guy named Jean Friedman-Rudovsky. Ah, a Jewish writer, who would've thunk it? He also tells us that one of the victims was retarded. . . since guys love to rape retarded girls, you know. See [my paper on the fake Glen Ridge "Our Guys" rape story](#), which also included a retarded girl as fake victim. Another victim in the current story was pregnant and was raped by her own brother, causing a premature birth. What guy doesn't want to be a part of that fun? This all screams Men-are-Pigs project, as you see.

[At another highly ranked site](#) promoting this story, we find this:

No way to understand how another could dream of a man forcing himself on her in a field—then wake up the next morning with grass in her hair.

Do all you Sherlocks and Sherlockettes see the problem there? How do you secretly gas someone in an open field? Was she sleeping in the field and the guys gassed the entire county? Or did they carry some of the women from the houses and rape them in the fields, just for a change of pace? Wouldn't that defeat the plan, which was to do this secretly in houses where everyone had been gassed? If you start carrying women out into the fields, you risk dogs barking, horses neighing, and neighbors looking out the windows. As I so often say, these scriptwriters don't know when to stop.

From that same CIA-front site, we get this:

For Sara Guenter, the mystery was the rope. She would sometimes wake up in her bed with small pieces of it tied tightly to her wrists or ankles, the skin beneath an aching blue.

Guenter, hunh? Did she look anything like this?



See *Futurama*, which came out in 1999.

If you are a woman and you ever bought stuff like this, it is because you wanted to buy it. I guess it is like dark porn for women, I don't know. Because it makes no sense. Put yourself in the shoes of these rapists. You are using the tranquilizer to avoid getting caught. Otherwise you would just rape these women awake and threaten them to keep them quiet. Or you would wear a mask and gloves and say nothing. But if you are going to all that trouble to gas them, you aren't going to rip their clothing, leave bruises, leave mud, tie them up, and leave the ropes on them. They are already tranquilized: why would you need ropes? No, you would get in and out—so to speak—as quietly as possible, trying to leave no trace. As part of that, you would undress them and redress them with care. If you were really smart you would come on a towel, not in them or on them. You will say these guys were average dummdums, too ignorant to think of that. But these guys weren't idiots, otherwise they wouldn't have thought of the tranquilizing or been able to make it work for four years. So as usual we have no continuity. The guys were both geniuses and idiots, at the same time. They were smart enough to secretly gas whole houses, but dumb enough to leave semen, blood, ropes, bruises, grass, mud, etc.

Which brings us to how they are supposed to have done this. You can gas whole houses, but it is kind of a high tech job. Not something most people outside the CIA can do, especially no-tech Mennonites. We are told one of the older guys was a veterinarian, explaining where they got the gas, but we still have the problem of delivery. They can't have just driven up in the middle of the night and put a hose through the window. That makes noise. They would have to plant canisters in hidden spots, then signal them remotely, the gas emitting silently. Those guys don't look up to that, Mennonite or not. And if that was how it was done, then the canisters should have been presented in court. They weren't.

In that same article, we are told the men sprayed the tranquilizer from hand-held canisters through window screens, while standing outside. Again, can you spot the contradiction there, Sherlock? One, that would make noise. Two, if they are spraying through screens, that means the windows are OPEN. But if you are going to gas a whole house of people, the windows have to be CLOSED. Otherwise the *gas escapes out the windows*. Logic 101. And there is a further problem. We are told these rapes went on for four years, despite the best efforts of these women to protect themselves. Some of them stayed up all night or hired guards. But they never thought to close or lock the windows? You have to laugh.

Next we are told this:

The family's pleas for help to the council of church ministers, the group of men who govern the

2,500 member colony, were fruitless, even as the tales multiplied. Throughout the community, women were waking to the same telltale morning signs: ripped pajamas, blood and semen on the bed, and head-thumping stupor.

It reminds us of the [fake Spotlight stories](#), doesn't it, where priests in Boston got away with molesting boys for years, right under the noses of parents and bishops. But like those stories, this one makes no sense. Why would husbands and ministers ignore hard evidence like blood and semen and ropes, assuming their wives and daughters were making it up? This wasn't just "women talking", this was physical evidence. Just as the Mennonites have veterinarians, they also have doctors, and those doctors aren't still using leeches. They know what a broken hymen is. They know what a bruise is. They know what blood and semen are. We are supposed to think they were covering it up, but there is one thing husbands and ministers don't overlook: the raping of their women. There is no way this would be covered up for four years.

So that leads us to the next question: why would Sarah Polley write and direct this horrible movie based on this fraud? I remember her only from *Road to Avonlea* and 1999's *Guinevere*, where she was very cute. But I remind myself that last film was also by a woman, and that the script was mostly about blackwashing the older photographer in it, who was dating this younger woman played by Polley. Although he got her away from her family, treated her well, and put her on her career path, he is constantly denigrated in the film as a loser and lech.



My readers will also like this coincidence, if coincidence it is: in *Road to Avonlea*, based on *Anne of Green Gables*, Polley plays Sara **Stanley**. As it turns out, Sarah Polley is also Jewish, though she doesn't look it. Her mother is Canadian actress Diane MacMillan, who is also a MacDonald and a Bell. But wait, the MacDonalds are in fact linked tightly to the Stanleys in the peerage through marriage,

both being from Isle of Man. So we already see it wasn't a coincidence. Polley's father is Harry Gulkin, son of Pyotr Ilyich Gulkin, a Russian Jew. Her husband is also Jewish. She was born 1/8/79.

More to the point here is that Polley was already a producer by her mid-thirties, and we find she produced the 2017 documentary *A Better Man*. Hmmm, that sounds suspicious here in context. And it is. It is about a survivor of **domestic abuse** meeting with the man who abused her, "to see if he can take responsibility to heal and repair the harms he created". Let me guess? No? The whole thing is fishy and looks like a set-up, since they split at 19. Not much time to abuse someone. Did they even live together, or was this abuse at the prom?

The first time she saw him, two years after she left him, Khan was weak and speechless. But as they continued to meet by chance over a six-year period, and her life continued to improve, they'd exchange a few minutes of small talk. It was during such chance encounter in 2011 that Steve asked if they could sit down. Once seated, Steve repeatedly apologized before bursting into tears.

Wow. And they got all that on film? What luck! The woman who wrote and allegedly lived this documentary was Attiya **Khan**, a woman's studies major. Who would have guessed? And I guess you noticed: Khan=Kohen. So this is the usual propaganda from Phoenician studios.

It reminds us of Alice Sebold's book and film about rape *Lucky*, which was showered with praise, becoming a bestseller, but [which was later found to be false](#). Which of course also destroys her even more famous book *The Lovely Bones*, also about rape. *Lucky* was removed from stores by its publisher, though *The Lovely Bones* is still on the shelves. The film *Lucky* was also scrapped at the last moment, when the executive producer noticed the flaws in Sebold's story. It was this producer's investigation into the story that ended up freeing the innocent man behind bars for the rape. So if you were thinking fake stories don't get told and films don't get made about them, well, you were wrong. Women do these things, for whatever reasons.

Polley also directed the 2017 *Alias Grace* miniseries, based on the book by Margaret Atwood. It is a novelization and fictionalization of the 1843 murders in Canada of Kinnear and Montgomery by Marks and McDermott. Can you smell the fake yet, just from those names? I will give you the first nudge: **Marks=Marx**. Yeah. Have you got it now? Marx also went by Mary **Whitney**, giving us a fourth name from the families. We are told her father was a stonemason. No, he was just a Mason, or Freemason, giving you the next clue. Here's another:

Grace Marks, the convicted murderess, has been hired out from prison to serve as a domestic servant in the home of the Governor of the penitentiary. A Committee of gentlemen and ladies from the Methodist church, led by the minister, hopes to have her pardoned and released. Grace cannot remember what happened on the day of the murders, and she exhibits symptoms of hysteria, so the minister hires Dr. Simon Jordan, a psychiatrist, to interview her, hoping he will find her to be a hysteric, and not a criminal. An arrangement is made so that Jordan will interview Grace during afternoons in the sewing room in the governor's mansion.

That's the first paragraph of the plot summary of Atwood's book at Wiki. Have you tossed your lunch yet? The whole story just fell apart in the first sentence, so how is it that Atwood found a publisher for this crap? Now you know. If you need more, [go read the rest of the plot summary](#). It doesn't get any better.

I won't unwind it further, since it isn't really worth it, but we have to ask why Atwood and Polley were reselling this fake in 1996 and 2017. Two words: **Operation Chaos**. They salt in the current fake

murders with all these old fake murders, making Men-are-Pigs a very long story. But still, if you are Sarah Polley and trying to make a name for yourself as director and producer, why would you make a miniseries about 1843 murders in the Canadian bush? It can only be because you have given up trying to make any real movie and have sold out to the CIA/CSIS, along with the rest of Hollywood. A girl has to make a living.