

WAS STANLEY KUBRICK KILLED?

AND WAS EYES WIDE SHUT RE-EDITED AGAINST HIS WILL?

By Rob Ager, January 2025

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION

At the time of my posting this article it has been twenty-five years since Stanley Kubrick's reported death on March 7th 1999. His final film, *Eyes Wide Shut*, was released to US markets several months later on July 16th of the same year. The conspiracy-themed content of *Eyes Wide Shut* included sub-plots of a high society ritualistic orgy and the possible murder of a prostitute character, *Mandy Curran*, who had apparently taken part in the orgy.

Suspiciously, the announced death of Kubrick himself in the run up to his film's release parallels the death and suspected murder of character *Mandy Curran*. So the film plot poses an unanswered question, "*Was Mandy murdered or was it a drug overdose accident?*", while Kubrick's death poses the question, "*Was Stanley Kubrick assassinated by a real world secret society that he had attempted to expose in his final film?*"

Rumours of Kubrick having been murdered have circulated online since the film's release (including a prominent Joe Rogan [podcast clip](#) featuring *Pulp Fiction* co-writer *Roger Avery*). Frequently accompanying these rumours are additional claims that *Eyes Wide Shut* was re-edited by the studio (Warner Bros) after Kubrick's death. These rumours allege the re-edit removed much more sinister scenes that Kubrick intended to be kept in the film.

In this article we'll explore the evidence / arguments for and against both the *Kubrick assassination* theory and the *Eyes Wide Shut was re-edited* theory. We'll also explore, in the final section, other possibilities of what may have happened regarding these issues.

EXAMINATION PRELIMINARIES

Whenever exploring a controversial or emotionally charged topic, it's good to first specify a reliable set of investigation principles. So we'll do that here. If you want to get straight to the evidence and arguments for the theory, just skip to page four of this article.

For the purposes of this study ...

- 1) The derogatory terms "*conspiracy theory*" and "*conspiracy theorist*" are to be avoided, being that some conspiracies turn out to be true, while others turn out to be false. Both conspiracies and co-incidences happen. Bias should not be taken toward or against either possibility.

- 2) A sound-minded investigator does not decide upon a conclusion before gathering evidence. Instead they withhold judgment while gathering as much information on the topic as they can manage within the available timeframe / budget.
- 3) The approach to gathering information should be guided by a series of unbiased, information seeking questions, such as ...
 - *If Kubrick was killed, how was it done, and who was the assassin?*
 - *Where was Kubrick when he was killed and how did the assassin get access without being noticed?*
 - *Which exact scenes were cut out and at what exact points on the film's timeline were they removed?*
 - *What was the exact content of the missing scenes?*
 - *Is there evidence of cut scenes in the film's documented production history?*
 - *Who would have given the order to kill Kubrick?*
 - *How likely was Kubrick to die naturally of a heart attack at age 70?*
 - *Were there any stresses in Kubrick's life that might have contributed to his death?*
 - *How can a heart attack be induced without leaving a trace of murder?*
 - *Who was in charge of Warner Bros when Kubrick died?*
- 4) After the available information on the subject has been gathered without bias, the information is to be cross-referenced in an attempt to establish reliable patterns. Such patterns will prove specific factual points, open up new avenues of investigation, and / or eliminate unlikely possibilities until only a finite few possibilities remain.
- 5) And, perhaps the most important step for minimalizing bias, each particular logical approach made in favour or against a particular theory, should also be applied with a balancing bias in the opposite direction. For example, if we assume a particular public statement on the given topic is a lie, then we should consider the possibility of lying in relation to all other statements on the same topic, regardless of who made the statement. If we are going to cast doubt on the honesty of one newspaper article, then we should reconsider the honesty of all newspaper articles, regardless of whether they support or contradict a given conclusion.

Throughout this article I will adhere, to the best of my abilities, the above principles.

AUTHOR'S IDEOLOGICAL STANCE ON THIS RESEARCH

Before we continue I would also like to illustrate, via my own documented history of researching Kubrick and his work (among other controversial subjects) ...

- My personal commitment to considering possibilities of both proof and disproof before I reach a conclusion.

- My willingness to resist the temptation to force a conclusion while the evidence remains insufficient.
- My willingness to explore possibilities that some might consider unpleasant, disturbing or simply not dramatic enough to have a chance of going viral once published (reality, after all, often isn't marketable or appealing).

Anyone familiar with my work on Kubrick will be aware that I have often published challenging and controversial interpretations on his life and work. I [published a study pointing](#) to the idea that in *2001: A Space Odyssey* there are no aliens and that the movie itself is testing and challenging its audience, just as the monolith (a 90 degree rotated symbol of the cinema screen itself – not an alien artifact) is testing and challenging the ape characters within the movie. I [published an interpretation](#) that in *A Clockwork Orange*, lead character *Alex* was pretending his violent impulses had been “cured” by the *Ludovico Treatment* so that he could get out of prison. I also published detailed original interpretations about Kubrick's movie *The Shining*, including a [sexual abuse theme](#) and a political theme about [US history and the Gold Standard](#) (later confirmed by production materials in the Kubrick Archives). These, and many other challenging takes on Kubrick's work, I've published, and typically I would be the first to publish those interpretations instead of being guided by rumours I'd heard online or in other publications.

At the same time, I have challenged several rumours about Kubrick's life and work in which supporting evidence appears to be completely absent. These include the rumour Kubrick was a 33rd Degree Freemason, the rumour that actor Lee Ermey adlibbed all of his dialogue as the Drill Instructor character in Kubrick's *Full Metal Jacket*, [rumours Kubrick secretly filmed staged moon landing footage](#) for the US government, and the assumption that Kubrick's knowledge of the Cold War (as expressed in his movie *Dr Strangelove*) could only be acquired if Kubrick had been an “insider” of the establishment (actually, all of the information Kubrick required was publicly available in books and think tank documents for whoever took the time to do the research). Remember, some conspiracies turn out to be true and some false. You should always be prepared to accept either, if the evidence takes you there.

Outside of Kubrick and his work, but relevant to the topic of possible *Eyes Wide Shut* deleted scenes of “child molestation” (this often forms part of the online rumours), I have actually worked with real pedophiles in probation, so am no stranger to the topic. I also published arguably the most extensive and unbiased study of [pederasty allegations against sci-fi author Arthur C Clarke](#), in which I personally concluded I lean 75% toward the possibility of Clarke's guilt. While at the same time I published multiple videos [debunking the Leaving Neverland pedophilia accusations](#) against the late *Michael Jackson*. These latter two examples illustrate my personal willingness to believe and disbelieve different pedophile accusations, in accordance with the evidence unique to each case. By contrast, there are many who reflexively believe, by default, all pedophile rumours about any public figure, regardless of evidence.

Other examples of my non-biased, case by case approach can be found in that I have published videos sympathetic to the plight of German soldiers in WW2 (see [my video Saving Private Kraut](#), which is a study of the movie *Saving Private Ryan*), while at the same time publishing videos highly critical of the Nazi regime (see my videos on *Starship Troopers*, *Dr Strangelove* and *A Clockwork Orange*) and the Soviet Communist regime (see my studies on *Fight Club* and [the war movie Red Dawn](#)). In other words, I'm not psychologically enslaved by the artificial paradigm of “left vs right” political ideologies. I've published hundreds of videos since 2006 and, for every video that

might be used to allege a particular form of ideological bias on my part, I virtually always have other published videos and articles that counter those bias assumptions.

Regarding *Eyes Wide Shut* itself, while I have never claimed Kubrick was murdered nor claimed the film was re-edited by the studio, I have published evidence that Kubrick was in fact [researching real world Occult secret societies](#) during pre-production, and published an extensive two hour video called *The Cult of Eyes Wide Shut*. The latter explores comparisons between dozens of real world secret societies and the content of the movie itself. In that video I concluded that what we see in the film is not a representation of any single real secret society, but instead is a symbolic hybrid representing many real world secret societies that span the globe and span modern history.

With all the above to my impartiality credit, I hope you'll be willing to stay with me until the end of this article for an unbiased exploration on the topics of Kubrick's death and the final edit of *Eyes Wide Shut*.

RUMOUR SPECIFICS

Almost invariably, claims that Kubrick was assassinated point to the timing of his death in relation to a reported screening of the film for studio executives at Warner Bros approx. one week earlier. The common claim is that executives saw the uncut version of the film, were infuriated because it exposed real world high level secret societies as being occultists engaging in ritual sacrifice/torture/rape/murder of women and/or children, and that they arranged for Stanley Kubrick to be killed the following week. It's claimed that Kubrick contractually had final cut of his own film, as he'd had with all his other films under Warner Bros, and that the executives could not order a recut while Kubrick was alive. After his death, it's claimed they removed the most reputationally damaging scenes from the film to protect their own occultist high society groups from being exposed.

It's also claimed that, in the aftermath of Kubrick's death, family and production collaborators on the film were silenced by the "elites", either by threats or bribery. As a result, "nobody is willing to speak out" and all denials are dismissed as part of the plot by the high level conspirators.

The descriptions of the deleted scenes vary, depending on who is making the claims, but most of them claim that either twenty-one or twenty-four minutes of scenes were cut from the film.

A milder description of the deleted scenes [comes from Youtuber David Wilcox](#). He claims that the missing scenes revealed lead character *Bill Harford's* wife, *Alice*, as taking part in the ritualistic orgies. He also claims that the *Red Cloak* leader of the Somerton ritual scenes is actually the character Sandor Szavost, who was dancing with *Alice* in a party scene earlier in the film. Wilcox claims that in the re-edit of the film, *Red Cloak's* voice was replaced so as to remove the connection between the two characters. The comment section of the Wilcox video includes multiple posts offering different descriptions of the deleted scenes, usually pointing to much more graphic content.

[Another blog post claims](#) that there is just one deleted scene, "At 1:19:27 Dr. Harford finds himself separated from the masked woman. He walks down a hallway distantly following a couple. He turns to see an empty room with a pentagram-like circle in the center. The reaction in his eyes can be seen in a close up. Acting as if he did not see the ceremonial room he continues to walk down the hallway which can be seen at 1:19:30."

Competing with the above versions, [this one is much more extreme](#). An anonymous poster on Reddit claims to have seen a missing reel of footage at the very end of the movie, but that the

rest of the film was exactly as we see it in the released version. The poster claims that the final reel showed *Bill* and *Alice's* daughter being taken away from the toy store in the final scene of the released cut, but she is then taken away in a limousine to the Somerton mansion, where she is placed on a sacrificial table and tortured with cuts, that the occultists remove their masks and drink her blood and have sex while covered in her blood. The poster claims the *Red Cloak* character, without his mask, was not a familiar character, but that he skinned the girl's face and wore it on his own face. The poster then claimed he was stalked and received warnings for having watched the deleted scenes.

Frequently, these claims are made anonymously online in forums and Youtube comment sections, but sometimes are spoken by identified individuals and political activists such as Alex Jones, David Icke and lesser known bloggers such as David Wilcox, whose general content tends to consist almost entirely of efforts to "*expose the elites*". Most recently, claims were made about deleted scenes and Kubrick's death by *Pulp Fiction* co-writer *Roger Avery* on the Joe Rogan podcast. These include a claim, which I've come across many times on social media, that Kubrick had a verbal fight with studio executives at the initial screening of his film, over their intentions to re-edit the film, a week before his death.

Promoters of these claims about Kubrick's death and the re-editing of *Eyes Wide Shut* are often predictably dismissed by those who disagree as "*conspiracy theorists*", while the promoters of the theories predictably dismiss their disagreeing opponents as being either "*shills*" (people covertly hired by the elites to artificially discredit "*the truth*") or as people who are too emotionally weak to handle the "*dark truth*" that our world is run by occult pedophiles and murderers in the highest positions of political and economic power. Sometimes they accuse those who disagree as being "*pedophile enablers*". Like with most controversial political issues, rational discourse between the promoters and debunkers on these topics is virtually impossible. Both sides resort to reflexive name calling as a compensation for their unwillingness to judge purely by the available evidence.

An additional factor is that those who post claims about the content of deleted scenes, when asked to provide sources and evidence, frequently claim that they had seen reliable source links online, but that those links have since "*been removed from the internet*". Their implication seems to be that there is ongoing censorship of such reports.

PART TWO

SUPPORTING EVIDENCE / ARGUMENTS

I'll now list a series of points that lean in favour of the assassination and re-edit claims, this will be followed by an opposing list of points that lean against the claims. In both instances I'll be playing a certain amount of *Devil's Advocate*. After reading them all, I leave it to you to draw your own conclusions.

1) THE EXECUTIVE SCREENING

According to available reports, it does appear that a near finalized version of *Eyes Wide Shut* was shown to Warner Bros executives the week before Stanley Kubrick died. On the day of Kubrick's death, Dan Cox [reported for Variety](#) that a screening had been arranged in New York for just four

viewers, “five days before” Kubrick’s death. According to the article, the viewers were lead stars Tom Cruise and Nicole Kidman, along with Warner Bros senior executives Bob Daly and Terry Semel. The article also states, “Always secretive, Kubrick had his assistant make the projectionist turn away from the screen so the foursome could watch it alone.” The assistant is not named, but may have been Kubrick’s devoted assistant, Leon Vitali. The article also states, “Normally, Kubrick requires executives to assemble in London for the final screening. But since Kidman had been ill (she had temporarily withdrawn from “The Blue Room” on Broadway), Kubrick’s editor had flown to New York with the print. Kubrick doesn’t fly and didn’t attend.” So, according to this article, Kubrick was not in attendance at the screening.

The documentary, *Stanley Kubrick: A Life in Pictures*, [includes at 2:16:45 this statement](#) from executive producer Jan Harlan (who was also Kubrick’s brother-in-law), “When *Eyes Wide Shut* was finally shown for the very first time in New York, on March 1st 1999, to Tom and Nicole and the heads of the studio, the response was very enthusiastic. Stanley was very, very happy and a great weight was lifted from his shoulders. I think this change in his being caused almost a physical change in his body because he had lived with this enormous responsibility for a very expensive film, which was long in the shooting ... for a long time, for two years. And suddenly it was all gone. He died a week later.”

To my knowledge, these are the most reliable accounts illustrating that the first screening of *Eyes Wide Shut* had occurred in the week before Kubrick’s death. The timing of Kubrick’s death, so soon after the near completion of his film that depicted high level secret societies in New York, and its initial executive screening in that same city, is suspicious. It’s not proof of assassination, but it’s certainly suspicious.

Regarding Jan Harlan’s claim that the executives were extremely enthusiastic about the film after screening it, he personally wasn’t at the screening, so we can assume this to be either second hand information (or, if we want to be cynical, window dressing on his part for the documentary). However, some support is given to Harlan’s statements in the *Variety* article. Former Warner Bros executive John Calley, who had worked on several Kubrick film distributions, is quoted, “He was so excited because Terry and Bob had seen his film and they loved it. Nicole and Tom had seen it and they loved it. I’ve never heard him as excited about a film.”

Note that in the *Variety* article, Warner executive Terry Semel was quoted as saying the released film would be approximately two hours and nineteen minutes. The actual released version is two hours and thirty-nine minutes – twenty minutes longer than Semel had stated. Why was a shorter version announced than what was released? Were the Warner executives actually shown a shorter version of the film, rather than an extended one?

Dan Gleister at *The Guardian* also reported, two days after Kubrick’s death, the screening for the same four viewers at the New York screening. It’s possible he simply took that info from the *Variety* article, though Gleister also offers quotes from a European publicity executive for Warners, so he may have verified the claim from that source.

2) EXECUTIVE RESIGNATIONS

Perhaps even more suspicious than the timing of Kubrick’s death, the aforementioned executives, Bob Daly and Terry Semel, each reportedly resigned from their posts just two days before the cinematic release of *Eyes Wide Shut*, after two decades heading the studio. The news was widely announced on July 15th 1999. *Eyes Wide Shut*, as announced on its marketing posters, was released the very next day, on July 16th.

<https://www.nytimes.com/1999/07/16/business/co-chairmen-resign-from-warner-bros.html>
<https://www.nytimes.com/1999/07/19/movies/behind-warner-bros-resignations-the-end-of-a-freewheeling-era.html>

According to Variety, “In a move that jolted Hollywood awake from its summer slumber, Warner Bros. co-chiefs Bob Daly and Terry Semel announced Thursday that they were stepping down from the studio that they had headed for almost 20 years. The execs, who both held the rank of chairman and co-CEO of the Warner studio and Warner Music Group, informed Time Warner chairman Gerald Levin in a letter dated July 14 that they had decided ‘not to pursue new employment contracts with Time Warner when (the) current ones expire at the end of the year.’” So it appears they had announced their decision to retire from their posts two days before the release of *Eyes Wide Shut*, but that the termination of their contract wouldn’t occur until later in the year.

This [article from the LA Times](#), offers more reporting, “The two waited to announce their resignations until after parent company Time Warner reported solid quarterly earnings Wednesday and after Tuesday’s premiere of the late director Stanley Kubrick’s final film, “*Eyes Wide Shut*,” which opens in general release today. ... Both denied that they were leaving the company under pressure or as the result of any contract dispute. They said they had not started negotiating new contracts, which expire Dec. 31, and will help with a transition. ... in recent years their formula began aging as younger audiences became Hollywood’s favorite target. Expensive big star vehicles such as “*The Postman*” and “*Fathers’ Day*” flopped, prompting criticism from Time Warner’s largest shareholder and vice chairman, Ted Turner, who disapproved of the free-spending culture. ... After a two-year box-office drought and uncharacteristic executive turmoil, the film division only recently began to turn around. However, the studio’s current big-budget release, “*Wild Wild West*,” starring Will Smith, is a disappointment expected to lose money. ... They had been considering leaving for about six months but decided while flying back from Europe on the corporate jet Sunday night.”

Was it coincidence they announced their resignation two days before *Eyes Wide Shut* was released? And why would the release of *Eyes Wide Shut* cause them to resign? Were they anticipating some backlash from “the elites” for distributing Kubrick’s film or was it mere coincidence?

3) THE 666 DAYS ENIGMA

I don’t personally consider this a strong piece of evidence, by any means, but I mention it because it does get brought up by some believers of the Kubrick assassination theory. Their claim is that Stanley Kubrick died exactly 666 days before New Year’s Day 2001 (*one of Kubrick’s most famous films is 2001: A Space Odyssey*). I checked up on this and it is, in fact, the case. It does seem like a strange co-incidence, but I haven’t heard anyone explain what meaning they attribute to this. Obviously 666 can be interpreted as the *Number of the Beast* or *Mark of the Beast*, in accordance with religious texts. I assume this is what those who raise this date issue are referring to.

4) KUBRICK OCCULT RESEARCH MATERIAL

While exploring the production materials for *Eyes Wide Shut* in the Stanley Kubrick Archives, I came across a copy of the book *Cult & Occult* (1985) by Francis E. King. This book explores multiple aspects

of Witchcraft in relation to modern history. It includes chapters on Occult beliefs within the Nazi Regime and, crucially, a chapter on Tantrix Sex Cults that operated in New York in the 1930's (I did some [follow up research](#) on this and it's very well documented). Kubrick also set *Eyes Wide Shut* in New York, a change from the original novella being set in Vienna, Austria. Strong references to these Tantric Sex Cults in the West (which had incorporated Yoga tantric practices from the East and combined them with Witchcraft) are present in *Eyes Wide Shut*. The ritualistic orgy of the film prominently features music from the Bhagavad Gita, a Sanskrit text often used in association with Yoga practices. This use of music [promoted allegations of blasphemy](#) from Hindu communities. And the interior of the mansion in which the orgy scene takes place, is actually Elveden Hall, an English country manor that had been decorated by a wealthy exiled Sikh who had occupied the property in the late 1800's.

The evidence of Kubrick researching the occult and tantric sex secret societies in New York doesn't directly support the assassination or re-edit theories, but it does illustrate the high likelihood that Kubrick was attempting to expose real world secret societies, whether real or imagined on his part. These societies can be shown to have historically existed, but I'm not certain if those exact same societies are still operating today.

5) DOCUMENTED EXAMPLES OF HIGH LEVEL SECRET SOCIETIES AND SEX TRAFFICKING

Believers of the Kubrick assassination theory often raise the controversies of Harvey Weinstein and Jeffrey Epstein as evidence of sexual perversions and sex trafficking forming a part of the Hollywood establishment and global political elites. Convenient for any co-conspirators in Epstein's sex trafficking operations, Epstein reportedly committed suicide in prison before he could be taken to trial. Many have claimed Epstein was killed to prevent that trial and stifle any further investigations into other high profile individuals who may have been involved in his illegal sexual activities. [Public opinion polls have leaned heavily in favour](#) of the theory he was assassinated.

Those who believe our world is run by cabals similar to the one shown in *Eyes Wide Shut* also tend to point to the Bohemian Grove Club, a summer retreat for some of the world's wealthiest and most influential people, as evidence. This society was reportedly infiltrated by Alex Jones in 2000. Jones shot footage of a ritual called *The Cremation of Care*, featuring hooded figures and fireworks. There's been debate over whether the filmed ritual had satanic or mock human sacrifice elements, but either way it's certainly interesting that such powerful people meet to engage in such a strange event. Incidentally, *Eyes Wide Shut* was released in July of 1999. The Bohemian Grove holds its annual meeting in July, each year. Jones' infiltration of the Grove occurred one day short of a year after the release of *Eyes Wide Shut*.

Other documented examples of real world high level secret societies include the Freemasons and Common Purpose, both of which keep their memberships and meeting contents secret, while seeking to wield influence over public life.

While not proving Kubrick was assassinated, these controversies provide a potentially plausible motive as to who might assassinate Kubrick and why they would do it.

6) FREDERIC RAPHAEL'S SECRET SOCIETY DOCUMENT

This issue I've not encountered among Kubrick assassination theorists, but I believe it tentatively supports elements of their views. *Eyes Wide Shut* co-writer, Frederic Raphael published a book titled

Eyes Wide Open (which is his account of working with Kubrick on early script drafts of the film). The book makes it clear that he and Stanley didn't get along very well and that he was persistently frustrated with Kubrick's secrecy, frequent rejection of Raphael's preferred creative choices in the script, and having been compartmentalized or *sandboxed* by the director. The latter was experienced by several other Kubrick co-writers, including Arthur C. Clarke and the multiple sci-fi writers who worked on the script development of *A.I. Artificial Intelligence*.

Raphael claims, on pages 143-146 of *Eyes Wide Open*, that during script development he mocked up a fake FBI report about a sex cult in US politics called *The Free* and sent it to Kubrick. He claims that Kubrick believed the document was genuine, demanded to know how Raphael acquired it and then required reassurance it was fabricated. If Raphael's claims are true, this is further evidence of Kubrick believing that such societies likely exist and holding some personal paranoia about them.

7) ANTI-PEDOPHILE THEMES IN KUBRICK'S FILMOGRAPHY

Going all the way back to the 1960's, Kubrick was making films that critiqued or attempted to expose pedophilia and sex trafficking. His film adaptation of *Lolita* showcased how manipulative and twisted a sexual pervert can be, though the film stopped just short of being blatantly about pedophilia due to censorship restrictions at the time, but in the novel the character was a pedophile. *Dr Strangelove* also depicted the pathology of warmongering global power seekers as being at least partially underpinned by their desire to compensate for feelings of sexual inadequacy. Two films later there was *A Clockwork Orange*, featuring a rapist protagonist along with subtle implications that his sexual motives are also a feature of the film's politician characters. *Barry Lyndon* featured a protagonist who climbs the ladder to wealth and power and becomes sexually immoral along his journey. *The Shining* featured a sexually horrifying bathroom scene. And *Full Metal Jacket* featured soldiers engaging in gang rape. All this before Kubrick concluded his filmography with the secret society orgy scenes of *Eyes Wide Shut*, a film which also features scenes of a costume shop owner pimping out his teenage daughter to visiting businessmen.

8) LACK OF NARRATION

A new theory related to all this was put forward by film maker Roger Avery, a collaborator of Quentin Tarantino, in a Joe Rogan podcast interview in late 2024. Avery claimed that *Eyes Wide Shut* seems like it should have narration in its edit, given how slow, and often silent, the film is. Many Kubrick films (such as *Lolita*, *Barry Lyndon*, *A Clockwork Orange* and *Full Metal Jacket*) feature narration.

9) KUBRICK'S DAUGHTER AND THE CULT OF SCIENTOLOGY

Kubrick's daughter Vivian, who had worked on several of his film productions, reportedly abandoned her family to join the Scientology movement, which Tom Cruise has also famously been a prominent member. [Christian Kubrick explained](#) to the Jon Ronson for [The Guardian](#), "*They (Kubrick and his daughter) had a huge fight. He was very unhappy. He wrote her a 40-page letter trying to win her back. He begged her endlessly to come home from California. I'm glad he didn't live to see what happened. ... I can't reach her at all. I've had two conversations with her since Stanley died. The last one was eight years ago. She became a Scientologist and didn't want to talk to us any more and*

didn't see her dying sister, didn't come to her funeral. And these were children that had been joined at the hip." In recent years Vivian Kubrick has become prominent on the public scene as a political activist, but it's unclear to what extent she is still involved with Scientology.

Viewers of *Eyes Wide Shut* have speculated that in the final scene of *Bill* and *Alice* talking about their marriage while Xmas shopping with their daughter, that the daughter wanders off with two men in long overcoats. Looking at the film, the daughter does wander off after giving a brief, half-hearted smile to her parents, but whether she is being guided by these two men is unclear. It has been observed that the same two men are seen together at the Zeigler party earlier in the film (they are sat beneath a spiral staircase as *Bill* and *Alice* enter the party). Some have claimed the end scene of the daughter "*being taken away*" is an indication that the daughter had been willingly sacrificed to the elites in return for letting *Bill* live after his unwanted entry to the Somerton Orgy, while others have claimed the scene is a representation of Stanley and Christiane Kubrick having lost their daughter to the Scientology movement.

10) KUBRICK'S HEALTH AT TIME OF DEATH

Several media articles have reported Kubrick was happy (and, by implication, in good health) in the immediate lead up to his death. [This one by the New York Post](#) says he was happy and joking, though it doesn't say where the information came from.

[This article at The Guardian](#) reports that Warner Bros senior vice-president of European advertising and publicity, Julian Senior, was on the phone with Kubrick discussing poster designs and a rugby match they were both watching at the time. Senior is quoted. "*He was excited about the release of the film. He wanted to talk about the publicity schedule. It was the same voice we'd known for the last 20 years - young, vibrant. He'd had flu a couple of weeks ago but apart from that there was no hint of illness.*" Senior also claims the released film is the one Kubrick had edited and hadn't been altered.

Warner Bros executive Terry Semel was also [quoted in the LA Times](#), the day after Kubrick's death, stating he had chatted with Kubrick the night before he died, "*We laughed our heads off, just talking about everything. He was on a roll...He felt really great about the film and I have to say we were really thrilled. It is an incredible picture.*"

I've found no information indicating Kubrick had been having health problems.

11) PREVIOUS DEATH THREATS

After releasing *A Clockwork Orange* in UK in 1971, Kubrick reportedly received death threats in relation to the film. This has been [reported in The Guardian](#) as being confirmed by Kubrick's wife, Christiane. A video of her statements [can be viewed here](#). Interestingly, she states that the police had advised Kubrick to withdraw the film from UK release on account of the threats. Christiane states that once the film was withdrawn, the family no longer had protestors outside their gates, nasty phone calls or horrible letters. Considering these factors, and that the film painted the UK government in such a bad light (depicting them as experimenting with draconian mind-control programs) it's not too far a stretch to speculate that the threats against Kubrick were being at least partially orchestrated by elements of the UK government. The UK press, including high profile film reviewers in the US, had already attacked the film as being supposedly pro-fascist, when in fact the film was a scathing critique of modern forms of psychedelic-infused fascism.

12) KUBRICK'S SECLUSION & REFUSAL TO TRAVEL BY PLANE

After directing the extremely anti-establishment and controversial *Dr Strangelove* in 1964, Kubrick, according to biographers John Baxter and Vincent Lofbrutto, became more reclusive and careful. One of these biographers even reported that Kubrick had begun carrying a knife in his briefcase for self-defense. Shortly after, Kubrick relocated to the UK, where he directed *2001: A Space Odyssey*. From this point on he became much more secluded from public life, to the point that hardly any photos of him appeared for decades. Most people didn't even know what he looked like. He also, according to multiple sources, including production collaborators and family, stopped flying on planes. And his film shoots became shrouded in secrecy with collaborators being compartmentalized and having to sign contracts that bound them to secrecy about the productions. Some sources have attributed his refusal to fly with an apparent incident when Kubrick was younger in which a friend of his had died in a plane crash, but to attribute all of Kubrick's efforts at secrecy to an irrational, trauma-induced event would be absurd. One [interview with Christiane Kubrick](#) seems to hint at a direct kind of fear, *"All Stanley's life he said, 'Never, ever go near power. Don't become friends with anyone who has real power. It's dangerous.' We both were very nervous on journeys when you have to show your passport. He did not like that moment. We always had to go through separate entrances, he with [our] two American daughters upstairs, and me with my German daughter downstairs. The foreigners downstairs! He'd be looking for us nervously. Would he ever get us back?"*

All these efforts illustrate a certain fear, perhaps even paranoia, on Kubrick's part. The backlashes he'd received regarding several of his films - *Paths of Glory*, *Lolita*, *Dr Strangelove* – most likely were the cause of his new isolated lifestyle, shielding himself against media attacks and, possibly, concerns about assassination attempts.

CONCLUSION TO PART TWO

Given all this evidence, it's certainly not unreasonable to speculate Kubrick might have been killed for making *Eyes Wide Shut*. The idea the film was re-edited after his death is a bigger stretch so far, given the lack of tangible evidence. In both cases we don't yet have conclusive proof.

PART THREE

COUNTER EVIDENCE / ARGUMENTS

In part two I made the best arguments I could for the theories of Kubrick being assassinated and *Eyes Wide Shut* re-edited to remove scenes that further “*exposed the establishment*”. A lot of the material came from other sources who have published to that effect and some of it came from my own observations. Effectively, we’ve heard the case for the prosecution, as we would in a court room. Now let’s hear the opposing position with as much rigour. These opposing arguments are many, so let’s get straight to it ...

1) THE CONSPIRATORS DIDN’T HAVE TO RELEASE THE FILM AT ALL.

Rather than release a re-edited *Eyes Wide Shut*, and later have to deal with questions and rumours about assassinations, what the film meant or whether scenes had been deleted, the studio could have announced that Kubrick simply died before his final film could be completed. They could have stated that the shoot wasn’t complete and so there wasn’t enough footage to finish the film. If the studio could silence people about a re-edit then they could, with as much plausibility, silence people about whether the film was finished at all.

2) THE SOURCE NOVEL ALREADY INCLUDED SECRET SOCIETIES

Contrary to the idea that studio executives were taken by surprise at the screening, they would have known from the script (essential for green lighting production) and from the source novella by Arthur Schnitzler that the film would contain scenes of the central character infiltrating a secret society. If they were concerned about this they didn’t need to fund the film.

3) THE CONSPIRATORS WOULDN’T HAVE RISKED RELEASING *EYES WIDE SHUT* IN ITS CURRENT FORM.

Even in its released form, *Eyes Wide Shut* blatantly causes its audience to ask questions about what the leaders of our society are like behind closed doors in their private clubs and social gatherings. It has sparked a great deal of widespread curiosity about modern day secret societies. The deletion of more gratuitous or more satanic scenes was not an effective counter of Kubrick’s effort to “*expose the elites*”. The conspirators would also not risk releasing any edit of the film at all in case Kubrick had slipped “*elite exposing*” details into the film that they had overlooked in their effort to re-edit. For example, the exterior of the Somerton scene is Mentmore Towers, formerly owned by the Rothschild family (a family widely cited in conspiracy websites as being at the near peak of the conspiratorial food chain). This external shot could have easily been removed from the film or replaced. In another instance, *Bill* has a conversation with two “*models*” at the Zeigler Party. A verbal reference to “*Rockerfeller Plaza*” is made. This could have been edited out of the film to protect the famous Rockerfeller family. In the Somerton scene, as *Bill* is summoned to receive a threat, several costume masks are shown in close up. One of them is a blatant pyramid and eye mask in the colours of the dollar bill (almost certainly a reference to the, apparently Masonic, seal on the back of the United States dollar bill). And a last example, the following lines from Zeigler are left in the film,

“Those were not just ordinary people there. If I told you their names, I’m not going to tell you their names, but if I did, I don’t think you’d sleep so well”. Any elite conspirator worth their salt (and capable of arranging Kubrick’s assassination within a week, as well as a full cover-up) would spot these details in the film and demand their removal from the edit, including the scenes of *Bill* receiving threats and being followed.

4) THE CONSPIRATORS COULD HAVE COMPLETELY RESHOT THE SOMERTON MANSION SCENE.

Given the vast power and control often attributed to the conspirators, they could have further delayed the film’s release and re-shot the Somerton orgy scenes. They could have it turned into nothing more than a straight forward wife-swapping party or an orgy without any religious order overtones. Re-editing and reshooting has happened with many studio movies, in which directors, even famous ones, had the final edit taken out of their hands. *Superman 2* is a well-known example.

5) THE RELEASED FILM STILL CONTAINS SCENES OF IMPLIED CHILD ABUSE.

In the scene where *Bill Harford* acquires a mask and costume from *Millich’s* costume shop, the shop owner finds his teenage daughter near naked with two older business men. He screams at them, *“She is just a child! You will have to answer to the police!”* The scene carries clear implications of older, wealthy men engaging in sexual activities with a minor. The conspirators, who supposedly re-edited the film, could have easily removed this scene by cutting away straight after the costume owner agrees to sell *Bill* a mask and cloak. The later scene, in which *Bill* returns to discover *Millich* is pimping out his own daughter, could have been safely edited out of the film as well.

6) THE CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATION NOT TO RE-EDIT MAY NOT HAVE ENDED WITH KUBRICK’S DEATH.

To my knowledge the supposed contract between Warner Bros and Kubrick, in which it’s claimed he had final cut rights, has not been made public. The contract may not have been directly with Kubrick personally. It may have been a contract between Warner Bros and a company Kubrick owned, just as at the Warner Bros end of the contract executives Terry Semel and Bob Daly were almost certainly not personally referenced as parties in the contract. If the contract was with a company Kubrick owned then the final cut obligations would remain in place, as the company would still legally exist. Its ownership would almost certainly have been passed on to Kubrick’s wife or some other appointed heir, such as Jan Harlan, Anthony Frewin or some other long-term Kubrick collaborator.

Kubrick, the great chess player, would certainly have considered the fate of his own movies after his own death. This is illustrated by him having kept many thousands of documents and production materials throughout his career for release after his own death. The possibility he might die during the production of his last film would certainly have been considered, and contingency plans and contract conditions adjusted accordingly. It would have been untypically amateur of him not to.

7) MISMATCHING DESCRIPTIONS OF DELETED SCENES.

As outlined in part one of this article, descriptions of the deleted scenes are varied. They also mismatch each other severely most of the time. Of its self, this proves that most of the deleted scene descriptions are flat out wrong. Likely they have been made up from the imaginations of the people making the claims, or what has started out as a statement of what the deleted scenes “*might*” have shown, has been taken as literal by readers who then repeat the descriptions in their own publications, but state them as if they’re proven fact.

8) SEVERAL KUBRICK FILMS DON’T HAVE A NARRATIVE VOICEOVER.

Countering the claim that the slow pace of *Eyes Wide Shut* is evidence of a missing narrative voiceover, there are two other slow-paced Kubrick films that have no voiceover. They are *2001: A Space Odyssey* and *The Shining*. These films were released while Kubrick was alive and are, by all accounts, his own final cuts. *2001* did have an initial narration for the executive screening, but Kubrick himself removed it (along with the pro- space race narrative) for the film’s release.

9) PRODUCTION MATERIALS DON’T CONTAIN SUPPORTING EVIDENCE FOR THE CLAIMED DELETED SCENES OR NARRATION.

There are lots of production materials for the film at the Kubrick Archives. This is where I found a copy of the book *Cult and Occult*, a clear indication Kubrick had been researching the subject of occult secret societies. But I have not found evidence of a voice over narration, nor evidence of deleted scenes depicting anything of the sordid nature. Researcher Nathan Abrams has, according to a follower of my work on Facebook, written of a voiceover narration that existed in an early script draft, but Abrams doesn’t report anything sordid as being present in that draft.

10) ASSASSINATING KUBRICK AND RE-EDITING WOULD NOT BE ENOUGH TO CONCEAL THE EXTRA FOOTAGE.

According to the film credits of the released movie, *Eyes Wide Shut* was edited by Nigel Galt. Kubrick typically would oversee the editing, which would reduce the official editor’s role to that of a technician. Kubrick himself would make the creative choices. Editor Gordon Stainforth has given multiple interview accounts of editing *The Shining* with Kubrick overseeing the whole process. Other editors worked on different Kubrick films, but usually there are no publicly available interviews with them to be found. This includes *Eyes Wide Shut* editor Nigel Galt. We could point to the lack of public statement from Nigel Galt as a conspiracy in which he has been silenced, but I’ve found no interviews with him about any movie he’d worked on, yet he’s [worked on many](#). Reportedly he was an interviewee for the documentary film *Stanley and Us* (he’s [credited here](#)), but I’ve not managed to find a copy of this documentary.

It’s actually rare that film editors provide interviews about the films they’ve worked on. This will partially be because the editor role is largely considered to be a minor technical one by movie reviewers and because the film editing art form is too detailed and psychologically subtle to make for strong marketing material. There’s the possibility that Galt was contracted not to speak publicly about his work on the film, but this might be a condition most film editors in Hollywood sign up to.

Other long-term collaborators of Kubrick's, including Jan Harlan and Leon Vitali, as well as his wife and their daughters, would likely have seen the edit that was sent to Warner executives for the New York screening. And it's not just about the edit. There would have been many people involved in the actual filming of the deleted scenes who would know of their existence and their content. There would be a cinematographer, sound technicians, lighting technicians, actors and their agents, parents (if sordid scenes involving child actors had been filmed, as some theorists have claimed), special effects and make-up artists (if reported torture scenes had been filmed).

All of these people would have to be silenced, but that would be too risky. Any of them could, at any point in the future, say "to hell with it" and talk publicly about what they knew, even from their own death bed, as they would then have nothing to fear. Alternately, any of them could publish their information online (with production material evidence to back it up if they'd kept some) through anonymous accounts. They could reveal shooting dates and shooting locations, perhaps even providing copies of documentation regarding the shooting schedule (as is typically handed out to film crew). At the very least, their accounts of the filming would not blatantly conflict with available evidence. But, no such accounts have surfaced in over twenty-five years since the film's release.

11) KUBRICK WOULD HAVE ENSURED THE EXTRA SCENES COULD NOT BE ERASED FROM HISTORY.

If Kubrick had filmed scenes that he knew were going to be controversial (he'd faced controversy before over his films) he would have anticipated the studio having a problem with it. And if he'd had an argument with Warner executives over the content of the film, shouting that he will not allow the film to be cut, then he most certainly would have made sure to preserve his own edit of the film in some form and place it beyond the reaches of the executives (not a difficult thing to do at all). Being that even the assassination theorists believe claim there was a one week gap between the executive screening and Kubrick's death, this gave the director a plenty of time to make a full record of the scenes and their creation. He could have gathered set photos, production schedules, the full version of the script, anything that could prove the existence and content of those scenes. He could then make copies of all this material, from which copies could be distributed among trusted family and associates or even forwarded to journalists who would be likely to cover the issue. These materials could have been hidden for years after his death then distributed online via untraceable methods such as Torrent uploads. The idea that Kubrick would spend the final week of his life fretting over the studio wanting to trim down his movie and that he would NOT take any precautions to ensure the preservation of the full film is absurd.

12) THE CLAIMED DELETED SCENES MISMATCH THE REST OF THE FILM

In the released version of the film, *Bill Harford*, after leaving the Somerton mansion orgy and being threatened, chooses to return to the Somerton gates. At the gates he is given a letter telling him to cease his enquiries. If *Bill* had witnessed child sexual abuse or murder while at Somerton, why did he return to the gates? Why did he not go the police? Why did he continue to be preoccupied with the mysterious and sexually alluring female character while at the mansion? Why are he and his wife primarily concerned with how to save their marriage at the end of the film, instead of discussing

how to protect themselves from being killed (actually this question applies to the released version of the film too).

In addition, if murders were taking place among the Somerton club, why do they let Bill live at all, especially if he'd witnessed the acts? They had him held captive and helpless. They could easily have just killed him.

13) THE EXECUTIVE RESIGNATIONS MISMATCH THE THEORY.

The announced resignations of Warner executives Terry Semel and Bob Daly the day before the release of *Eyes Wide Shut* may initially strike some as evidence that the film was a problem for them among their conspiratorial peers, but logically it mismatches the theory. If they had arranged Kubrick's assassination then why would they need to resign upon the film's release? If anything, they would be in the good books of their peers. As stated by multiple media outlets at the time, Warners had been having financial difficulties for some time and stock holders were unhappy with the performances of these two executives. It's reported they announced their resignations around the time that a new financial report on the company's takings for the year was released. This is a more plausible explanation for the timing of their resignations.

14) 666 DAYS, COUNTDOWN AND THE SILLY "23 ENIGMA".

The issue of Kubrick having died 666 days before the year 2001 is most likely incidental. Coincidences do happen, and can usually be found quite easily if one is looking for them. This was certainly the case with the famous 23 enigma that has been popular in conspiracy media from time to time. A two digit number is incredibly easy to find in random, incidental contexts if one goes searching for it. A three digit number takes a little more digging, but it still isn't too difficult. For example I went looking for the number 237 in relation to Kubrick's death (237 being the famous scary room number in Kubrick's *The Shining*). And guess what? Kubrick death was announced by multiple news sources on March 8th, exactly 237 days before Halloween in the same year, 1999. Oh my God, the devil's hand must have been at work!

As an example of how a person with decent math skills can quickly find a randomly chosen three-digit number, [watch contestants on the TV show Countdown](#) doing it, but forced to use six randomly chosen smaller numbers to reach the target.

15) THE SUPPOSED ASSASSINATION WAS TOO QUICK.

Upon seeing *Eyes Wide Shut*, any executive conspirators wishing to arrange Kubrick's death wouldn't need to rush into it so fast. They would need to have a sit down to discuss exactly how to deal with the situation ... whether to re-edit the film, how exactly to re-edit it, whether to release it at all, how to arrange the assassination in a way that would not backfire and be revealed, how to ensure Kubrick hadn't stored away hidden copies of the film with collaborators to protect the existence of his edit (a near impossible task), arranging a full list of everybody who knew about the full edit and planning how to keep them all silent for decades to come.

This would be a major organisation of resources, requiring considerable co-ordination. To plan this and have the assassination done within a week is absurd, especially being that there was no rush. There were several months left before the scheduled release of the movie, which could also have

been delayed by the studio, if needed (even delayed by years). Such an operation would have been more carefully thought out over a longer period.

16) KUBRICK WASN'T KILLED REGARDING HIS OTHER ANTI-ESTABLISHMENT MOVIES.

Way back in 1962, Kubrick directed his screen adaptation of *Lolita*. The film was an exposure of the mind sets of pedophiles and pederasts with a plot that linked those sexual abnormalities with Hollywood via the playwright character *Claire Quilty*. KUBRICK WASN'T KILLED FOR MAKING THE FILM.

Two years later, in 1964, Kubrick directed *Dr Strangelove*, a film that mocked and humiliated Pentagon officials and delusional cold war strategists such as Herman Kahn and Henry Kissinger. The film was such a military embarrassment that the US Air Force [produced an internally distributed documentary](#) called [SAC Command Post](#), specifically to reassure its own staff that the nuclear war scenario depicted in the film couldn't happen. Kubrick and the film were attacked by establishment film critics, but he WAS NOT KILLED FOR MAKING THE FILM.

Seven years later, in 1971, Kubrick directed *A Clockwork Orange*, which depicted government sponsored mind control experiments against the public, and was very critical of the UK's major false opposition political parties. This was the third time in a decade Kubrick had made a film "exposing the elites". Again establishment film critics attacked Kubrick and the film. In UK a co-ordinated campaign of threats against the Kubrick family persuaded Kubrick to withdraw the film from UK release (until after his death when it was re-released, Kubrick playing the long chess game of course). This author suspects the threats against Kubrick may have been orchestrated by well-funded political sources, but ... KUBRICK WAS NOT KILLED FOR MAKING THE FILM.

Following this he made *Barry Lyndon* in 1975. The film exposed, via historical context, the hypocrisy and stupidity of social climbers seeking high positions within the British class system and, especially, its pompous Knighthood Orders. KUBRICK WAS NOT KILLED FOR MAKING THE FILM.

Not only was Stanley Kubrick not killed for making these films, but the films were also not re-edited by the studios against his will. His career as a film maker was also not destroyed as a punishment, though film critic attacks were plenty. He was allowed to carry on making movies. Several of these movies, were as anti-establishment as *Eyes Wide Shut* and, in the cases of *Dr Strangelove* and *A Clockwork Orange*, even more so.

It makes little sense that Kubrick would be allowed to have a long career of making mostly anti-establishment films, but that his final film would suddenly spark a knee-jerk assassination within a single week of the first executive screening.

Incidentally, *A Clockwork Orange* and *Barry Lyndon* were also distributed by Warner Bros.

17) NON-ASSASSINATIONS OF OTHER ANTI-ESTABLISHMENT FILM MAKERS.

In 1999, the same year as *Eyes Wide Shut*, several other politically influential anti-establishment films were released. They include *The Matrix*, *Fight Club*, *Three Kings* and Polanski's *The Ninth Gate*, which is even more satanic in its plot than Kubrick's film. None of the directors of these movies were killed. One of the producers has claimed in an interview that he lost his job for having made *Fight Club*, but he was not killed. His firing could also have been because of the initial weak performance of the film at the box office.

There are many other anti-establishment and “*exposing the elite*” films on the market ... *Starship Troopers* (1997, a humiliating advance parody and warning about the *War On Terror*, with the writer and director openly admitting the themes of the film in the DVD commentary), John Carpenter’s *They Live* (1988), *Being There* (1979, an all-out mockery of White House power politics. This film even ends with a powerful economic figure being buried inside a pyramid with an all-seeing eye at the apex), *The President’s Analyst* (1967), Robert DeNiro’s directorial effort *The Good Shepherd* (2006, shows scenes of the Skull & Bones secret society), Polanski’s films *Rosemary’s Baby* (1968) and *Chinatown* (1974), *The Lives of Others* (2006), Francis Coppola’s films *The Conversation* (1974) and *Apocalypse Now* (1979), *V for Vendetta* (2005). *Kill List* (2011, shows high level secret societies engaged in satanic practices and depicts them as child abusers), *Late Night with the Devil* (2024, includes recorded footage from Alex Jones’ real life infiltration of the Bohemian Grove Club), *The Truman Show* (2001), and the TV series *True Detective* seasons 1 & 2 (the second season has police infiltrating a secret society masked ball orgy, very similar to in *Eyes Wide Shut*).

None of the film makers who created these movies have been assassinated. Those movies are still on the market. Most of the film makers went on to make other movies. Yet the Kubrick assassination theory singles he and his movie *Eyes Wide Shut* as somehow being a huge threat to high level secret societies, requiring fast assassination of the director. It’s even more implausible for the fact that Warner Bros released both *Eyes Wide Shut* and *The Matrix* in the same year and released *V for Vendetta* in 2005. Their filmography is too anti-establishment for them to be secret society protecting conspirators.

18) NON-ASSASSINATIONS OF INFLUENTIAL POLITICAL ACTIVISTS

Outside of the world of cinema there have been, and still are, many political activists who have published in-depth books and documentaries attempting to expose high level secret societies. They include Alex Jones, David Icke and Antony C Sutton. The quality of research varies from claims so ridiculous and self-discrediting the authors may as well be working covertly for the high powers they purport to expose, to far more rigorous and fully documented research that genuinely exposes high levels of corruption in ways more reputationally damaging for our “leaders” than a fiction movie could ever be. Yet these researchers have not been killed. They get attacked by establishment news media (sometimes with merit, and sometimes by pure defamation), but they don’t get assassinated. Alex Jones’ Bohemian Grove infiltration, for example (was a real world *Eyes Wide Shut* style revelation), has not earned him a death sentence.

I’ve heard the argument made that these kinds of activists are too prominent to be killed without arousing suspicion and turning them into martyrs, but that argument would apply to Stanley Kubrick as well, who was even more famous. If they could get away with killing Kubrick, why not do the same to Jones, Icke, Sutton and others like them?

19) DEFAMATION (NOT MURDER) IS THE STANDARD METHOD FOR STOPPING DISSIDENTS.

Universally in our western culture, the standard way of dealing with people who expose establishment corruption (whether they are famous or not) is to character assassinate them. This typically comes in the form of defamatory smear attack articles published in establishment funded news and entertainment media. Journalists and editors can either be bribed to the task, or willingly will do it out of their own ideological bias. A well-funded smear campaign will typically start with

either a large audience publication or a new wire / press agency service (news sources that provide news stories to other news organisations) launching the initial “story”. The false or exaggerated claims are then regurgitated by dozens, even hundreds, of smaller publications that lack the funding or motivation to do their own research. This system can very quickly turn a blatant lie into a mass produced narrative. We see this on a weekly basis in our news media.

In the case of *Eyes Wide Shut*, I had a think about how the potential reputational damage to the establishment could have been directly handled by the establishment in a way more effective than simply assassinating Kubrick himself. I think a far more effective response would have been to let the film go public, but influence dozens of high level film critics and reviewers to declare it Kubrick’s most boring, pompous and delusional film. A narrative could have been weaved that Kubrick, the secluded obsessive compulsive film maker, had lost touch with the real world and lost himself in a land of “conspiracy theory” delusion. Kubrick’s entire filmography could have been reframed in the public sphere as that of a “paranoid tin-foil hat wearing film maker”. Headlines like “What’s Stanley Kubrick been smoking?” would sink easily into the public memory. The film could have been reframed as being a massive drop in technical quality for Kubrick as well (an approach used against Michael Winner in 1982 regarding his excellent, but critically loathed, vigilante film *Death Wish 2*). News media sources could have demanded that Kubrick step out of the shadows and answer questions about *Eyes Wide Shut*. His silence could be branded that of a “coward, unable to publicly defend his own work”. Mockeries of the film’s Somerton scenes could be broadcast in TV chat shows and so on.

In my view, the co-ordination of a relentless and humiliating defamatory attack against Kubrick and his last film would have been much more effective, and less legally risky, than all out murder. In reality though, the film had initial mixed reviews, as almost every Kubrick film did, and its reputation has grown since. So we’re expected to believe Kubrick was killed and his film re-edited, but that the conspirators didn’t even bother trying to downgrade public perception of either Kubrick or his final film upon its release. This would have been even easier a task, given Kubrick was not alive to take legal action or publish a retort.

20) KUBRICK’S DEATH INCREASED INTEREST IN EYES WIDE SHUT

This is a very simple point. Interest in the film, as well as interest in its meanings, was enhanced by Kubrick’s death, defeating the point of assassinating him.

21) JAN HARLAN HAS PUBLICLY EXPLAINED THE EDITING PROCESS

In October 2023 I took part in an after-screening Q&A on Kubrick’s *Full Metal Jacket*, discussing Kubrick’s filmography with executive producer Jan Harlan. He was executive producer on all Kubrick films from *The Shining* through to *Eyes Wide Shut*. I asked Harlan directly, in front of a live audience, how the final edit of the film was done and who was involved in the final polishing. He wasn’t flustered or angry at the question. He answer calmly. [Here is what he said](#), explaining that himself and editor Nigel Galt, along with input from Kubrick’s wife, were the finalizers of the edit. When I posted the clip on youtube, predictable deniers in the comment section claimed (without evidence) that Harlan was lying and had been silenced. The next day at a film festival lunch Jan Harlan came and sat with me of his own choice. We had plenty of conversation and he didn’t seem in the slightest bit upset that I’ve asked him about the final edit of the film. I detected no indication of

anxiety or a guilty conscience. And I'm a good reader of non-verbal communication on account of my seventeen years work in mental health and probation.

It's also ironic that assassination theorists choose to dismiss Harlan's explanation of the edit as a lie, but they choose to believe Harlan's own statements that the film was shown to studio executives a week before Kubrick died. Cherry picking statements from the same source as being, in turn, truth or lies to fit the desired narrative is standard bias.

22) EXECUTIVES DIDN'T NEED TO ANNOUNCE THE FILM HAD BEEN SCREENED FOR THEM.

To more successfully pass off Kubrick's death as a natural heart attack, the studio executives would have been better off not announcing they had seen the film at all. Or they could have claimed they'd seen a rough cut months before or that they didn't see it until weeks after Kubrick's death. This would help to prevent suspicions. And, going with the logic of the assassination theorists, those who worked on the film could be "silenced" with threats and bribery.

23) KUBRICK WASN'T A CRASS TORTURE PORN DIRECTOR.

The more extreme descriptions of deleted child sex abuse and torture scenes are not fitting with Kubrick's more subtle approach to film making.

24) CHILD ABUSE SCENES WOULD HAVE BEEN BANNED BY THE CENSORS

Executives would not need to edit out scenes of child sexual abuse or torture because the censors would have blocked them anyway. Sure, a lot of Hollywood films do have extremely sadistic violence or rape and are permitted for release, but scenes of such activities against children are virtually never permitted. Kubrick would have known this and would not have been stupid enough to expect such scenes to be accepted for distribution.

25) CHILD ABUSE SCENES WOULD HAVE RUINED KUBRICK'S CAREFULLY PROTECTED REPUTATION

Regardless of any perceived effort to "*expose the elites*", audiences would have widely objected to seeing such content on screen. Critics would also object. But, even more dangerous to Kubrick, the scenes would have become widely distributed among real world pedophile gangs who were stimulated by it. I believe Kubrick was smart enough to anticipate such reactions. If he'd been stupid enough to put that content out in the world, it would have become the nail in the coffin of Kubrick's reputation.

26) FILMING CHILD ABUSE SCENES WOULD BE ILLEGAL AND DIFFICULT TO CAST.

Those claiming scenes of child abuse and torture were edited out are so hell-bent on their desired narrative that they've overlooked how difficult it would be legally, and logistically, to shoot such scenes. Scenes require actors. Actors need to see a script. Child actors work under legally strict conditions, which includes their parents seeing the script (and agreeing to it contractually), and parents or other established carers will be on set to provide support for the child.

How many parents or child actor agents would agree to have a young child take part in the filming of sexual abuse or torture scenes? How many crew members would idly take part in the shooting of such scenes? There have been many instances in film history of crew walking off set and quitting a film if they objected to what was being filmed. The original cinematographer of *Death Wish 2* quit during the shooting of a rape scene, in which only adults were acting. Crew members reportedly left the location when George Miller was filming a tanker crash in the finale of *The Road Warrior*. Film crews aren't just obedient robots.

The filming of such scenes would, for realism, require the children be shown in emotional distress, as well as being naked. The experience could lead to lasting psychological harm. Kubrick would not subject a child actor to this, not would the crew put up with it. As has been famously cited regarding his filming of *The Shining*, child actor Danny Lloyd (for his emotional protection) was told they were making a comedy movie. The novel included a moment when the child character is choked, but Kubrick opted not to show this on screen. Instead, we see the aftermath in which he has bruise make-up on his neck. He did opt to show the Grady twin girls' corpses covered in blood, but did not show the act of them being killed.

27) THE CLAIMED DELETED SCENES WOULDN'T MAKE THE DEPICTED SECRET SOCIETY ANY MORE REAL.

Regardless of evidence in the real world of elite secret societies, the one we see in the film is still framed by the basic premise that it is a staged fictional event in a movie. It would be no more "real" than the evil *Cenobytes* in the movie *Hellraiser*. The audience would still know that the people in the scene are actors and that any graphic violence shown is just special effects. It wouldn't have the same "revelation" effect of real footage, such as that shown on the Hunter Biden laptop.

28) ARTISTS AND FILM MAKERS HAVE DIED AT THE END OF A PRODUCTION BEFORE

It was inevitable Kubrick would die in the process of film making because the art form was one he would never want to give up. Clint Eastwood is currently in his 90's and is still making films. The cinematographer of *Superman* (1978) died during the film's editing process. In 2023 William Friedkin, famous for directing *The Exorcist*, died during post-production of his final film *The Caine-Mutiny Court Martial*. Why is it that Friedkin's death during editing of his final film is accepted as natural causes, but some are unable to accept it regarding Kubrick's death?

29) KUBRICK'S DEATH WOULD HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED SUSPICIOUS AT ANY POINT

Given Kubrick's filmography of often controversial and establishment-challenging movies, his death at any point would have raised the question of assassination. If *Eyes Wide Shut* had been released and he'd died six months later, assassination theories would still emerge. If his planned movie *A.I. Artificial Intelligence* had gone into production (directed by Spielberg after his actual death), with Kubrick directing, and he'd died during production, assassination theories would still emerge and, likely, claims that his unfinished last film would have been too dangerous for the establishment.

This logic applies with any controversial figure. When conspiracy gurus like David Icke or Alex Jones eventually die, their deaths will cause persistent rumours of assassination, no matter what the actual circumstances or evidence.

The mere fact that a prominent public person devotes their life to a controversial cause, making enemies along the way, doesn't mean that they can only be killed by assassination. They're mortal too and, eventually, they have to die like the rest of us.

CONCLUSION TO PART THREE

What initially started off as a semi-plausible theory that Kubrick was assassinated for making *Eyes Wide Shut*, falls apart under scrutiny, as do the sordid deleted scenes theories, which lacked plausibility to begin with. The inconsistencies and unlikely-hoods regarding both are too many. However, the suspicion remains, especially in terms of the one week gap between the reported executive screening and Kubrick's reported death, as well as the parallels between Kubrick's death and the Mandy Curran character in his final film. But ... there are alternate possibilities about the course of events that might explain these issues. We'll explore those in the fourth and final part of this article.

TO BE CONTINUED ...

If any of you reading this article have important information or sources you believe I've missed you can email me with the details (you'll find my contact details at [my site](#)). And please ... PROVIDE SOURCES !!!

Meanwhile, if you want to know more about *Eyes Wide Shut*, you can explore the following videos I've previously produced about this complex film.

THE CULT OF EYES WIDE SHUT
 THE MASKS OF EYES WIDE SHUT
 THE CHILDREN OF EYES WIDE SHUT
 KUBRICK'S RAINBOW STORY
 EYES WIDE SHUT AND THE WEINSTEIN EFFECT
 BEHIND THE CHARADE
 RED CLOAK UNMASKED
 THE PLOT THICKENS: EYES WIDE SHUT'S MYSTERIOUS NEWSPAPER ARTICLES
 KUBRICK'S OCCULT RESEARCH FOR EYES WIDE SHUT
 CASTING AND PRODUCTION OF THE "EROTIC FANTASY MOVEMENT" SCENE
 WITCHCRAFT AND TANTRIC YOGA IN EYES WIDE SHUT
 MANDY'S SECRET

All of these videos (or their equivalent youtube links) are available on my [Film Analysis Page](#)