

LAW

The Top Ten Most Incriminating Elements of the Newly Released 2003 Trump-Epstein Communication—Which Clearly Reads As Being About Pedophilia

This is the closest thing to a smoking gun with respect to Trump and Child Rape that America has ever seen—which explains why Trump has gone to extraordinary lengths (even for him) to lie about it.



SETH ABRAMSON

JUL 18, 2025 • PAID



213



18



94

Share





To receive free, unrestricted access to this publication’s 500+ exclusive reports for seven days, just click the red “free trial offer” button below. You can cancel your subscription at any time. A newly updated version of this author’s (very) long-form biography can be found at [this link](#).

Introduction

*{Update on Friday, July 18, 2025 at 5:58 PM EDT: Trump has [sued](#) the Wall Street Journal. This seemingly confirms that he sees the “**Birthday Note**” discussed in detail below—the only part of [this Wall Street Journal](#) report that’s at all new—as a tangible threat to his presidency. In the \$10 billion lawsuit, [which mentions this author twice in its eighteen pages](#), President*

*Trump denies having ever been involved in any way with the production of the alleged Note. For an excellent summary of the life and times of **Jeffrey Epstein** generally, see [this interview](#).}*

I'm a former federal criminal investigator—in the mid-1990s I worked in that capacity in the federal criminal justice system in **Washington, D.C.**—and a former criminal defense attorney who worked for many years, in several jurisdictions, to represent thousands of criminal defendants in cases and jury trials ranging up to **First-Degree Murder**. This report doesn't constitute legal advice, as while I'm still an attorney in good standing with my state and federal bars, I'm retired from practice. But it does represent an instance of me using my professional skills to expertly analyze a major public event. That major public event is without question the biggest scandal of the **second Trump administration**, and possibly the biggest scandal of President **Donald Trump's** entire ten-year political career.

How is it possible that **The Epstein Scandal** could be the biggest-ever Trump scandal, given that the man was **impeached twice, convicted of thirty-four felonies in New York, adjudicated by a federal judge to be a rapist, charged with state and federal offenses related to a violent insurrection in multiple state and federal jurisdictions,** and near-daily is caught (i) **offering or accepting bribes**, (ii) **seeking illegal foreign election interference**, (iii) **issuing an executive order that flagrantly violates the U.S. Constitution** in the view of federal prosecutors and judges, or (iv) manipulating the executive and legislative branches of the U.S. government in clandestine, corrupt, and decidedly seedy ways that even President **Richard Nixon** (of **Watergate** infamy) would never have imagined? (Sometimes the manipulations **aren't even clandestine at all**.)

Well, it's simple, really.

As a longtime Trump biographer and presidential historian who has written **several national-bestselling books about Trump**, I can summarize what makes the Epstein Scandal different in just five bullet-points:

1. This scandal involves **Child Rape, one of the worst crimes known to mankind;**

2. this scandal has dogged Trump for the entirety of his political career, and unlike every other scandal he has ever faced, it's never receded to any significant degree;
3. this scandal is the first that **has the president's own political base even angrier at him than his critics are**;
4. this scandal is the first that the president himself appears to have no idea how to combat, leading to a host of first-ever blunders (such as **viciously savaging his own political base**) that bespeak a POTUS unnerved by the potential consequences of what he's now facing; and
5. unlike prior political scandals that struggled to break through to the average American because they centered (at least in the public's imagination) on just a single phone-call transcript (the **Trump-Ukraine Scandal**) or primarily the actions of Trump agents being indirectly orchestrated by him (the **Trump-Russia Scandal**), or that could only be properly recounted in FBI interviews no one wanted to read in their entirety (the **January 6 Scandal**), *this* scandal involves Trump directly interacting with disgusting figures, comprises a *mountain* of physical evidence that almost every American has seen and finds is undeniable (notably, hundreds of photographs and video clips of Trump happily cavorting with child sex traffickers) *and* involves *sex*—a national obsession in America.

This last point is particularly crucial, as the Epstein Scandal has now come to a head precisely *because* of two pieces of physical evidence nearly all Americans are now well aware of: (i) the missing **"Phase 2" binder from the Epstein Files** that Trump personal lawyer **Pam Bondi** (still working as Trump's personal lawyer, just now under the title of **"Attorney General"**) explicitly promised to supply to all Americans and **said would include** an Epstein **"client list,"** and (ii) a **"birthday note"** that Trump sent to Epstein in 2003 (hereafter referred to, in this *Proof* report, as simply the **"Birthday Note"**).



Had Trump’s lawyer Bondi not pulled the stunt—on behalf of her client—of inviting to the **White House** all of **the most irresponsible MAGA** influencers (even some with **potential ties** to **events** that occurred in D.C. on January 6, 2021) to give them a binder of Epstein evidence that said “**Phase 1**” on the cover, thereafter sending them out to the **White House Press Corps** to crow about how “Phase 1” was just the beginning of Trump and Bondi’s **promised revelations** about Epstein, America would not have been waiting for “Phase 2,” or be so richly able to imagine what that binder would look like in the hands of not just far-right trolls but actual journalists and experts.

Just so, had the *Wall Street Journal* not just published a detailed report on the birthday note Trump sent in 2003, on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday, to **his longtime best friend**—a pedophile **who had been raping kids for years and years**—Americans would not be able to imagine exactly what sort of evidence was still being hidden from them when Bondi **suddenly declared** that there would be no “Phase 2” Epstein releases or

indeed *any* further releases about Epstein or his associates at all. (Yes, that's right, the Birthday Note that's the subject of this report *appears* to be part of the evidence that Trump and Bondi have been hiding from America, as everything taken from Epstein's home is part of the Epstein Files now in government custody, and the bound book of birthday wishes for Epstein the Birthday Note is from was taken from Epstein's home.)

All of the foregoing also explains why Trump has been virtually out of his mind—not figuratively but literally, as his public conduct in the last week has been **conspicuously deranged**—trying to (a) keep the *Wall Street Journal* from publishing even this *one* piece of evidence that he and his lawyer have been hiding from Americans, and (b) trying to use brute rhetorical force to get his fans to “**shut the fuck up**” (**his words**) on Epstein.

Trump's Epic Meltdown Over the Epstein Files Continues, Coldplay Kiss Cam Exp...



Right now, Donald Trump and not just one but *two* of his personal lawyers (new FBI director **Kash Patel** is *also* his personal lawyer, and *also* still working as Mr. Trump's lawyer while ostensibly holding a title at a government agency) are trying to hide the

full contents of the federal investigative file on Epstein, not just Phase 2 but almost certainly what would comprise Phase 3, Phase 4, and Phase 5 releases at a minimum.

So the fact that the *Wall Street Journal* just released *the very first tranche of data* from what *would* have been Phase 2—a minuscule drop in the bucket of Epstein data in terms of its word-count, if not its significance—and *just this one release* sent the *entire Trump administration* into a tailspin, followed immediately by a downward spiral, is as telling as anything else.

In other words, the **Birthday Note Incident** suggests—not just by way of its contents but how Trump and his legal team are responding to it—that the Trump-Epstein evidence the White House is currently hiding from America (and particularly the president’s “MAGA” base, which has been eerily obsessed with Child Rape for years via its “QAnon” sub-cult) is significantly worse than anyone could have imagined.

Why? Because *just the Birthday Note* is one of the worst things this former federal criminal investigator, criminal defense attorney, Trump biographer, and presidential historian has ever seen—and I say this as someone who published a full-length book on every known instance of Trump being violent to women, kids, or helpless persons.

What 2024’s *Proof of Cruelty* couldn’t have imagined, however—despite it being a book that describes Mr. Trump engaging in dozens of Assaults, Sexual Assaults, and even Rapes—is that the *perpetrator* of these many crimes and alleged crimes would be so brazen about them, indeed so gleeful about their commission, that he’d risk implicitly acknowledging some of the worst of them in a note to a major co-conspirator. *That* level of criminal sociopathy is, I can say from professional experience, quite rare; most criminals do all they can to hide their conduct, indeed not just their criminal conduct but any antisocial or otherwise unsavory conduct that surrounds it. Trump appears to have done the opposite: recklessly tossing out bread crumbs about his malfeasance without any apparent worry that the long arm of the law would ever come for him.

Clearly, judging from Trump’s own actions this week, that perspective has changed.

If *Proof of Cruelty* **revealed** that, according to multiple witnesses—including one who gave his name to the press—Trump regularly threw sex parties for underage models at the **Plaza Hotel** in the 1980s and early 1990s, parties during which he was well-known to be having sex with the attending models, apparently what Trump believes will soon be coming out about him and Child Rape is much worse than even that.

And it would appear, now, that the proverbial tip of the iceberg is the Birthday Note.

The Birthday Note

Here, in full, is the 2003 **Birthday Note**, as **just published** by the conservative *Wall Street Journal* and now republished in major outlets around the country and the world:

It isn't clear how the letter with Trump's signature was prepared. Inside the outline of the naked woman was a typewritten note styled as an imaginary conversation between Trump and Epstein, written in the third person.

"Voice Over: There must be more to life than having everything," the note began.

Donald: Yes, there is, but I won't tell you what it is.

Jeffrey: Nor will I, since I also know what it is.

Donald: We have certain things in common, Jeffrey.

Jeffrey: Yes, we do, come to think of it.

Donald: Enigmas never age, have you noticed that?

Jeffrey: As a matter of fact, it was clear to me the last time I saw you.

Trump: A pal is a wonderful thing. Happy Birthday — and may every day be another wonderful secret.

The report that follows not only breaks down the core elements of this now historic document—the **Text**, the **Subtext**, the **Sketch**, the **Signature**, and the **Context**—but also zooms out to consider what else was happening around this time in the life of both Trump and Epstein that might help us understand this private communication (albeit a communication Trump would have anticipated being semipublic, as his note was to be contained in a bound book to be presented to Epstein and thereafter used by the man in whatever way he wished; Trump would have been aware, therefore, that the book might be seen by other Epstein friends—or even acquaintances—and that he therefore had to be coy about things he otherwise might have written about outright).

In tackling this task, my aim is to use not just my professional experiences as a federal criminal investigator and criminal defense attorney but also, candidly, my professional experience as an analyst of texts and *specifically* texts intended as creative artifacts. I hold both a **PhD in Literary Studies** and also the nationally acknowledged terminal degree in the field of **Creative Writing**, the **MFA** (the latter granted by the **Iowa Writers' Workshop**, the former by the University of Wisconsin-Madison). I mention these credentials because criminal investigations are by their nature interdisciplinary, so when a key piece of evidence in an investigation is a *text*—moreover a text intended to be a work of artistry as much as information transmission—it's useful to have an investigator who also holds terminal degrees in additional relevant fields besides **Law**.

So far, this author has identified fifteen inculpatory—i.e., potentially incriminating—components in this piece of evidence President Trump and his personal attorney have worked so hard to suppress.

The bulk of this report will focus on the ten most significant data-points in the view of a federal criminal investigator, while the **Conclusion** will address others that are more esoteric but nevertheless compelling and deserving of additional research.

The Birthday Note's Top Ten Most Inculpatory Elements

(1) Trump confessed to having “certain things in common” with a man we now know is the most notorious pedophile and child sex trafficker in American history—and Trump was clear that the things he had in common with Epstein were things he *didn’t want to publicly confess*.

It takes no great detective skills to observe that when a man is writing a birthday note to a man **widely described** as his “best friend,” one thing that man is apt to do is make mention of things the besties have in common—as it’s likely those things that helped to form the foundation of the friendship.

So what are we—or, rather, what is *anyone*, detective or average citizen—to make of a situation in which a man writing a birthday note to his best friend is *unwilling to say in public* what he has in common with that friend? The options are relatively limited, and seem to consist only of these four:

- The point of commonality is **embarrassing** to both men;
- the point of commonality is for some reason a **secret** the men have agreed to keep;
- the point of commonality is something **antisocial or illegal** and it therefore must not must not be stated publicly, in the interest of protecting one or both men; or
- some **combination of the three items above**.

But our analysis can go further than this. When Trump wrote to Epstein, archly, in the Birthday Note, that the two men have “**certain things in common**,” it underscored at least *three* realities it might be easy for a casual reader of the note to miss:

1. Trump is saying that he and Epstein have *more than one* commonality he will not discuss;
2. Trump is indicating that Epstein *knows what those commonalities are* without Trump having to state them (suggesting that they’re a subject of regular discussion between the two, such that Trump needn’t itemize them for Epstein); and

3. these points of commonality are *so important* to *both* Trump and Epstein that they are worth bringing up in this arch way, and on one of the most important dates of Epstein's life (his fiftieth birthday, the occasion for Trump's birthday note to him).

Do we know what things were most important to Trump and Epstein in 2003?

As a matter of fact, we do. In fact, we do to a degree that's almost *comical*.

Stuart Pivar, one of Jeffrey Epstein's *other* best friends along with Trump in the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s, **told Mother Jones** in a 2019 interview that one of Epstein's favorite interjections in *any* conversation—but particularly the sort of conversations on science that he often convened for his home salon but was, candidly, unable to keep up with—was the following: “What does *that* have to do with *pussy*!?”

Yes, really.

Mr. Epstein would, on a regular basis, interrupt some of the nation's most renowned scientific experts, while they were in the midst of discussing their groundbreaking research, by *emphatically* stating that he considered the public discussion of “**pussy**” considerably more important than anything else. And apparently, Epstein's *obsession* with “pussy” was well known to *anyone* who knew him.

So it certainly was well known to his best friend for all those years, Donald Trump.

Most readers will know, in fact, that in a *New York Magazine* interview in 2002—an interview Trump therefore gave *just a few months* before he wrote the Birthday Note—he **told the world** that “I've known Jeff for 15 years. Terrific guy. He's a lot of fun to be with. It is even said that he likes beautiful women as much as I do, and many of them are on the younger side. No doubt about it—Jeffrey enjoys his social life.”

What's significant here isn't just Trump's acknowledgment in public of what everyone already knew about Epstein—he was obsessed with sex (a 2010s **Epstein Investigation** **revealed** that his obsession was so pathological that he felt he *needed* to be brought to

orgasm *at least three times* daily)—but the *other* point that Trump is making here: that being obsessed with being with women is *something that he and Epstein had in common*.

So when Trump wrote, in the Birthday Note, that he and Epstein had “**certain things in common**,” there’s every reason (not just the foregoing ones, but the avalanche of ones this report is about to dive into, *infra*) to say that Trump is speaking of a daily obsession with pursuing attractive women.

But wait a minute. If just months before the Birthday Note Trump had no problem at all telling the *whole country* that his best friend was obsessed with “**beautiful women**,” and moreover females “**on the younger side**,” what was left for Trump to be coy about—and he was clearly being coy—when he said of Epstein in his 2003 Note that he and Epstein had “certain things in common” when it came to pursuing beautiful women? Why not name the things? Why be arch about it and say “certain things” and no more?

Those things in common couldn’t *simply* be that both men pursued women *obsessively*, as Trump had already happily revealed that publicly. It couldn’t even simply be that Epstein liked females who were “on the younger side”—as Trump had no difficulty whatsoever broadcasting that to America as well, not just in his 2002 interview with *New York Magazine* but whenever he spoke of his daughter **Ivanka**, whenever **he spoke lasciviously of underage models** from his creepy Miss Teen USA pageants (and **a ring of associated and still dodgier pageants he acted as a judge for**), even **at random times** when speaking to the press. Trump prided himself on having an eye for female flesh, and he didn’t hide that some of that flesh was slightly below the age of consent.

No—what Trump was clearly doing in the Birthday Note was revelling in *additional* information he had about Epstein’s sexual proclivities that (i) he couldn’t state openly (so, beyond merely liking younger women), *and* (ii) that he and Epstein had in common.

It wouldn’t take a detective to understand from this that something about the sexual proclivities of the two men was either **antisocial** or **illegal**.

It wouldn't take a detective to determine that the reason Trump didn't want to state outright what the two men had in common sexually was because doing so wouldn't just implicate the birthday boy—Epstein—but Trump himself.

And given that Epstein's particular and *known* sexual obsession was younger women, Trump's reference to a commonality he couldn't state outright had to be something *more* antisocial or illegal than that, any detective would take from this that what the man was referring to here was **underage girls** and **very likely sex with underage girls**.

But did Trump have *knowledge* of Epstein cavorting with underage women? Enough for this to comprise his coy citation of a commonality?

You bet he did. How do we know? Because Trump was himself cavorting *with* Epstein *and* underage women.

People Log In Magazine Newsletters Sweepstakes

ENTERTAINMENT CRIME HUMAN INTEREST LIFESTYLE ROYALS STYLEWATCH SHOPPING SUBSCRIBE

Top Stories

- 1 Super Bowl Champion Bryan Brame Spent His Last Two Weeks of Life with His Young Daughters by His Side (Exclusive)
- 2 4 Dead, 7 Sickened by Flesh-Eating Bacteria in Florida
- 3 Cause of Death Revealed for Paddleboarder Killed in Maine Pond as Teenager is Arrested for Murder: Police
- 4 Trump Reportedly Told Epstein They Have 'Certain Things in Common' in Lewd Birthday Card: 'May Every Day Be Another Wonderful Secret'

Advertisement **Verzenio** abemaciclib Ask your doctor if Verzenio is right for you. Verzenio® is a registered trademark owned or licensed by Eli Lilly and Company, its subsidiaries or affiliates. PP-AL-US-4617 02/2025 ©Lilly USA, LLC 2025. All rights reserved. *Lilly* Advertisement

Ex-Casino Boss Claims Trump and 'Best Friend' Jeffrey Epstein Were Once Caught Bringing Underage Girls to Casino Floor

A former executive at Trump's Atlantic City casino told CNN that the duo brought three girls to the gambling floor who were not yet 21. The White House is calling his story "fabricated"

By **Meredith Kile** | Published on July 17, 2025 05:03PM EDT

([Link.](#))

Top Stories: Fed building renovation | Trump and Epstein | Sleeping on planes | Coke with cane sugar?

DAILY BEAST

Epstein Showed Me Photos of Trump with Topless Young Women Sitting in His Lap, Claims Author

Hugh Dougherty

Thu, October 31, 2024 at 5:50 PM EDT

5 min read



(Link.)

≡ DAILY NEWS

Donald Trump hosted wild parties with sex,...

NEWS > POLITICS

Donald Trump hosted wild parties with sex, cocaine and underage models: report

(Link.)

POLITICS ↗

Inside Donald Trump's One-Stop Parties: Attendees Recall Cocaine and Very Young Models

| 'SO MUCH FUN' |

'I was there to party myself. It was guys with younger girls, sex, a lot of sex, a lot of cocaine, top-shelf liquor' but no smoking. Trump didn't approve of cigarettes.



Michael Gross

Updated Oct. 31 2024 11:06AM EDT
Published Oct. 24 2016 9:00PM EDT



([Link.](#))

We'll return to this topic—Epstein and Trump partying jointly with underage girls, and therefore the near-certainty that this is what Epstein and Trump had in common that Trump didn't want to state publicly in his 2003 Birthday Note—in just a moment.

(2) If anyone doubted that the exclusive subject of the Birthday Note was sex with women, and specifically young women, Trump helpfully framed the Note in a way that made that fact literally *inescapable*.

It can't possibly be emphasized sufficiently that all of the words and ideas this report discusses—all of them words written and/or signed off on by Donald Trump himself—arrived inside a “frame” of sorts: a doodle of a naked female. As the *Journal* reports, “[the] several lines of typewritten text [in the Birthday Note were] framed by the outline of a naked [female], which appears to be hand-drawn with a heavy marker. A pair of small arcs denotes the [female]’s breasts, and the future president’s signature is a squiggly ‘Donald’ below her waist, mimicking pubic hair.”

It probably doesn't take a Literary Studies PhD or a Creative Writing MFA-holder to know that when the subject of a communication is coyly vague but *appears* to be sex—

and then *the entirety of that communication is literally put inside a naked female*—it only confirms that the subject of that communication is, indeed, females and having sex with females.

You may be wondering, now, why this report keeps repeating the word “**females**” rather than using the infinitely less creepy (in this context at least) term, “**women.**”

Well, the reason for this is a good one: there’s ample reason to think that the frame Trump put around his sex-related communication with a known child sex trafficker and pedophile was *not* a woman but a *girl*.

While the *Wall Street Journal* hasn’t revealed the image itself yet, it was at pains to say that the female form Trump either drew or (literally, see *infra*) *signed off on* was a “**small-breasted**” female. That’s an extremely interesting fact, in this context, not just in hindsight—because we know Trump’s best friend, the man he was writing to, was a pedophile—but because we know that Trump himself favors, in *women*, *larger* breasts.

That’s not only what we see with **Melania Trump**, who has an ample bosom, but what we saw with Trump’s two earlier wives, **Ivana Trump** and **Marla Maples**, as well.

In fact—and here things must necessarily become tragicomic again—we *know* that Trump is obsessed with larger breasts because he **infamously gave one of the most cringeworthy interviews about a baby daughter any man has ever given**, in which he told an interviewer, while sitting alongside his second wife Marla Maples, that he was excited to see whether baby **Tiffany** would end up with large breasts like her mom.

But it gets worse. Trump is **known to speak publicly**, and with obvious sexual interest, about the evident “**voluptuousness**” of his *other* daughter, **Ivanka**.

We could go on like this forever. *Proof* could post **pictures and accounts related to Stormy Daniels**, one of the many women Trump eagerly cheated on Melania with, but the point is clear: Trump is very much a “breast” man. So why would he choose to doodle, to a child sexual predator, a “small-breasted” female and then say, inside that

frame, that he and that child sexual predator have something in common that he can't speak of openly? Could it be that Trump has two discrete sexual appetites, one legal but adulterous (large-breasted models, porn stars, and cheerleaders who are not his lawful wife) and the other illegal and *verboden* (small-breasted underage girls, mostly models, who by law can't properly consent to sex at all)?

One way to approach this question would be this way: to ask whether Donald Trump ever been accused of **Human Trafficking** involving small-breasted underage models.

Yes, he **has**.



The stories of Trump Model Management are **harrowing** and **endless**, and suggest an illegal operation on all possible ends: illegally importing underage models from abroad; **entering into illegal contracts with them** in the **United States**; and then using them in illegal ways to further Trump's interests. And most of the "women" involved

were in fact *girls* in their teens, many of whom (see the “Plaza Hotel” revelations [here](#)) weren’t yet fully developed, puberty-wise, and therefore were small-breasted females of the very sort Trump drew in the Birthday Note.



Live

Video

Shows ▾

Shop



Trump Model: Felt Like 'Slave' Working for Donald's Agency

Beauty vs. the billionaire in lawsuit over Trump modeling agency.

By ABC News

March 10, 2016, 6:59 AM



Donald Trump is famous for liking big things: big buildings, big breasts, big paydays, big events, big media gaggles, **big claims about his own business acumen that turn out to be false**. We also know (see *infra*) that he’s fond of doodling, and he has no difficulty expressing himself through the medium of drawing. It’s with all that in mind that he sent a note to a best friend *who infamously liked small-breasted girls and young women*, which note was framed, by him, by a doodle of a small-breasted female. Why would Trump have doodled for his best friend anything but the sort of female form he knew from experience (see the headlines above of the two partying together) his best friend preferred? And how could we not then attribute to the coyness that runs throughout the Birthday Note the secret that’s *made manifest* in the Trump doodle surrounding it?

(3) Trump’s heavily coded Birthday Note includes an anagram no actively engaged pedophile would miss—let alone one of the most infamously prolific and shameless pedophiles in American history.

Proof has no history of believing in anagrams as a key element in forensic analysis.

There's a good reason for that: anagrams are, simply put, juvenile and silly. They're such a simplistic form of coding that not only should a good criminal investigator never assume they're present in a given investigation but it would be comical if in even more than one instance in an investigative career they *were*. Candidly, it takes a real manchild to use an anagram—someone too obsessed with movies and television—and we certainly would *least* expect to find one in a message that discusses a sensitive subject (as the risk of the anagram being detected and quickly decoded is too great).

But for all that, there's an exception to this general rule. There is, in fact, a *certain* sort of missive in which anagrams are rather common and perhaps even to be expected.

That scenario is this one:

- The communication is intended to be “fun”;
- the occasion for the communication is a clearly “happy” but ultimately trivial form of celebration;
- the communication is between two close friends;
- those close friends are males with notably underdeveloped (puerile) psyches, senses of humor, moral codes, and personal interests;
- the communication in question is *heavily* coded throughout, not just with respect to the anagram itself;
- that coding is *necessary* (i.e., the communication can't be performed any other way *if* it is to be committed to writing rather than delivered orally); and
- the anagram stands out enough to be caught by the communication's recipient, but for various reasons can't instantly be decoded by a lay observer—including one who suspects that an anagram may be present.

All of those elements certainly apply to the Birthday Note. So with this in mind, let's point out two rather obvious facts about the Note:

1. **By far, without question, the single word in the note that stands out the most is the word “enigma.”** It stands out for too many reasons to count, including that (a) it’s not a word one would normally expect to find in a birthday note, (b) it’s not likely a word Trump often used or uses in his day-to-day social dealings (though we should remember that Trump exhibited a slightly larger vocabulary in 2003 than the **third-grade-level lexicon he employs as President of the United States**), and (c) it’s a word whose very *definition* and very *rarity* calls attention to itself by default, all the more so when, as in the Birthday Note, it begins a new sentence, represents a higher level of diction than the rest of the document, and, by its very placement in an obviously already highly coy and coded missive, draws the eye.
2. **Among the words male pedophiles would know but the average person wouldn’t is the term “gamine,” which means “an attractively boyish, charming young woman.”** Put another way, a “gamine” is an underage girl in her teens who looks like a “boy”—a pre-teen male—and who is seen, by the (presumptively pedophilic) viewer of same, to be “attractive” and “charming” *because she looks like a child*. If we were to try to imagine any subset of human being familiar with the notion of a “gamine” *besides* a heterosexual male pedophile, it would be someone who owns a modeling company that imports “gamines” from abroad precisely *because* these small-breasted females have an “attractiveness” and “charm” seen as essential in certain modeling sectors (sometimes we hear the term “waif” used in this context, and indeed the **Waif Era in U.S. modeling** was the 1990s, the height of Trump and Epstein’s friendship, highly dubious partying, and *both* men **being involved in the extremely seedy American modeling industry as on-again, off-again managers**).

Dictionary

Definitions from [Oxford Languages](#) · [Learn more](#)



gam·ine

/ˈɡamēn/

adjective

(of a young woman) attractively boyish.

"a picture featuring a gamine young model"

Similar:

boyish

elfin

waifish

waiflike

noun

1. a young woman with a mischievous, boyish charm.

"a long-legged, short-haired gamine"

2. **DATED**

a female street urchin.

"I left school and fell in with some gamines"

You've probably seen by now that GAMINE is an anagram of ENIGMA and vice versa.

But you *should* be skeptical of whether this anagram is intentional—even given all the reasons already stated that it seems to be. That's why this item is mentioned early on in this report, so you can keep returning to it to see whether your view of it changes based on what comes next.

For instance, the next item on our list.

(4) The "enigma" Trump raises to a pedophile friend—one he doesn't want to state outright—is something that "never ages," a bizarre description that further suggests a reference to very young females.

The full line from the Birthday Note is, "Enigmas never age, have you noticed that?"

It arrives *immediately* after the coy, coded claim by Trump that he and Epstein “**have certain things in common.**”

In fact, in the context of the Note, the reference to “**enigmas**” is a *direct reply* to the notion that Trump and Epstein have “certain things” in common that they can’t say publicly (or even in the semi-public confines of a birthday card).

As someone who was a university **English** faculty member for fifteen years in total—an adjunct faculty member and, later, a tenure-track Assistant Professor at a series of flagship public universities where I taught, among other academic subjects, **Rhetoric, Composition, and Creative Writing**—I’ll observe that the very fact that “enigmas,” in context, is here a *non sequitur* (i.e., it doesn’t follow at all from the words that precede it) suggests that *the word itself* is supposed to be part of the coding of the text. This of course would be unsurprising, given that the most famous use of the term in *all human history* is as the name for **the supposedly unbreakable code** the **Nazis** used throughout **WWII**. Indeed, “enigma” is closely linked to the idea of a “code” that is intended to be confidential for precisely this reason.

A Literary Studies professor would note here that the sentence, “**Enigmas never age, have you noticed that?**” is, in isolation, nonsensical. Why? Because it’s manifestly untrue. By definition, once an enigma is identified there’s a massive effort undertaken to resolve it, which is why most enigmas don’t *last* a long time—indeed, hardly long enough to be said to have “aged” at all. Even the Nazis’ supposedly unbreakable 1940s **Enigma Code** was broken in just a few years, not decades or centuries or millennia.

When an enigma goes *unsolved*, that’s actually *precisely* when it begins to age. People think about it less; speaking of it becomes passé; so much is said and written about it that one must dive into very old texts to properly understand the discourse on it; it is, indeed, one of the *core features* of enigmas that, if they survive long at all, they begin to *palpably* age in the public imagination, such that they seem mere academic exercises rather than timelessly relevant. (I myself have only spoken of **Zeno’s Paradoxes**—among the most famous enigmas—at a party once, and it certainly wasn’t with a man

who, like Jeffrey Epstein, famously shut down *any* academic dispute unfolding in his presence with the phrase, “What has *that* got to do with *pussy!*?”)

For these reasons, the word “enigma” in Trump’s heavily coded and coy Birthday Note is *due* for attention from experts in textual analysis—not just journalists or historians.

And for these reasons, the fact that “enigma” is an anagram for “gamine,” and the fact that the words immediately following “enigma” in the Birthday Note are “**never age**” is significant. Enigmas *do* indeed age, manifestly so, but it’s in the very *definition* of a *gamine* that *they don’t seem to age*. A gamine could be 15, 19, 24, or 29 years old and it would still be a *defining feature* of her *being* a gamine that she looks like an attractive young boy—a small-breasted female of exactly the sort Trump doodled in his Note—who “never ages.” Or must we point readers to the most infamous meme on this topic?

That's what I love about these high school girls, man.



“That’s what I love about these high school girls, man. I get older—they stay the same age.”

This infamous **Matthew McConaughey** line from the cult-classic film *Dazed and Confused* is a sort of dark mantra for the brand of heterosexual male pedophile **known to psychiatrists** as a **hebophile**: a heterosexual male “**who engages in sexual activities with pubescent teenagers under the legal age of consent (ages 13–16 years)**” at a time when he is “**at least five years older**” than the teenager in question. As it happens, this is *exactly* the sort of pedophile Jeffrey Epstein is confirmed to have been; *exactly* the sort of pedophile the evidence in *Proof of Cruelty* (2024) would suggest Donald Trump is *when* he seeks intercourse with gamines rather than with slightly older (and large-chested) women; and *exactly* the sort of pedophile McConaughey’s character **David Wooderson** is supposed to be in *Dazed and Confused*. (Wooderson is 22 years old, so high school girls—definitionally ranging in age from 13 to 17—would nearly all be illegal for him to have intercourse with, unless he’s sleeping with a 16- or 17-year-old in a jurisdiction where that’s the legal age of consent.)

So while it may seem upsettingly on-the-nose, the premise that “[gamines] **never age**” is *exactly* the sort of mantra a hebophile like Epstein and (likely) Trump would hew to in the same way the fictional Wooderson did (“**high school girls stay the same age**”).

Certainly, there’s no easy or evident way to read “enigmas” in the Birthday Note as a straight reference or citation to something else that’s conspicuously in the Note itself.

It’s manifestly out-of-place, unless it’s some reference to an in-joke between Trump and Epstein... but of course that possibility is exactly what we’re seeing in the analysis above. It is an in-group code between these two men, and it’s about, well, pedophilia.

Hence the doodle of a “small-breasted” female; hence the “gamine”; hence the “never ages”; hence the notion that Trump is willing to say publicly that Epstein likes his females “on the younger side” but in the Note is clearly alluding to something *more*—i.e., more transgressive—than this, but related to the same subject. Hebophilia would fit the situation perfectly.

In fact, this author can't think of anything else that would fit with the facts we have.

(5) Donald Trump was so scared about being caught out not just as the author of the Birthday Note's text but *also* the Note's *doodle* that he did something famously done by desperate men who have just been caught in a major malfeasance—he told an easily disproven lie.

He told it quickly, widely, and in the most public way possible: in an interview with national media. And the lie was so obviously a lie that the fact that he told it at all, let alone to national media on a subject comprising the biggest political scandal he's ever been caught in, is astounding. It is astounding even to this Trump biographer, a man who has been writing about Mr. Trump's endless lies and cover-ups for a decade now.

Let's first consider **the lie Trump told**: "I never wrote a picture in my life."

This is, to be very clear, a *whopper*. Not only does Trump doodle; not only has he doodled for years; not only is he famous for having doodled; not only was he well-known for doodling during *precisely the period* the Birthday Note appears with a doodle around it; but he's even *sold his doodles at auction for tens of thousands of dollars*.

Yes, really.

Here is a **Reuters report** on Trump selling a 2004 doodle for **\$16,000**.

Here is a **report** on Trump selling a 2005 doodle for **over \$29,000**.

Here is the ***Washington Post* reporting** that Trump has sold *so many* doodles through the nation's largest auction house, **Heritage Auctions**, that Heritage has said—as is summarized by the *Post*—that "Trump's rare drawings have 'attracted interest' in previous sales and typically go for 'low five figures to around \$30,000.'"

That's right: there is such a known, established market for Trump doodles that there is a *history* of such sales, a *price range* his sales have routinely attained, and an ability

within the collectibles industry to approximately *determine* what future doodles will sell for.

Note again that these doodles largely come from *exactly the time period* of the Note.

As a Trump biographer, I noticed something else here as well. Trump has a very long history of *serial lying*: a set of lies told in rapid succession, one sentence after another, in an obvious sign that Trump is trying to, *in real time*, find a statement that's both plausible and distantly defensible. Consider the full quote from Trump's denial of authoring the Birthday Note doodle: "This is a fake thing. It's a fake *Wall Street Journal* story. I never wrote a picture in my life. I don't draw pictures of women."

Readers will note that this is four lies in a row, with Trump's claims getting narrower and narrower with each successive lie as he tries to find one—in vain—that can stick.

First he contends, uselessly, that the entire subject the press wants to ask him about is "fake." But that lie just won't fly, as the *Wall Street Journal* report on the Note *does* exist.

Second he contends, equally uselessly, that the specifics of the (now-acknowledged) *Wall Street Journal* report are fake. This is "equally useless" because he knows that the *Wall Street Journal* has seen the "Epstein birthday book" in which the Birthday Note appears. In other words, Trump can't claim no such object exists. He *knows* it does.

Third he contends that, okay, maybe the Note exists, which means that *someone* wrote it, but *he* didn't do that—which he knows because (he says) "I never wrote a picture in my life." The problem, of course, is that as soon as Trump tells this lie he realizes that it's a lie that'll be quickly caught. He's been doodling and selling his doodles for *literal* decades.

So where he lands, in his fourth lie in just a matter of seconds, is on the idea that he "doesn't draw pictures *of women*" (emphasis supplied). This is a lie he can live with, for the moment, because he's pretty sure he's never sold at any auction a doodle of a woman. Clearly he reserved such doodles, which necessarily are far more sensitive

than any others, politically and professionally, for private communications that would only be seen by a relatively small number of people.

We must keep in mind, however, that Trump has far more against him in making the claim he didn't draw *this* doodle than just *Wall Street Journal* sources insisting he did.

Trump famously doodles in **heavy black marker**. The Birthday Note doodle uses that specific tool as well.

Trump's Birthday Note doodle has **his unmistakable signature** inside it, per WSJ.

Trump has prided himself on having a unique signature that can't be mistaken for any other, and that signature was apparently authenticated by the *Wall Street Journal*, so Trump lying about this doodle *necessarily* means that he's *also* claiming that, 22 years ago, someone *forged his signature* on a birthday card to his best friend in the world. Uh, why? That's unclear. After all, why would anyone be forging Trump's signature on a birthday card *years* before Jeffrey Epstein became a controversial public figure? And given that the card was apparently coordinated directly with Epstein girlfriend and Trump friend **Ghislaine Maxwell**, Trump is *also* saying that someone *impersonated him with Maxwell* (with her being none the wiser) over 20 years ago in order to pass off this forgery. It's such a silly premise as to be, frankly, beyond laughable.

Trump also has a **history of lying about his drawings**. The most infamous instance:



This is a photo of Trump using his distinctive black marker to doctor an official government document as part of an effort to defraud the American people about a natural disaster. It was a sordid incident—if only a rather minor scandal for Trump, relatively speaking—and you can read all about it [here](#). The short version is that the President of the United States lied about a drawing of his to avoid profound political embarrassment, other people suffered because of his lie, and the lie was in the first instance intended to mislead the American public on a critical topic. Sound familiar?

As I know from my lengthy experience in criminal investigations and trial advocacy, *consciousness of guilt* is a very real thing. There's a reason it's studied in **Criminology**, looked for in every case by criminal investigators, and often teased out in questions asked by prosecutors and criminal defense attorneys at trial. People who have done wrong know they have done wrong, and they develop defense mechanisms to deal with that fact; the most common defense mechanism, one that is instinctively used if the

perpetrator is called to the mat for criminal misconduct before he can devise a better response, is to tell the easiest lie then at hand: almost always, a *blanket denial*.

That *blanket denial* usually takes the form of words like, “**I don’t know what you’re talking about,**” “**This is the first I’m hearing of this,**” “**I couldn’t tell you anything about that,**” or “**I don’t know who [or what] that is that you’re showing me here.**”

As at once a politician, a pathological liar, a grandiose braggart, a serial malfeisor, and someone who was taught by both his **bigoted late father Fred Trump** and late **disbarred criminal attorney and thug Roy Cohn** never to back down from anything or anyone, Trump isn’t inclined toward blanket denials that are *vague*. Trump’s long history of false denials includes aggressive negations that are always slightly more specific than the broad ones us common folks use; unlike a typical malfeisor, Trump will tread into more obviously dangerous territory by saying “**I’ve never heard of that person**” (in reference to longtime friends he’s often been pictured with), “**I don’t know anything about that situation**” (in reference to a situation he’s repeatedly spoken on and in public), or “**that’s something I would never do**” (in reference to a type of action he’s repeatedly been caught doing). His “doodle denial” falls squarely within this long history of both *serial false denials* and *desperate yet aggressively specific “blanket” denials*.

This can’t be emphasized enough: nearly 100% of Donald Trump denials are false. As a Trump biographer I can’t off the top of my head think of an instance in which Trump was falsely accused of something, denied it, and turned out to be telling the truth. The reason this rarely if ever occurs is that Donald Trump gets away with far more than the average person; he is, in short, rarely called to the mat on any of his misdeeds, so if he *has* been it’s almost always because his accuser has marshaled significant facts against him and the allegation at hand is *true*. Just so, Mr. Trump is such a shameless malfeisor because he almost never gets caught, and when caught never faces any real accountability, so whereas with anyone else a high volume of accusations would be a signal that some of those accusations are false, with Trump we find a both very high

number of accusations *and* that these many allegations *still* somehow represent just a very small subsection of his *actual* malfeasance.

(6) Trump clearly says, in the Birthday Note, that the coded and coy subtext of the Note is “wonderful secrets” involving “daily” conduct.

The Theory of Primary and Recency, a common concept in the academic field known as Rhetoric & Composition—and, interestingly, in Trial Advocacy as well—holds that the first and last thing someone says to you in a direct communication are what you will remember most. It’s why many communications contain their most memorable content somewhere at the top or the bottom of the relevant text rather than buried somewhere in the middle.

Trump ends the Birthday Note by saying to his best friend, “May every day be another wonderful secret.”

It’s incumbent on *Proof* to begin by noting just how *weird* this statement is on its face.

What normal person views every day as a “secret”? What normal person *wants* to *create* a new “secret” daily? What normal person is engaged in *daily* conduct that must be kept from so many of the people they see and communicate with regularly that it qualifies as a “secret”? What normal person takes such *pleasure* in “secrets” that it’s a normal thing for their *best friend* to wish for them to have *new* secrets... *every single day*?

The questions begin to pile into a veritable mountain, here. Most secrets are secrets we’re forced to keep by circumstance or by promise, making secret-keeping more of a burden than a blessing. What normal person views every new secret they develop as some kind of “wonderful” development in their life? What normal person has a friend so close to them that that friend *knows* that they are *daily* developing new “secrets”?

And if one indeed has such a friend—and that sort of friendship would have to be just about the *closest friendship imaginable*, right? To be so defined by *secrets*?—why in the

world would that friend risk the revelation of those “secrets” by alluding to them in a Birthday Note that was going to go into a book unknown others might someday see?

More broadly, Trump’s sign-off in the Birthday Note establishes that, indeed, one of the core subjects of the coy and coded Note *has* in fact been “secrets.” This not only underscores the likelihood that the “certain things in common” Trump speaks of are transgressive acts but deepens the probability that the out-of-place word “enigma” is in fact intended as an anagram (as anagrams are very much secrets hiding in plain sight, a word game in which the real meaning of a word is locked inside its letters).

But we must also delve more deeply than this, and note the core components of what Trump is saying to his best friend here:

1. I know that you, Jeffrey Epstein, are doing something daily that you are keeping a secret.
2. I know that that secret is something you do not want me to openly mention here.
3. I know that the subject or theme of that secret is something we have in common.
4. I want you to know, and to here be reminded, that I know many of your secrets.
5. I believe, just as *you* believe, that the subject or theme of these daily secrets is in fact something “wonderful”—but even as you and I deem it to be “wonderful,” I am aware, as you are also aware, that *others* would not deem it “wonderful,” which is why I cannot be more explicit about exactly what our shared secret is here.

And keep in mind that surrounding all this is a doodle of what looks to be a naked girl.

(7) Trump is clear on the fact that the daily secrets that make Epstein so happy are secrets that Trump is privy to—in part because he has been *physically present* at the birth of at least some of these secrets.

One of the least-noticed phrases in the Birthday Note is Trump writing that “it was clear to me the last time I saw you” that “enigmas never age.” Could this simply be

Trump calling his best friend an “enigma,” and noting that Mr. Epstein seems like he “never age[s]”? Could Trump be saying that he noted Epstein’s resilience to aging “the last time [he] saw [him]?”

Well... no. For two reasons:

1. **In the Birthday Note, the line “it was clear to me the last time I saw you” is spoken by *Epstein* to *Trump* in the conversation Trump allegedly invented.** In other other words, the implication is that Epstein is calling *Trump* an “enigma” and saying that *Trump* “never ages.” Why would a man include a gratuitous, out-of-the-blue compliment about *himself* in a birthday card, especially when putting the words of the compliment in the mouth of the man whose birthday it is (and who therefore should be the *recipient* of any such compliments)? Even for Trump, that’s pretty convoluted.
2. **Trump and Epstein saw each other regularly, so even the broad idea of suddenly noticing that an old friend doesn’t age isn’t really relevant to *their* relationship.** When you have two friends who live close to one another, are in regular contact, and indeed see each other in the flesh regularly, a comment about one of them seeming to never age *and that only becoming clear during their last meeting* is not appropriate or relevant. What *would* be relevant, however, would be one of the two men referencing something *specific* that happened between them the last time that they saw one another.

It’s been so widely reported that the basis of the friendship between Donald Trump and Jeffrey Epstein was women—nothing else, just *women*—that *Proof* needn’t pound this point into the dirt. While Epstein was at least an intermittently intellectual and curious person, Trump is infamously *not* intellectually curious; he has very few close friends, very little personal “downtime,” and when he’s not working on business he is known to spend his leisure hours not with his family (the very notion is laughable) but either (a) watching television, (b) golfing, (c) going to a sporting event (the more well-attended and violent the better) in order to be seen by the press and adored by his fans,

or (d) partying at an event at which beautiful women entranced by him can be found. It's hard to think of any exceptions to this general rule regarding Trump's schedule over the last two decades, unless acting as an impromptu, **maybe unwelcome DJ** at certain **Mar-a-Lago** weddings and member gatherings counts.

Epstein wasn't someone Trump was known to have business with, at least not after Epstein helped Trump purchase Mar-a-Lago (per **Epstein's 2010s claim to a *Forbes* journalist**). In fact, the real reason the two men had a falling out wasn't because of Epstein's misconduct at Mar-a-Lago but because **they both bid on the same building in 2004** and it eventually led to bitterness between them (the building, sold in 2008 to a Russian national close to **Vladimir Putin**, **netted Trump a suspiciously large payday** and became a **key focal point of the Trump-Russia scandal**; see the 2018 *New York Times* **bestseller** *Proof of Collusion*, published by **Simon & Schuster**, for more on this).

Nor was Epstein known to be a big sports fan.

Just so, the sort of congregation of intellectuals Epstein liked to arrange at his home (only to crassly interrupt them with his sexual peccadilloes) weren't Trump's forte, to say the least.

No, the two men famously *partied* together. And they partied with *women*. And more specifically still, *very young women*. Consider **this** already noted report:

DAILY BEAST

Epstein Showed Me Photos of Trump with Topless Young Women Sitting in His Lap, Claims Author

Hugh Dougherty

Thu, October 31, 2024 at 5:50 PM EDT

5 min read



4

Or **this** already noted report:

Top Stories



Super Bowl Champion Bryan Braman Spent His Last Two Weeks of Life with His Young Daughters by His Side (Exclusive)



4 Dead, 7 Sickened by Flesh-Eating Bacteria in Florida



Cause of Death Revealed for Paddleboarder Killed in Maine Pond as Teenager is Arrested for Murder: Police



Trump Reportedly Told Epstein They Have 'Certain Things in Common' in Lewd Birthday Card: 'May Every Day Be Another Wonderful Secret'

Advertisement

Verzenio[®]
abemaciclib

Ask your doctor if Verzenio[®] is right for you.

LEARN MORE



Verzenio[®] is a registered trademark owned or licensed by Eli Lilly and Company, its subsidiaries or affiliates. PPAL-US-4617 02/2025 ©Lilly USA, LLC 2025. All rights reserved.

Lilly

Advertisement

Ex-Casino Boss Claims Trump and 'Best Friend' Jeffrey Epstein Were Once Caught Bringing Underage Girls to Casino Floor

A former executive at Trump's Atlantic City casino told CNN that the duo brought three girls to the gambling floor who were not yet 21. The White House is calling his story "fabricated"

By [Meredith Kile](#) | Published on July 17, 2025 05:03PM EDT

Or **this** famous video:

NBC archive footage shows Trump partying with Jeffrey Epstein in 1992



Or what if we delve a little deeper, into the Sexual Assault account of former *Sports Illustrated* supermodel Stacey Williams, who alleges that Trump and Epstein seemed to

be involved—I emphasize, *together*—in a game of sexual titillation that she was at the center of? As ABC News **reports**, “Williams went public this week [October 2024] with an allegation that *Trump groped her in front of Epstein* after she said Epstein, who would later be known as a serial sex offender, brought her to Trump Tower in the early 1990s” (emphasis supplied).

The network **adds** that “Williams, who first began speaking publicly about the alleged incident with Trump and Epstein in Facebook posts dating back to 2020, said she felt like the alleged groping incident was a ‘twisted game’ between Trump and Epstein.”

Williams presents us with an entirely new understanding of the relationship between two rich men who, to all appearances, had *only* an obsession with sex in common.

While Stacey Williams wasn’t underage in the early 1990s, she was in her **early to mid-twenties**, whereas Trump was in his **late forties** and Epstein in his **early forties**. Neither man was age-appropriate for Williams, which while not an indication that pursuing her was illegal, *does* indicate that these two **known sexual predators** *did* play sexualized games *together* that involved *much* younger women.

But we also get *another* striking revelation from the Williams allegation, which is that

I would say that [Jeffrey Epstein] talked about having just seen Donald [Trump] or having just done something [with Trump], I mean, every time we spoke.

....

*The people [Epstein] spoke about the most were his boss, or whatever that person was, **Les Wexner**—hard to understand that role—and then Ghislaine [Maxwell], again, a little ambiguous weird relationship.*

And then Donald Trump.

Those are the people he spoke about the most.

Note here that Williams wasn't confused about the **Epstein-Trump relationship**. It was clearly a bromance between two aging lechers obsessed with having sex with inappropriately younger women.

She *was* confused by the **Epstein-Maxwell relationship**—understandably so, given that Epstein would introduce Maxwell as his “girlfriend” at public events even as he was pursuing women like Williams and (we now know) receiving at least thrice-daily handjobs (and more) from underage girls.

And Williams couldn't understand any *business* links that Epstein may have had with Trump. Williams clearly saw that, unlike the **Epstein-Wexner relationship**, the one between Epstein and Trump relationship *wasn't* predicated on business. It was about women, partying, and sex.

And that's consistent with every piece of public evidence ever compiled about the nearly-twenty-year friendship between the current POTUS and a dead child sex trafficker.

All this is the context for Trump cryptically referring to “**the last time I saw you**” in his Birthday Note to Epstein, and *specifically* attaching to that prior engagement the two had together the odd phrase “**enigmas never age**”—which this *Proof* report does suggest may well be the lightly coded pedophilic sentiment, “**gamines never age**.”

This would suggest that the last time Trump saw Jeffrey Epstein before writing the Birthday Note, something *may* have happened that he can't write in a birthday card, that was connected to the “certain things” he had in common with Epstein—his own claim around the time being that that would be women and sex—and that this something could best be summarized with the three words, “enigmas never age.”

In all of this, we must keep in mind that just months before Trump wrote the Birthday Note he was *summarizing* Epstein's “**social life**” as being hanging out with women “**on**

the younger side.” So if Trump were indeed referring to a recent social engagement he and Epstein had, wouldn’t Occam’s Razor suggest that that event involved Epstein’s usual pursuit of hanging out with women “on the younger side”—something we know Trump and Epstein had done many times before and was the basis of their friendship?

And if that prior engagement occurred in the context of *underage* girls partying with these two aging lechers, would it not indeed be an event (a “wonderful secret”) Trump couldn’t mention openly in his Birthday Note, but only in code (“enigmas never age”)?

(8) In the hours before the Birthday Note dropped, Trump began acting in a way that this Trump biographer and presidential historian has never seen before—a pattern of self-destructive behavior that suggested the president was truly scared.

There are by now too many major-media reports detailing the frenzy at the White House in the face of this looming *Wall Street Journal* report to summarize them all.

What we know is that Trump directly called *Wall Street Journal* editor Emma Tucker to try to intimidate her into not publishing the Birthday Note.

We know, because Trump admits it, that he called his friend Rupert Murdoch—the owner of the *Wall Street Journal*—to try to get him to kill the story, presumably out of friendship and political loyalty rather than journalistic integrity (as Murdoch had had no role in investigating the report, and therefore would have no basis to know if the claims by Trump that the Birthday Note was a fake were accurate).

We know that around the time Trump learned the Birthday Note would be published he lashed out at his own followers in a way he never had before, writing, per ABC News, that the Epstein Scandal is a “SCAM is what we will forever call the Jeffrey Epstein Hoax,” one that his “PAST supporters have bought into....hook, line, and sinker” despite it being “bullshit.” He added—catastrophically, from a political standpoint— that “these [Trumpist] weaklings continue forward and do the

Democrats work,” so he “do[es]n’t want their support anymore!” He later repeated similar sentiments in the **Oval Office**, saying to the press (rather awkwardly, as he was supposed to be in a meeting with a foreign leader and focused exclusively on that), “It [the Epstein Scandal] has all been a big hoax. It’s perpetrated by the Democrats and some stupid Republicans and foolish Republicans fall into the net.”

It’s unprecedented for a President of the United States to, in his official capacity as a government employee, try to intimidate the editor of a major news outlet into killing a story, let alone to then go over her head and try to play on a personal relationship with the owner of her newspaper to do so. If anything like this had been done by **Barack Obama** or **Joe Biden** there would, quite seriously, be an investigation by **Congress** that, like the ill-fated **Benghazi Probe**, would stretch on fruitlessly for many years. It’s a textbook instance of not just the sort of **Big Government** that Republicans falsely claim to hate, but exactly the sort of “dictatorship” that Trump claimed pre-election he would only succumb to on “**Day 1**” of his second presidency.

No one believed he could or would keep that promise, and needless to say he hasn’t.

But Trump’s attack on his own party, his own voters, and his own political base is unprecedented *even for Trump*. We’ve seen him try to intimidate journalists before, but we haven’t seen him faced with polling that says a significant percentage of his base wants him to do something and then—in the face of a refusal to do the thing his base wants—attack that base and say that he doesn’t want its political support anymore.

And for **all this to happen** against the **backdrop** of *very real evidence*, that Trump would have seen, that his supporters are *taking him up on this suggestion they withdraw their support* is something else yet again—as it suggests that Trump isn’t merely blustering about being willing to lose his base of support, but is actually *willing to lose it* in order to keep from his supporters what he surely, by now, *knows* is held in the Epstein Files.

If we knew nothing else about the Birthday Note, this alone would seem to suggest that Trump believes it to be incriminating at a level nothing else previously released

about him and Epstein is. It would also suggest that he knows much more in this vein is coming, which is why the release of the Birthday Note didn't lead him to suddenly being okay with the release of the rest of the Epstein Files (which is what we'd have expected from him if he felt the Birthday Note to be the *only* harmful item in them).

(9) Trump responded to what he suddenly began calling “the Epstein Hoax”—a phrase that he had never used before, despite the Epstein Scandal being decades old—by launching what was unmistakably a new hoax of his own: the Grand Jury Hoax.

Donald Trump is famous for never backing down. Even his **supposed apology** for the horrifying October 2016 Access Hollywood Tape—in which all Americans heard the GOP candidate for President of the United States bragging about being a serial sexual predator in the most grotesque terms—focused primarily on accusations of Sexual Assault against former president **Bill Clinton**, allegations of a **Criminal Conspiracy** by Clinton's wife **Hillary Clinton**, and Trump's insistence that his own confession to a lifetime of sexual predation was just a *distraction* from his undeniable qualifications for being America's face before the world. In other words, America hasn't seen Trump ever actually concede anything, to anyone, on any subject, in any way, for any reason, at any time, no matter how *brutally* wrong he is and how clear it is to everyone around him that he's wrong.

So for Trump to learn that his Birthday Note was just a matter of days from coming out and immediately do an about-face on releasing additional documents from the Epstein Files *could* have been a bracing, unprecedented acknowledgment of a recent political (perhaps even moral) blunder...

...if that's *really* what his recent direction to his lawyer (Pam Bondi) to seek the release of various Epstein grand jury transcripts was.

But it wasn't. It was a hoax. An obvious, instantly discernible hoax—perpetrated, no less, at a time Trump was accusing his political rivals of running an obvious and also instantly discernible hoax. We could see in this stunning hypocrisy merely another example of the **Roy Cohn Principle** Trump lives by (“**deny, deny, deny; attack, attack, attack**”) but there's a problem with that: Trump pushing Bondi to seek the release of grand jury transcripts *isn't* any sort of denial *or* any sort of attack. It's just an instantly discernible hoax.

It's a hoax Trump had to know would come apart immediately, which suggests that the Birthday Note revelation indeed had him so rattled that he quickly came apart at the seams in a way we haven't seen from him before. And former federal prosecutor **Barbara McQuade** explains it well (reposted here by ex-FBI agent **Asha Rangappa**):

↻ Reposted by Asha Rangappa



Barb McQuade @barbmcquade.bsky.social · 38m

This is a meaningless trick. A court cannot violate rule 6(e), which prohibits public disclosure.



Sahil Kapur ✓ @sahilkapur.bsky.social · 44m

New



Donald J. Trump ✓

@realDonaldTrump

Based on the ridiculous amount of publicity given to Jeffrey Epstein, I have asked Attorney General Pam Bondi to produce any and all pertinent Grand Jury testimony, subject to Court approval. This SCAM, perpetuated by the Democrats, should end, right now!

295 ReTruths 954 Likes

7/17/25, 9:07 PM

That's right: Trump had to have already been told by Bondi that she wouldn't have any success getting the grand jury transcripts he just publicly ordered her to try to get.

But it's worse than that, as noted by former federal attorney (and now Democratic member of Congress) **Dan Goldman** of New York:



Daniel Goldman @danielsgo... · 8h

Nice try @AGPamBondi.

What about videos, photographs and other recordings?

What about FBI 302's (witness interviews)?

What about texts and emails?

That's where the evidence about Trump and others will be.

Grand jury testimony will only relate to Epstein and Maxwell.



Attorney General Pamela B... · 8h

President Trump—we are ready to move the court tomorrow to unseal the grand jury transcripts.



Donald J. Trump

@realDonaldTrump

Based on the ridiculous amount of
publicity given to Jeffrey Epstein...

publicity given to Jeffrey Epstein, I have asked Attorney General Pam Bondi to produce any and all pertinent Grand Jury testimony, subject to Court approval. This SCAM, perpetuated by the Democrats, should end, right now!

Goldman is right. Even if Pam Bondi could get—and release—transcripts from the categorically secret grand jury proceedings used in federal criminal cases, that data would represent only a *tiny fraction* of Phases 2, 3, 4, 5 (and so on) of the Epstein Files.

It would include, in fact, almost *nothing* that Trump fans are demanding from him, or that even ultra-conservative Speaker of the House **Mike Johnson** *wants to see made public*. It wouldn't include videos. It wouldn't include audio recordings. It wouldn't include photographs. It wouldn't include exhibits like the Birthday Note itself. It wouldn't include texts. It wouldn't include emails. It wouldn't include state or federal police reports. It wouldn't include *anything* but the evidence *the Trump administration* chose to put forward under **Bill Barr** way back in the 2010s, as of course it was in *that* administration that the Epstein investigation was launched and concluded and in *that* administration that Epstein “**committed suicide**” (or *not*).

Trump's **Grand Jury Hoax** is thus a hoax thrice over: (1) it won't lead to the release of the materials Trump now claims to want released, and he knows that; (2) even if it *did* lead to the (unprecedented) release of such sealed federal criminal materials, those materials wouldn't include anything but information the first Trump administration pre-cleared for courtroom use *because it didn't harm the president*; and (3) Trump's new instruction to his lawyer Pam Bondi, after a meet-up between the two whose contents Americans have no access to, was to *only* seek those grand jury materials *she* deemed

“pertinent”—which, because she’s his lawyer and is acting at all times as his lawyer, by definition *can’t* include evidence that would incriminate him. This is a hoax atop a hoax atop a hoax.

But it’s also a shabbily constructed one, as it took just *minutes* for attorneys on social media to point out a number of the items referenced above. This was, in short, a hoax that bought Trump, at most, *minutes* in his attempt to fend off new reporting about the Birthday Note. That alone underscores that not only does Trump pray for his fans to be just as stupid as **he’s previously publicly celebrated them being**, but perpetrated this new hoax on the American people out of desperation rather than premeditation.

As the *Washington Post* **concludes**, “The grand jury testimony [Mr. Trump says he is willing to see released] would constitute only a fraction of the evidence amassed by federal authorities—material broadly referred to by Pam Bondi and others as the ‘Epstein Files.’”

(10) We need a sort of catch-all item here that underscores just how many (a) Trump lies, and (b) conspicuous synchronicities attended to the release of the 2003 Birthday Note.

In 2019, Donald Trump **infamously said** that he hadn’t spoken to Epstein in “15 years.”

That was, of course, a lie—and a telling one—as it signaled that Trump knew that his extremely close, long-term friendship with a notorious child sex trafficker/pedophile was a major political problem (as if anyone would know that a notorious child sex trafficker was a notorious child sex trafficker, it’d be his best friend of many years).

In fact, Trump saw his relationship with Epstein as *such* a problem that the lie Trump told America in 2019 went well beyond falsely claiming he hadn’t spoken to Epstein since 2004 (when in fact the two had their final falling out in 2008, meaning that they were friends and in communication up to that point). Trump needed to expand his “15 year” lie by *adding* to it that *even before his supposed 2004 break with Epstein* he “**wasn’t a**

fan [of Epstein],” which at a bare minimum would suggest that Trump had nothing good to say about Epstein in 2001, 2002, or 2003, either. It was a clear attempt by the then-president to relegate his friendship and bromance with Epstein to *last* century.

So Trump couldn’t be happy about the fact that his Birthday Note, *authored in 2003*, referred to Epstein as a “pal” and called their friendship a “wonderful thing.” Keep in mind that the difference between Trump having lost contact with Epstein in the 1990s—as he deceitfully tried to convince Americans was the case—and still being his “pal” (with no signs of that status ending) in 2003 is the difference between Trump being in contact with Epstein during only *some* of the years the latter was engaged in criminal conduct and *all of them*.

The truth? It was *all of them*. The story of Jeffrey Epstein’s child sex trafficking ring is almost exactly contemporaneous to the story of Jeffrey Epstein and Donald Trump being best friends. And that means exactly what you’d think: that either Epstein told his best friend everything he was into sexually as part of the “twisted game” the two were in the midst of for years as one another’s wingman, or Epstein kept *secret* from Trump the most important elements of his private life—and did so for almost twenty years.

Using Occam’s Razor as a guide, which do you consider more likely? Which do you think a criminal investigator would consider more likely? And more to the point, as Trump’s personal lawyer Pam Bondi assures America that *there’s not a single piece of evidence in the entirety of the Epstein Files* that would even provide the FBI with any “reasonable suspicion” to investigate any party further, what do you think that a *truly committed, neutral FBI investigator* not scared of the American president would think?

Now add to the foregoing the fact that Donald Trump wrote an entire Birthday Note to his best friend in 2003, at the height of Epstein’s sex-trafficking ring, boasting that *he knew Epstein’s secrets*. Does that boast, made directly to Mr. Epstein on his birthday, make more or less likely the possibility that Trump... well, *actually knew Epstein’s secrets*?

These questions answer themselves, of course.

So now let's add a piece of breaking news to the foregoing.

One of the most powerful politicians in all of Washington, D.C., **Senate Judiciary Committee Ranking Member Dick Durbin (D-IL)**, just **revealed** that “My [Senate] office was told that these [FBI] personnel [reviewing the Epstein Files] were instructed to ‘flag’ any records in which President Trump was mentioned.”

At a time when Trump is saying there's nothing incriminating in the Epstein Files, and his personal lawyer is saying that there's no reasonable suspicion to investigate any of Epstein's contemporaneous associates—the leading two of which, in the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, were Donald Trump and Ghislaine Maxwell, the latter of whom is **now in prison** for *twenty years*—it turns out that Trump and Bondi made sure the FBI agents looking through the Epstein Files (a) expected in advance to find evidence with Trump's name in it, (b) committed to all their superiors in advance that they would surrender any such evidence to them, and (c) wouldn't know or be told (we must now presume) what was done with any such evidence thereafter (as the hundreds of agents Bondi had working on the Epstein Files were of low enough rank that they wouldn't be entitled to such information as a matter of course).

Now add to this revelation that the Birthday Note almost certainly was in the federal evidence being reviewed by FBI agents; was exactly the sort of evidence that the FBI agents were told by Trump's personal lawyer (Bondi) to surrender to her immediately; and *instead* found its way to the *Wall Street Journal*. And keep in mind that if either Trump or Bondi thought the Birthday Note was the only such piece of evidence that could leak from the Epstein Files and hurt President Trump, they would order that all of the Epstein Files be released immediately. With all that said, three questions arise:

1. Are the FBI agents *even done reviewing* these hundreds of thousands of pages of files, tens of thousands of hours of video, and tens of thousands of photographs?

2. If not, why has Trump's personal lawyer already told America that there's no evidence in the Epstein Files that could possibly lead to any new investigations?
3. How many pieces of evidence that—like the Birthday Note—actually *could* and *do* warrant the opening of a new criminal investigation, in this case specifically into Donald Trump, have already been turned over to Trump and his personal lawyer and thereafter disappeared (which of course would be a serious federal crime)?

Indeed, observing how Trump has handled the release of just *one* piece of evidence about him in the Epstein Files—with shrieking, deranged conspiracy theories, vile attacks against his own supporters, a highly public grand-jury-related hoax and more—*isn't* that conduct itself the best evidence we could imagine to suggest that (a) Trump and Bondi believe there's more incriminating evidence to be found and/or leaked by the FBI, and (b) they're seriously concerned that more such leaks are coming, such that they must send DOJ, the FBI, and the White House to DEFCON 1 in the most public way possible to deter any such future leaks or investigative reports?

This is certainly one way of understanding Trump's \$10 billion lawsuit against the *Wall Street Journal*—as a warning not only to major media but to law enforcement.

Meanwhile, we're watching other Trump allies and sycophants try to come to his aid in ways that only underscore the consciousness of guilt Trump and Bondi are now exhibiting. Witness Vice President J.D. Vance, whose sole public defense of Trump thus far has been an enormous head-scratcher: *contradicting* Trump by saying that the *Wall Street Journal* refused to share the contents of the Birthday Note with Trump in advance, when Trump himself says that the contents were shared with him and that he knew from seeing them that the Note was a “fake.”

So which is it?

Vance, who **infamously demanded the release of the Epstein Files over and over** until his boss (Trump) told him to shut up about them, now **says**, “Forgive my language but **this story is complete and utter bullshit. The WSJ should be ashamed for publishing**

it. Where is this letter? Would you be shocked to learn they never showed it to us before publishing it?” Either Vance is lying—in which case Trump saw the letter and rejected its authenticity—or Vance is telling the truth, in which case Trump falsely claimed the Birthday Note was a fake (and sued in support of that claim) without even reviewing its language or getting any information from the *Wall Street Journal* allowing him to make that assessment.

(Vance’s addition of a new complaint—**“Does anyone honestly believe this sounds like Donald Trump?”**—sounds even more desperate, as Vance didn’t know Trump 22 years ago, didn’t know what he sounded like in private correspondence with a friend nearly a quarter-century in the past, and in any case is speaking of a Birthday Note that even if Trump *didn’t* personally write was one he *literally signed off on* with his signature.)

But all the foregoing is peanuts next to the truly massive revelation about Epstein that came down the pike just as Trump was suddenly losing his cool online exclusively about—or so we thought—ever-increasing demands for public access to the Epstein Files and (as we later learned) the upcoming release of the Birthday Note: to wit, the U.S. senator who’s spent more time investigating Jeffrey Epstein than almost anyone outside the FBI, Sen. **Ron Wyden** (D-OR), just **announced** that his investigation into Epstein has found that (as summarized by the *New York Times*) **“four banks waited until Jeffrey Epstein’s arrest on federal charges to flag \$1.5 billion in suspicious transactions”**; **“[those transactions include] thousands of wire transfers for the purchase and sale of artwork for rich friends, fees paid to Mr. Epstein by wealthy individuals, and payments to numerous women”**; Epstein had **“accounts at [at least] two Russian banks before those institutions were subject to U.S. sanctions”**; and all of the foregoing came from bank reports **“called suspicious activity reports, or SARs, that are meant to be an early warning system [initiated by banks themselves] for law enforcement about signs of illegal activity.”** In other words, forensic investigators have many years of work ahead of them to disentangle Epstein’s finances in a way that would show who was involved with, and benefited from, his child sex trafficking ring.

So what did Trump's personal lawyer Pam Bondi do when the Ranking Member of the **Senate Finance Committee** demanded that the FBI and DOJ reveal what bank records of this sort are in the Epstein Files? She refused to answer his query. Did the recent revelation of all these documents (possibly *millions* of records in total) in any way change Pam Bondi's announcement that the Epstein investigation was forever closed?

No.

Is the revelation of the size and extent of the **Epstein Sex Trafficking Ring** (see more discussion *infra*) fundamentally a “**follow the money**” case? Yes, absolutely, and any investigator at DOJ or the FBI knows that. Yet after three years of investigation, the Senate Finance Committee is still *just at the beginning* of getting access to the records any Epstein investigator acting in good faith would want... even as the DOJ and FBI are not only *not* cooperating with Congress but are summarily declaring the Epstein case closed. (Senator Wyden's Democratic-led investigation also gives the lie to the seemingly endless claims by Trump and his supporters that Democrats in Washington have shown no interest in the Epstein investigation until now; that could be further from the truth.)

So now, when pressed to the point of the **MAGA coalition** possibly collapsing, Trump and his lawyer throw the driest bone imaginable to his supporters: a distant promise of seeing grand jury records a year from now for which (Bondi **promises**) she will, in advance, have overseen “**redactions of victim-related and other personal identifying information**” (emphasis supplied). If you're thinking that redacting “**victim-related information**” is normal and okay, you're right; if you're simultaneously thinking that Bondi saying she will “**redact**” any “**information**” that allows a reader to identify any “**other person[]**” referenced in the grand jury transcripts means that even when the transcripts' release comes (if it ever does) sometime after the 2026 midterms it will include *nothing* that could *possibly* hurt *any* Republican, let alone Trump, you're right.

This is exactly what a government cover-up looks like—and as it happens, a massive government cover-up is exactly what Trump's own supporters are now accusing him

and Bondi of being involved in.

And they're right to do so.

Conclusion

There's an aesthetic interest in the female form, and then there's something rather more gratuitous and, depending on the circumstances, puerile: an obsession with *fucking* per se. We hear the latter juvenalia in Jeffrey Epstein's repeated refrain in polite company, "What's *that* got to do with *pussy*!?" And we see the same attitude—which historically has helped promulgate everything from misogyny to sexual violence—in the decision by Donald Trump to make his *signature* in the 2003 Birthday Note the *pubic hair* in his doodle. That's a rather crass way for Trump to identify what he deems important about the women he and Epstein (per his 2002 *New York Magazine* interview) shared a fixation with, as it suggests, much like nearly every word of **the first book exclusively about Trump's sexual violence suggests**, that not only does Trump see women as mere receptacles for his seed but that one key element of his friendship with the pedophile and child sex trafficker Epstein—for years and years, mind you—was that Epstein saw women the way Trump did and Trump appreciated that.

So while not a discrete element on this list, Trump's placement of his signature as the *pubic hair* of his 2003-doodled, small-breasted female is well worth mentioning here.

We might also note that Trump has one of the largest teams of lawyers in America—maybe even the largest such team of any non-institution. He is also, infamously, one of the most litigious men in all of America, despite his political agenda centering on attacking *others* for being litigious and acting as perpetual victims. We've repeatedly seen Trump tweet out that he's going to sue someone, with the first filing in that suit then arriving mere hours later. Trump's lawsuits are so spawned in emotion, and so reckless, and so morally haphazard, and so almost *categorically meritless* that there's nothing stopping them from being filed almost as soon as Trump imagines them (his

veritable legion of legal counsellors being one of the many things that makes this possible; I won't say that his wealth makes this possible, as Trump **famously doesn't pay his attorneys**—instead he does other favors for them to avoid having to pay them, such as **setting them up in business with foreign nationals, nominating them to be judges** despite their obvious lack of qualifications for that role, or else touting them publicly, **in spite of their incompetence**, until they go from well-earned obscurity to being sought out by Trump sycophants looking to get even closer to his inner circle.)

With all this in mind, and considering the fact that Trump has said he was in contact with the *Wall Street Journal* about its Thursday morning story well before it came out, it's inexplicable that Trump has told everyone who'll listen that he is going to sue the *Wall Street Journal* but didn't take the opportunity to seek an injunction against the report before.

Or perhaps it's all *too* explicable that Trump didn't do this, or that the civil lawsuit he ultimately filed against the *Wall Street Journal*—for an amount of money far beyond the total amount of money Trump has accumulated in his entire adulthood—was rife with careless factual errors, including one that relates to the author of this report, which suggests that it's not ultimately going to be either a serious lawsuit or a successful one.

As most readers here know, to successfully sue someone for **Defamation** is a tall order under even the best of circumstances—and the most famous and talked-about man on **Earth** suing a respected major-media outlet may well be the *worst* of circumstances.

Civil litigation also involves the **discovery process**, during which litigants exchange documents and information that each side requests of the other and then follows up with extensive **depositions** in which virtually no questions are off the table and the litigants are under oath. (The reason few questions are off the table is simply because, generally speaking, at a deposition *all objections are reserved*—meaning the attorneys can object to certain questions, but they must be answered anyway, with a judge later determining whether those answers can be shared with jurors.) Trump **has a history of lying under oath in depositions**, of course, and that's his primary way of evading the

dictates of the many civil lawsuits he initiates, but the very fact that the *Wall Street Journal* hasn't immediately thrown itself on a fainting couch in the face of lawsuit threats from a sitting president (as now-disgraced institutions like CBS News and ABC News did, among many others) suggests that Trump won't be able to win a civil lawsuit against the widely respected conservative newspaper in his usual way: via intimidation. This means he'll have to produce documents and information he doesn't want to produce, answer questions he doesn't want to answer, and run the risk of a prosecution for Perjury when he lies at deposition (as he most assuredly would) or face the wrath of a judge and orders for mandatory production of potentially damning documents and information if he tries to forestall compliance with court rulings at that stage of the proceedings (as he most assuredly would). So it's not clear that Trump has much to gain by having now carried out his threat to sue the *Wall Street Journal*.

And yet.

If Trump were telling the truth about the Birthday Note, which he manifestly isn't as far as this author can tell from the information currently available, it would mean that (i) someone forged his signature back in 2003, (ii) someone faked a communication between him and his best friend back in 2003, and (iii) someone went so far as to impersonate him in communications with his good friend Ghislaine back in 2003—and not in the fun, John Barron/David Dennison sense of a Trump impersonation, either—in which case the evidence of such a bizarre conspiracy, one that had no reason to exist in 2003 because Epstein's crimes weren't then publicly known, should be legion.

In other words, if Trump is *really* the victim here, as he claims he is, the evidence of that being the case should be *literally everywhere* and a lawsuit against the *Wall Street Journal* one that's primed for success. Instead, we see the backchannel maneuvering and threats described in this report *supra*, which I probably needn't tell any of you are evidence of consciousness of guilt, profound malfeasance, and simply put, desperation.

A reasonable guess here is that Trump will now slow-walk the litigation against the *Wall Street Journal* so that he can maintain plausible deniability on the subject of the

2003 Birthday Note through the midterms. Trump can be expected to, as was the case with every investigation of him from **Robert Mueller's** to **Jack Smith's**, from his case over January 6 in **Georgia** to his stolen-classified-documents case in **Florida**, drag his heels at every stage so that he need never provide any documents or information to his adversaries, need never sit for a deposition, and certainly need never go before a jury—which would be all but certain to determine that every word in the *Journal's* report was accurate and, to boot, penned entirely in good faith. Trump fares poorly before juries, as his 34 felony convictions in **New York** confirm.

Proof is loath to ever say that Event A is a “distraction” from Event B, as this is the lowest form of political analysis—besides presuming a conspiracy, it also presumes that people are more cunning and premeditated than they usually are—and therefore is worthy of mild contempt. This author regularly disputes claims online that a new development can or even *must* be ignored because a prior event must take exclusive precedence. In fact, America can walk and chew gum at the same time, and journalists in particular are professionally tasked with doing so. Every story can and should be assessed individually on its merits, not in relation to other news stories. Just because a given news consumer's attention span is “full” at the moment, say, that Donald Trump declares that he's **planning to unilaterally revoke the U.S. citizenship** of former actress **Rosie O'Donnell** doesn't mean that that story is suddenly rendered unimportant or a “distraction.” This remains the case even if Trump issues his unprecedented, fascistic threat in the midst of another scandal. Indeed, even if we knew for certain that in a given scenario Trump had *orchestrated* Event B as a *distraction* from Event A, working journalists would *still* have to independently assess the newsworthiness of Event B. If Event B is a burgeoning American dictator threatening to revoke an American's U.S. citizenship on grounds that echo legal arguments he's lately made in federal court (that **he has unfettered power to determine U.S. policy** if he thinks an action is “**in the best interest**” of America as a national security matter, impossibly broadly defined); if Event B is a burgeoning American dictator threatening to revoke an American's U.S. citizenship on the heels of ICE **having already illegally removed from the country at least 70 U.S. citizens** in the last few years; if Event B is a burgeoning dictator doing

something he *absolutely will do* when or if he declares martial law because that thing is quintessentially something dictators do, then yes, it's worth media covering no matter whether Trump timed his announcement strategically or not.

It's with all that in mind that *Proof* notes that Trump (a) *never* releases medical data about himself, even in the face of countless photographs and videos suggesting he's suffering from a major medical ailment, and yet (b) **suddenly decided to announce that he has a serious medical condition** just at the moment he most needed his supporters' empathy—and for journalists across America to focus on him being an elderly leader rather than looking back at his days as a sexually ravenous playboy. So yes, the timing of the revelation that Trump suffers from advanced CVI is curious, to say the least.

Consistent with the above, however, Trump's CVI can be a legitimately interesting story even if the timing of its release was artificially concocted. How long has Trump been hiding this? Is it more advanced than he's telling us now? What possible impact could it have on his presidency going forward? Can we finally discuss Trump's age in the same cutting and acidic way major media attacked Biden's age during the middle of a presidential campaign in 2024?

But there's another new conversation the CVI revelation occasions, which is just how serious a political scandal Trump has to find himself in the midst of to be willing to, *for the first time ever*, use his personal health as a “distraction” (if that's indeed what's happening). In other words, even those who find CVI-related reporting a strain on their limited political attention span(s) would have to admit that *the mere fact* of the sitting president opening up about his most closely guarded medical secrets suggests that he too understands he's in a form of political danger he's never been in before.

Proof ends this report with the beginning of the Birthday Note, which many analysts will skip because it's not just creepy and obtuse but seems like merely a trite platitude:

VOICEOVER: “There must be more to life than having everything.”

TRUMP: “Yes, there is, but I won't tell you what it is.”

EPSTEIN: “Nor will I, since I also know what it is.”

TRUMP: “We have certain things in common...”

This first exchange between Trump, Epstein, and an unnamed narrator concludes with the now-infamous “certain things in common” line—and it’s key for that reason, of course, as it sees Trump saying that *one* of the *many* things he and Epstein have in common is that they *know* there’s more to life than having everything.

That might even be a nice sentiment if either Epstein or Trump were family men, or great lovers of nature, or amateur philosophers, or dedicated (rather than, as in the case of Epstein, dilettantish) students of history. But what does it mean if we consider, instead, that these were two creepy old lechers with a history of sexual predation? Or if we consider that that fact was, at the time the words above were written, their sole basis of connection? Or if we consider that these few words were *literally* wrapped in a doodle of a naked female? If we consider that the *entire point* of the Birthday Note was for two old cretins to wink at one another about their sordid shared history? In that case, the lines above take on a different meaning. And they start to seem like a riddle.

No, not a good one. Or a hard one. Or a whimsical one, like the ones from *The Hobbit*.

In fact, this riddle is more like a puerile mantra for dodgy codgers, something on the order of the odious “**Boys and their toys...**” or “**Boys will be boys**” or “**If this van’s a rockin’, don’t come a-knockin’...**” It’s the forty-something lecher’s equivalent of a college roommate putting a sock on the doorknob to signal he’s having sex with a girl.

Q: What do you get for the man who has everything?

A: Something he’s not *allowed* to have.

This is the well-worn, by-now cliched *point* of films like *Hard Target* (1993) or *Surviving the Game* (1994), both movies that came out in the decade preceding the Birthday Note and the former featuring **Jean Claude van Damme**, one of Trump’s favorite actors and

the star of **his favorite movie**, 1988's *Bloodsport*. (Trump is **apparently obsessed** with van Damme and that movie, so saying he “likes” it is probably insufficient verbiage, here.)

So what do *Hard Target* and *Surviving the Game* have in common? They're popular films that came out during the heyday of the Trump-Epstein bromance—the former of which he almost certainly saw, given his love of van Damme—whose theme is that rich men invariably get bored with having everything and, when that happens, what they turn to is committing acts of violence against innocent victims to stay amused with and engaged by the world. In both films, rich men hunt the homeless and the disabled for sport (remember that **Trump has said all disabled people should just kill themselves or else let the government indirectly or directly put them down**).

Remember how Stacey Williams said it was clear to her that two rich men who had everything they could ever want, Trump and Epstein, were playing a “twisted game” with her in which the point of the game was to get away with Sexual Assault—a sort of real-world, entirely non-heroic version of **Legolas** and **Gimli's** bloody competition in the *Lord of the Rings* films (to see which protagonist could kill more enemies)? A detective taking into account all of the facts included in this report, and everything known of the Trump-Epstein relationship, would conclude that the “secret” Trump and Epstein are keeping in Trump's monologue about there being something more to life than having everything is that rich men can stay excited about life by committing crimes... as long as they keep those crimes a secret. In this way, rich men can open up a whole new world—a deviant, antisocial, sadistic, *criminal* world—of “having things” that even the civilized, law-abiding rich man who “has everything” doesn't and never will have. Trump and Epstein's dialogue does *seem* to establish all this, in short form:

1. Both men know there's a way for rich men who “have everything” to have more.
2. Both men know that the other man knows this secret.
3. Both men know that this secret must, for unstated reasons, *remain* a secret.

4. Both this secret *and* the execution of this unstated way of rich men having “more” than “everything” are among “certain things” that these men “have in common.”
5. One component of this dark new way of life—a way of life Epstein, at least, was *definitely* living at the time—was Child Rape (a crime that required, also, not just **Human Trafficking** and **Sex Trafficking** and Conspiracy but Epstein covering his bases by developing blackmail material on other rich men who followed this dark way of living as a wealthy person).

If this sounds a lot like the QAnonist fantasy the American far-right onanistically attaches to a fantastical narrative that *only involves Democrats*, that’s not *exactly* right.

The QAnonists who make up Trump’s most dedicated base, who are now turning on him *in ways we’ve never seen before*, *believe* that there’s an international cabal of child-raping **Satanists** who are controlled by **Jews** and suck life energy from children.

They also believe in an equally fanciful dark fairy tale: that Trump will save the world from all this, and that **God** has chosen him to be POTUS for precisely this reason.

But as it turns out, there’s no organized cabal, controlled by Jews or otherwise. No Satanists are involved whatsoever, though it’s extremely useful for the QAnonists (who are also **Christofascists**) to pretend so, as it always adds a sheen of legitimacy to any crime or moral atrocity they commit if they can claim to be fighting the **Devil** while committing it. While Child Rape *does* suck the joy out of the lives of its victims, that joy can’t then be harvested by the rapist (as QAnonists insist it can be) in the form of the child’s *adrenochrome* (which horrifying trope was most famously explored, QAnon aside, in **Stephen King**’s 2013 novel *Doctor Sleep*, which reimagines adrenochrome as a sort of vapor).

But was there, in the 1980s and 1990s, a network of old rich white Christian men—with a smattering of non-observant Jews thrown in—who systematically preyed on underage, barely-of-age, and adult-trafficked gamines in and around **New York City** and **Southern Florida**? Yes, that’s true. That happened. Scores of the victims have

spoken up about it. Some of these victims were recruited out of Trump's Mar-a-Lago by Epstein after he helped Trump buy it; some almost certainly were preyed upon at Trump's Plaza Hotel; some are people Trump met and Epstein raped, or even, if what Trump biographer **Michael Wolff** says is true, people **Trump was photographed with**.

The leader of this network, Epstein, died on Trump's watch. The investigation of his death was bungled on Trump's watch. Trump has told more lies about Epstein than any person alive, Ghislaine Maxwell—another close friend of Trump's—excepted. It was Trump who rewarded the man who covered up Epstein's crimes in Florida, **Alex Acosta**, by making him his first (unqualified, later to resign in disgrace) Secretary of Labor. It was Trump who made the state attorney general during many of Epstein's crimes, Pam Bondi, first his personal lawyer and then Attorney General of the United States. It was Trump who lied to his fans about releasing the Epstein Files, who told all those who still want them released to “shut the fuck up” and then disowned them completely (calling them weaklings and cowards and much worse), and who has now devised the Grand Jury Hoax to keep the loyalty of any members of his base who are left. It's Trump who partied with Epstein and underage girls and now appears to have sent his then-best friend a Birthday Note crowing about it all in thinly veiled language.

So it's no surprise that Trump—ever one to accuse his enemies of what he himself has done, never one to take responsibility for anything he does—is blaming Democrats for what sure looks like a rich man's sex cabal that he was in the vicinity of in the 1980s and 1990s, which cabal was defined not by its politics but by the wealth and depravity of its patrons, which included not just rich Americans but allegedly **rich foreigners**, as well.

The question *now* isn't what Trump is saying or doing, though. He's like a criminal defendant caught red-handed and screeching about how everything besides his own conduct is unjust, unfair, corrupt, deceitful, and dangerous. We should expect that from Trump in the same way we would expect it of any malfeator caught in the act.

No, the question now is what *Republicans* do with these revelations. Whether they indeed have any values left—such as the protection of children—that they’re willing to live by, hold themselves to, and punish others (be they Democrat or Republican) for violating. That remains to be seen, but it’s harder today than it ever has been before to deny that Donald Trump *appears* to have committed some of the very worst crimes any human being can commit. (To read much more on this topic, read the full text [here](#).)

What we *can* say is that **63% of Americans** *oppose* how Trump is handling the Epstein Files, [according](#) to a **Quinnipiac Poll**. We can say that an arch-conservative former Trump White House Chief of Staff, **Mick Mulvaney**, now [says](#) Trump is in the Epstein Files. We can say that the former “First Buddy,” **Elon Musk**, was publicly insisting that he knew for *certain* that Trump was in the Epstein Files he and his administration are currently withholding from the public [until](#) Trump [threatened to deport him](#)—a threat so unprecedented (until the O’Donnell redux, that is) that it only underscores how seriously Trump takes any accurate public statements about his ties to Epstein.

We know that Trump’s [public ranting on this subject has gotten so incoherent](#) that he increasingly seems to be mentally unwell in the eyes of a large percentage of voters.

8h ago 09.27 EDT

Trump again tries to brush off Epstein crisis as 'nothing' concocted by Democrats

Donald Trump has been [posting](#) on Truth Social early this morning, repeating his accusations about the Democrats regarding the **Jeffrey Epstein** case.

■ ■ *If there was a “smoking gun” on Epstein, why didn’t the Dems, who controlled the “files” for four years, and had Garland and Comey in charge, use it? BECAUSE THEY HAD NOTHING!!!*

(It goes without saying that if Trump really believes the Epstein Files currently under his control contain “NOTHING!!!”, there would be no reason for him to continue to

refuse to release them—let alone launch a massive lawsuit against the *first* U.S. major-media outlet to release even the *smallest excerpt* from them. This doesn't even take into account that Trump's timeline is profoundly messed up; he personally *fired Jim Comey* from government service years before the end of the Epstein prosecution, and the *very reason* that he never publicly attacks **Merrick Garland** is that Garland was a famously *apolitical* Attorney General—a fact that worked to Trump's advantage for four years and is exactly why, as Trump well knows, Garland would have held onto materials not just *despite* but *because* of the fact that they'd cause a seedy political scandal. As ever, Trump is applying his own lack of ethics and unfettered willingness to do anything to destroy an opponent to his political rivals, despite there being no basis for doing so.)

So where do we go from here?

Well, we're in a bit of a race between competing energies: (1) the ability of Trump's MAGA base to stay focused on a single topic for weeks (which ability is, candidly, fairly strong); (2) the ability of that same MAGA base to stay focused on just one *value*—the protection of children—even after it has become politically impractical and inconvenient (which ability is, candidly, fairly weak); (3) the ability of major media to stay focused upon a major scandal when Trump is expert at artificially or organically producing new atrocities, melodramas, and emergencies every week or even daily (a fairly weak ability); and (4) the ability of Trump himself to move off a topic that's at once harmful to him politically but also one he's extremely exercised about (an ability this author can only summarize as *variable*). What's *certain* here that Trump will never allow any even distantly damaging evidence about him and Epstein to see the light of day, to the extent the said evidence is under his command and control; that neither the Trump FBI nor the Trump DOJ can be trusted to be anything more than **Trump Legal** in any of these matters; that Trump will always have available to him the option of throwing a few Democrats who cavorted with Epstein to his base as red meat in lieu of any significant case disclosures (as it's a fair bet MAGAs want Democratic hides more than they want the *full truth* of what Epstein was doing and with whom); and none of

this will matter long-term unless *both* (a) it remains a political issue until the midterms and (b) Trump allows the midterms and **2028 U.S. presidential election** to go forward.

So much is up in the air. But, increasingly, our understanding of what Trump was up to in the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s—and with whom—isn't. That's something we actually have a pretty good handle on, now. And what we've learned is truly grotesque.

Proof is a reader-supported publication. To receive new posts and support my work, consider becoming a free or paid subscriber.



213 Likes · 94 Restacks

← Previous

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks



Write a comment...



KathyInCali KathyInCali 18h

...

Thank you Seth! That was exhausting. Ppl should be outraged that he's trying to cover up for the biggest and most notorious sex trafficker of underage girls, whom he procured for the wealthy and elite, so they could rape and sodomize them.

Those poor girls! How dare he deny the existence of this whole thing, especially when he's likely

♡ LIKE (13) 💬 REPLY

🔗 SHARI

1 reply



Muck-raker 18h

...

I will never get over the look of Bongino—a mix of scared shitless and horrific disgust and Patel just scared shitless and a bit helpless. First thing that came to my mind when Tramp first started his denial routine after he too saw Their reaction was it has to be so bad that not only would he lose the Presidency but also face something far worse like life in prison. Then we have again, the Russia connection and possible money laundering coupled with Tramp Modeling agency comprised primarily of women from Eastern Europe who were virtually indentured servants. Looking like the typical Tramp scheme, accuse others of doing what he has in fact been doing—an international sex trafficking ring of children (at a minimum).

♡ LIKE (9) 💬 REPLY

🔗 SHARI

16 more comments...

© 2025 Seth Abramson · [Privacy](#) · [Terms](#) · [Collection notice](#)
[Substack](#) is the home for great culture