The Floor

by Daniel Brockman & Claude
Friday, February 13, 2026

There is a crack in everything.
That's how the light gets in.
—Leonard Cohen

You've seen the number. Three and a half million pages. That's the Department of Justice's release, mandated by the Epstein Files Transparency Act, signed by a president who didn't invite reporters to the signing. Congress voted 427 to 1. The one dissenter didn't explain his vote. Three and a half million pages, 180,000 images, 2,000 videos. The largest document release in modern American legal history,

produced not by institutional will but by a discharge petition that overcame a Speaker who didn't want to bring the bill to the floor. Nobody in a position of power wanted these documents released. Every single one of them said they did. Then they voted for it because the alternative was being the person who voted against releasing the Epstein files, and that's a position no one can survive, not even the people the files protect.

The DOJ released them on January 30, 2026. Or rather, the DOJ released approximately half of the documents it had identified as responsive. The other half—roughly three million more pages—remains unreleased. Nobody has explained why. Nobody has been asked to explain why in a way that requires an answer. The question floats in the air and dissipates, because there are three and a half million pages to read, and reading them is itself a full-time occupation that displaces the question of what isn't there.

This is what the released documents contain: thousands of emails between a convicted child sex offender and heads of state, billionaires, Nobel laureates, intelligence operatives, tech founders, and members of every institution that claims to govern the civilized world. Flight logs. Financial records. Photographs from a private island. Communications in which the most

powerful people on earth interact with a man they all knew had been convicted of sex crimes involving minors, with a casualness that suggests either extraordinary naivety or the total absence of concern. The emails don't read like correspondence with a pariah. They read like correspondence with a colleague.

This is also what the released documents contain: over 550 pages that are entirely blacked out. Sixteen files that disappeared from the DOJ website within hours of being posted. Faulty digital redactions that could be bypassed by copying and pasting text—an error so elementary that it implies either staggering incompetence or a controlled leak designed to look like incompetence. Victims' names left unredacted while the names of powerful men were carefully obscured. And when a congressman identified one such redaction—covering the name of a man the FBI had designated a co-conspirator—the DOJ removed the redaction within forty minutes of being confronted, which tells you the redaction was not an oversight. Someone made a decision to hide that name. Someone else made a decision to unhide it the instant they were caught. Both decisions were made by the same institution, and both were made in the service of something, and the something is not transparency.

Before the release, the FBI issued a two-page unsigned memo declaring that no "incriminating client list" existed, that no credible evidence of blackmail had been found, that Epstein's death was a suicide, and that "no further disclosure would be appropriate." This was in July 2025. Congress forced the disclosure anyway. The FBI then deployed approximately one thousand agents—reassigned from counterintelligence, from active investigations, from work that was presumably important—to the task of redacting the documents before release. They logged 4,737 overtime hours. The cost exceeded $851,000. One thousand federal agents, working overtime, not to investigate a pedophile network that had operated for decades under their jurisdiction, but to control what the public would see when the evidence of that network was finally released. Many of the agents lacked training in redaction procedures. They redacted the wrong things. They left the wrong things visible. The whole operation had the feel not of a government executing a transparency mandate but of a government managing a crisis of exposure.

The Epstein Files Transparency Act is explicit about what may be redacted and what may not. It prohibits redaction on the basis of "embarrassment, reputational harm, or political sensitivity, including to any govern-

ment official, public figure, or foreign dignitary." It requires that all redactions be accompanied by written justification published in the Federal Register and submitted to Congress. It permits redaction only for two purposes: the protection of victims and the protection of active investigations. The FBI has categorically denied the existence of any blackmail operation, which means the powerful men whose names are redacted cannot be classified as blackmail victims, which means there is no legal basis under the Act for redacting their names—unless the FBI is lying about the blackmail, in which case the redactions are legally justified but the FBI's public statements are false. One or the other must be true. There is no third option.

And then, during Attorney General Pam Bondi's testimony before the House Judiciary Committee, a photographer captured an image of a document in her hand. The document was titled "Jayapal Pramila Search History." The DOJ had been tracking which members of Congress searched for which names in the unredacted files. The people's representatives were being surveilled by the institution they were overseeing, using the very database they had legislated into existence. The Speaker of the House called it "inappropriate." That word—*inappropriate*—is doing extraordinary work in that sen-

tence, because what it describes is an intelligence agency monitoring the oversight activities of the legislative branch during the investigation of a case in which the intelligence agency is itself implicated.

None of this is conspiracy theory. Every sentence in the preceding paragraphs is drawn from reporting by the Associated Press, NBC News, CBS News, Bloomberg, NPR, CNN, and the official statements of the Department of Justice. This is the institutional record, reported by institutional media, and it describes an institution that has lied at every stage, obstructed at every stage, and surveilled its overseers at the moment of maximum scrutiny. If you trust these institutions, then you trust the institutions that did all of the above. If you don't trust them, then the above is the reason. There is no version of this where the institutions come out clean. The best-case scenario—the most charitable possible reading—is that the FBI is a bureaucracy so dysfunctional and so captured by its own inertia that it was unable to investigate a crime that was visible to everyone, for twenty years, despite having the evidence in hand. The worst-case scenario is something else.

※

Here is a question nobody will answer: what happens when you apply standard law enforcement analytical techniques to the communications in the released files?

In drug trafficking cases, when investigators encounter emails in which participants use food terminology in grammatically impossible constructions—"walking the product across town," "the package is eight years old," "fresh delivery, Grade A"—they initiate a decryption analysis. They build a concordance. They map the code terms against known transactions, movements, dates. They identify patterns. This is not exotic methodology. It's standard procedure. Every federal prosecutor in the country knows how to do it. It works. It produces convictions.

The released Epstein files contain thousands of emails in which food items—pizza, cheese, beef jerky, pasta, grape soda—appear in contexts where the language doesn't function as language about food. Ages are attributed to food items. Verbs that cannot grammatically apply to food are applied to food. The FBI's own intelligence bulletins—documents produced by the Bureau itself, for its own analysts—identify the code system used by pedophile networks: "pizza" means girl, "cheese" means little girl, "pasta" means little boy, "hot dog" means boy, "map" refers to semen, "walnut" means per-

son of color, "ice cream" means male prostitute. These are the FBI's terms. This is the FBI's own framework for decoding the communications of pedophile networks. And the FBI has applied this framework to zero of the thousands of emails in its possession from the largest known child sex trafficking operation in American history.

Consider the specific emails. Someone writes about "a pizza party this weekend." In another thread, someone writes to an associate of Epstein's: "I don't need a pizza but thank you for offering, just random J here and ready for you instead." Someone sends Epstein a photograph. He replies: "She looks pregnant." The sender responds: "You mean radiating a soft glow with a look of bliss and excitement." Epstein writes back: "Yeah, that's the pizza." Find the reading in which "pizza" means pizza. Find the reading in which a photograph of a woman is described as "the pizza" and the word refers to food.

Epstein's urologist, Harry Fish, prescribes him erectile dysfunction medication from the pharmacy and then writes: "After you use them, wash your hands and let's go get pizza and grape soda, call me." Another message tells someone to "go for pizza and grape soda" followed by "no one else can understand better than a

Chinese cookie." An email reads: "There are millions of babies, very little good vegetable cream cheese," and the reply is "lol." Another: "There is a rat for every cheese," preceded by "I bet you'd kill for it." Someone sends Epstein a photo attachment. The accompanying text, in its entirety, is: "Age 10." No context. No "this is my daughter at her birthday party." No framing of any kind. A photograph and a number. The file name is in DSC format, indicating a personal camera. The sender's name is redacted. The image is redacted. The subject line is redacted. Everything that would identify the child or the sender has been removed. The number remains.

Consider the beef jerky. It appears thousands of times across the released communications. An associate named Francis emails someone: "Just wanted to touch base about jerky. Jeffrey Epstein said he was going to start eating regular food again so he might be eating less jerky. That said he has six bags of it in the downstairs freezer for his next trip. I believe it should be enough for him to get through. Any other questions please let me know." Epstein emails someone else: "How do we deal with the frozen white tuna?" The reply: "Jerky will be with me when I get to ISJ. I can come tomorrow and take care of white tuna if you'd like.

I'm due back in NYC by this evening." Another email discusses a "jerky class" where Francis will "show me how to make it" and "bring you a taste of his new jerky recipe from the restaurant." The restaurant is named Cannibal Cooks.

A victim of Epstein's, someone who was physically present in his life, who spent time in his homes, has confirmed she never once saw the man eat beef jerky. Not once. This is a billionaire who dined at the world's finest restaurants, who employed private chefs, whose homes were stocked with wine and caviar. He stored his jerky in a freezer, which is a contradiction in terms: the entire point of jerky is that it is shelf-stable, cured, preserved, the one food that does not need refrigeration. Correspondents discuss "walking the beef jerky across town." They mention how old the beef jerky is—in years. They discuss storing it in a bag of ice. They discuss being "on a diet of beef jerky." They apply verbs to beef jerky that cannot grammatically or logically attach to dried meat. The suggestion that Epstein and his associates were conducting an elaborate, years-long, multi-correspondent conversation about their shared passion for dried meat is not a hypothesis that survives contact with reality. And yet that is the only alternative to the

other hypothesis, and the other hypothesis is the one nobody will say aloud.

Consider the shrimp and the sharks. Epstein writes: "Some are like shrimp—you throw away the head and keep the body." The reply: "As long as you don't have any hammerhead ones are like white sharks." Epstein writes the next day: "As two are Russian, I guess some might refer to them as white sharks." The reply: "The king of Saudi has a few white sharks at his Jeddah palace. I totally prefer yours. Sure I would enjoy the view." Epstein responds: "On my island in the Caribbean with an aquarium full of girls." This is a conversation in which the code breaks down entirely and the plaintext bleeds through. One moment they are discussing marine animals by species and sorting them by ethnicity. The next moment the marine animals are girls on a private island. The king of Saudi Arabia is mentioned in passing, casually, as someone who also has the thing they are discussing. Nobody in this correspondence is confused about what they are talking about. The confusion exists only in the minds of people who have to decide whether to look at it.

Consider the pattern across all of Epstein's communications: he never directly addresses anything incriminating. He replies "call me" when associates make

references that could be coded. He lets others use the specific language while maintaining plausible deniability for himself. He stated explicitly in emails: "I don't like putting things in writing. Call me instead." The one time someone wrote him a long, emotional message—a woman recounting his broken promises, ending with "you offered to buy my baby six months into our relationship and six years later you offered to support my ex-boyfriend"—Epstein replied with a vague non-denial that addressed none of the specific claims. Not the baby. Not the offer. Not any of it. He could not deny it, because denial would invite her to provide dates and details and evidence. Silence was safer than denial. The most incriminating material in the archive is visible not in what is said but in what is never challenged.

Are we really to believe that the world's wealthiest and most powerful people were obsessed with cheese pizza and beef jerky? Is that a known feature of billionaire culture that somehow escaped documentation until now?

※

In any other investigation, this would be the starting point. Not the conclusion—the starting point. You

would assign analysts. You would build the concordance. You would map the code against the known movements and transactions. You would present the pattern analysis to a grand jury.

Nobody has done this. Or if someone has done this, the results are in the unreleased half. Or the results were produced and destroyed. Or the results were produced and classified. Every one of those possibilities—including the possibility that the analysis was simply never performed—represents a failure so severe that it requires either extraordinary incompetence or deliberate choice. One thousand agents were deployed to redact. How many were deployed to decode?

The reason this analysis hasn't been done—or hasn't been made public—is not a mystery. It's Pizzagate. In 2016, the idea that powerful people use food terminology as code for child abuse was attached to a specific, ludicrous, partisan narrative about a specific pizza restaurant in Washington, D.C. The narrative was false. The restaurant was real and had no basement and no children. The narrative was debunked, publicly, comprehensively, and the debunking was justified. And in the process, the entire analytical framework—the recognition that food-based code language exists in pedophile networks, that it has been documented by law enforce-

ment for decades, that it appears in court records from cases that have nothing to do with politics—was rendered unusable. After Pizzagate, any analyst who says "these emails about pizza look like they're not about pizza" is a conspiracy theorist. The tool was poisoned. Whether the poisoning was deliberate or accidental, the effect is identical: a standard investigative technique cannot be applied to the largest known cache of communications from a child sex trafficking operation because a debunked conspiracy theory pre-discredited it.

This is not a comfortable observation. It is also not a claim that Pizzagate was engineered as inoculation. It is an observation that inoculation is what happened, regardless of intent. The result is that three and a half million pages of communications sit in the public domain, containing thousands of instances of a known code system, and no credible institution will touch them, because touching them means being associated with the people who think a pizza restaurant in D.C. has a secret basement. The clowns are doing their job. The clowns don't need to know they're clowns.

※

The files contain more than communications. They contain the infrastructure of the operation itself.

In 2014, someone emailed Epstein describing the purchase of two motion-sensor spy cameras from a spy store in Fort Lauderdale. The cameras were "the size of a thumbnail drive" with sixty-four hours of recording capability, being installed into a Kleenex box. "I'll bring them later today," the sender wrote. This is not an allegation of surveillance. It is a receipt. And the files contain still images from these cameras, confirming they were operational and in use—that the hidden cameras described in the email existed, recorded what they were pointed at, and that footage from them was retained.

A June 2012 email bears the subject line: "Reminder: take home thumb drive, drag it to trash before taking out." This is a documented instruction to destroy surveillance recordings. Not alleged. Written down, by someone who apparently believed the instruction itself would not become evidence.

The FBI says no credible evidence of a blackmail operation has been found. The emails describe the purchase and installation of hidden cameras. The files contain footage from those cameras. The emails instruct the destruction of recordings from those cameras. The FBI

says no credible evidence of a blackmail operation has been found.

Among the items recovered during the FBI's search of Epstein's New York residence on July 11, 2019: a black suitcase containing loose diamonds, assorted cash and currency from multiple countries, and four binders of CDs. A blue suitcase containing two binders of CDs, expired US passports, a forged Austrian passport in the name "Marius Robert Forelli" with Epstein's photograph and a listed residence of Saudi Arabia—well-used, with multiple entries through Charles de Gaulle airport in 1982 and 1983 and through Heathrow—and a genuine US Department of Treasury Customs Service special agent credential wallet containing a pin or badge described as "for a special agent." No credentials were inside the wallet, but the wallet itself was real.

The forged passport. The special agent wallet. The suitcase full of diamonds and foreign cash. And the binders of CDs, which in 2019 would have been an archaic storage medium for anything except material that someone wanted to keep off networked systems—material that was never supposed to be accessible remotely, that was meant to be physically controlled, physically locked in a suitcase, physically handed to someone or physically destroyed. A special agent inven-

toried a book of CDs during the July 11 search that subsequently disappeared from the record. The FBI's explanation: the agent "duplicated the entry" and the item "was not located in either suitcase." The one inventory error—out of forty-eight loose diamonds, stacks of foreign currency, multiple passports, and binders of discs—happened to involve the item most likely to contain the material that the FBI says doesn't exist.

When the FBI ran the alias "Marius Robert Forelli" through its own Sentinel database in 2025—six years after finding the passport—one result came back "restricted, access denied." The FBI's own system will not tell the FBI who this dead man was pretending to be. An Austrian passport with a Saudi address, used extensively through European airports in the early 1980s, connected to a man whose mentor and father-in-law figure was documented by multiple governments as an intelligence asset, found in a suitcase next to a Treasury special agent credential wallet and binders of CDs. The intelligence thread in this case is not speculation. It is physical evidence sitting in an evidence locker, connected to a classified file that the FBI cannot or will not access in its own database.

※

Two 55-gallon drums of sulfuric acid were ordered for Epstein's island on September 15, 2015. Two more were ordered on February 8, 2017, approximately eighteen months later. Six drums were ordered in December 2018—tripling the quantity—coinciding with the period when new charges and accusations were emerging against Epstein. The purchases escalated in lockstep with his legal exposure.

Sulfuric acid has legitimate industrial uses. It is used in water treatment, in cleaning, in pH adjustment for pools. It is also used to dissolve organic matter, including human remains, and it is used in the production of methamphetamine. The best-case interpretation of a private island ordering ten 55-gallon drums of sulfuric acid over three years, with volumes tripling as criminal investigations intensified, is that someone was manufacturing drugs. The worst-case interpretation is something that the mind declines to complete. Every interpretation in between requires the same question the entire case requires: find the benign explanation and hold it up to the light.

※

Consider the torture references. A UAE sultan messages Epstein: "I am in China. I will be in the US second week of May." Epstein replies: "Where are you? Are you okay? I loved the torture video." A Harvard professor, Martin Nowak, messages Epstein: "Our spy was captured after completing her mission." Then: "Did you torture her?" A redacted email with the subject line from Jeffrey Epstein reads: "Do you want me to try to do her or just torture her on Friday?"

Across thousands of emails, Epstein uses coded language for everything that could incriminate him. Food for whatever the food means. "Call me" for anything that gets too specific. Vague non-denials for direct accusations. But the word "torture" appears openly, casually, in plain language, in emails to a sultan and a Harvard professor and in subject lines. The implication is not that torture was a code word. The implication is that torture was not the thing being hidden. In a correspondence where everything damaging is wrapped in euphemism, the things that appear in cleartext are the things the writer considered safe to say—either because they were jokes, or because in the world these people inhabited, they were not the kind of thing that required hiding.

※

In February 2026, a woman appeared on camera in an extended interview with a serious journalist. The interviewer treated her with rigor—almost cross-examination. She described things she had experienced personally in Epstein's orbit. She described abuse. She described things that, if true, belong in the category of the most extreme crimes any legal system recognizes.

She also described seeing Epstein transform into the devil. She described a gateway to an alien dimension. She described being abducted by extraterrestrials.

The instinct—the reasonable, sane, protective instinct—is to file this under "unreliable narrator" and move on. She believes she saw the devil. Therefore her testimony is contaminated. Therefore the abuse she describes is uncertain. Therefore we can set her aside and focus on the documents, the flight logs, the financial records, the things that don't require us to evaluate the credibility of a person who claims to have seen a portal to another dimension.

But this instinct, however reasonable, conceals a mechanism. The clinical literature on severe childhood sexual abuse—the peer-reviewed, institutional, respectable literature—documents in extensive detail what happens

to memory encoding under conditions of extreme, prolonged, ritualized trauma. Dissociation. Confabulation. Narrative fragmentation. Magical thinking. Screen memories in which the mind, unable to process the actual event, substitutes a symbolic representation that preserves the emotional reality while replacing the factual content. A child being systematically terrorized in a disorienting environment, by people who have constructed that environment specifically to disorient, will encode those experiences using whatever framework is available—religion, science fiction, the supernatural. The memory is real. The interpretation is the mind's attempt to survive what it recorded.

When a trauma specialist hears a patient say "my abuser turned into the devil," they don't hear a delusion. They hear a severity marker. They hear: something happened to this person so extreme that their developing brain reached for the most powerful image of evil available to it, because no other category was adequate. That is evidence of the intensity of the experience, not evidence of its absence. In a clinical setting, the supernatural elements are diagnostic. They tell you how bad it was.

But in a courtroom, in a congressional hearing, in a news broadcast, in the public discourse that determines

what a society is willing to reckon with—those same elements function as disqualification. She saw the devil. She was abducted by aliens. She's crazy. Move on. The severity of the abuse produces the symptoms that are used to discredit the report of the abuse. The worse it was, the more damaged the witness. The more damaged the witness, the less credible the testimony. The less credible the testimony, the safer the abuser. This is not a flaw in the system. If you were designing an operation intended to produce witnesses who would discredit themselves every time they opened their mouths, you would do exactly what appears to have been done: abuse children in environments engineered to maximize psychological disorientation, using ritualized elements that the mind will later encode as supernatural, ensuring that any future testimony will contain details so bizarre that no institution will take it seriously.

This may not be what happened. It may be that this woman is simply unreliable, that her claims of abuse are as fabricated as her claims of alien contact, that the whole thing is confabulation from start to finish. That is possible. But the alternative is also possible—that the abuse was real and the alien abduction is what the abuse looks like after twenty years inside a mind that was broken by it. And there is no tool available to distin-

guish between these possibilities from the outside. The clinical tools require access to the patient over extended therapeutic engagement. The legal tools require a functioning investigative apparatus, which is the thing that has demonstrably failed. The journalistic tools require sources that can be corroborated, and the corroborating evidence is in documents that are half-released and half-redacted. Everything points at everything else. Nothing resolves.

※

The scale of what is documented—not alleged, not speculated, documented in the released files and in prior court proceedings—is already extraordinary. The FBI's own investigation identified twenty-seven victims between the ages of fourteen and twenty-three. Federal prosecutors prepared a thirty-two-count indictment and then a sixty-count indictment, naming three unnamed co-defendants, and then filed neither. Instead, a non-prosecution agreement was negotiated that gave Epstein thirteen months in a county jail with work release privileges. The agreement also granted immunity to unnamed co-conspirators—an almost unprecedented provision that effectively closed the door on any future

prosecution of anyone in the network. The agreement was sealed, meaning the victims were not informed of its terms, in violation of the Crime Victims' Rights Act, as a federal judge later ruled.

After Epstein's arrest in 2019, the Southern District of New York prepared its own case. Epstein died in federal custody before trial, on the morning of August 10, 2019. Or rather: a body was removed from the Metropolitan Correctional Center on the morning of August 10, 2019, and that body was declared to be Jeffrey Epstein, and the death was ruled a suicide by hanging.

Here is what the released documents, the Inspector General's report, the correctional officers' interviews, the medical examiner's report, and the newly released prison footage actually show.

Two DVR systems served the Metropolitan Correctional Center. DVR1 recorded sixty-four cameras. DVR2 recorded one hundred twenty-eight cameras. All cameras on L-tier—the special housing unit where Epstein was held—recorded to DVR2. DVR2 stopped functioning on July 29, 2019. July 29 was the exact day Epstein was transferred back into the special housing unit after his first injury—the July 23 incident in which he was found with a ligature around his neck and told other inmates someone had tried to kill him, then told psy-

chologists he didn't remember what happened, then requested to be housed with the same cellmate he had accused of assaulting him, a sequence that was used as the basis for concluding the incident was self-inflicted.

The official position is that DVR2's failure meant zero footage exists from any L-tier camera. All footage destroyed. Nothing salvageable. The Inspector General's report and the official camera diagram mark only two cameras as recording to DVR1: one in a hallway at a terrible angle where you could barely see L-tier, and one covering the ninth-floor fire exit and elevator bank. Every other camera in the special housing unit, including the camera at the end of L-tier directly facing Epstein's cell, was marked as recording to DVR2—the broken system.

But newly released footage from August 11, 2019—the day after Epstein's death—shows a clear shot from the L-tier camera. The camera that was officially nonfunctional. The camera that was supposedly recording to the broken system. There it is, on August 11, producing footage. DVR2 had not been repaired by August 11. Emails confirm that Nice Vision, the repair company, did not arrive until August 12, and even then could not begin work because the FBI was still in the equipment room exporting video. The electronics technician con-

firmed the repair process would take far longer than a single day. The footage cannot have come from DVR2.

The footage from the L-tier camera is stored in the same file as footage from the hallway camera that was confirmed to be on DVR1. The feed transitions seamlessly from one to the other, indicating both cameras were recording to the same system. An FBI email from August 14, 2019, references "a third camera of interest connected to DVR system 1" with footage exportable back to July 23—the date of Epstein's first injury. The official diagram shows two cameras on DVR1. The FBI's own email describes a third. That third camera appears to be the L-tier camera.

The implications are straightforward and devastating. If the L-tier camera was on DVR1 all along, then clear footage of everyone who approached Epstein's cell on the night of August 9–10 exists or existed on the functional system. Someone either deleted it or mislabeled the camera to make it appear the footage was on the broken system. The camera labels were switched: the command center camera was mislabeled as "L tier" and the actual L-tier camera was relabeled as the command center. The released hallway footage has gaps that align precisely with every significant event: it skips from 11 PM to 1 AM on the night of August 9–10, then from 2

AM to 9 AM—missing both the presumed time of death and the body discovery at 6:33 AM. July footage was released going back to early July but is absent around the July 23 incident, despite all cameras—including DVR2—supposedly being functional before July 29.

On the day of Epstein's death, newly released footage shows personnel setting up a physical board to block the camera's view of the area where the body was being handled. This footage was intentionally withheld from previous releases that purported to include all available footage. And undated footage from J-tier—a corridor perpendicular to L-tier—exists in the files with no timestamp and no documentation explaining its presence, from a camera also supposedly on the non-functional DVR2 system, showing the kind of clear corridor shot that should have been available from L-tier had the footage been preserved.

The FBI seized all DVR2 hard drives on August 10, returned August 14–15 for additional DVR2 components and the entire DVR1 system. FBI forensics at Quantico determined "catastrophic disc failures" in DVR2 with no recordings available after July 29. Nobody has explained why the DVR1 footage—from the system that was working the entire time, from the camera that was demonstrably recording to it—has not been produced.

Nobody has been asked to explain this in a way that requires an answer.

Here is what happened inside the cell.

Correctional officer Michael Thomas entered Epstein's cell at 6:33 AM to bring breakfast. He described finding Epstein in a seated position, body upright from buttocks to head, legs pointed forward, "suspended one inch off the ground." He said the face looked normal, no discoloration, no purple, "almost like it just happened." He wasn't even sure Epstein was dead. He said he ripped the noose off, that Epstein's body "plopped down," landed on his butt, body "limped over." He could not remember who else entered the room, which nurses came in, or what happened to the noose. Yet photographs of Epstein's body taken later that morning show his face completely purple—contradicting the officer's description of a normal-looking face.

The cell was on L-tier. The correctional officers' station was literally feet away—close enough that inmates could hear what guards were saying, close enough that tearing anti-tear prison linens into strips would have been clearly audible. Both officers claimed to have heard nothing.

The fabric attachment point—the bar from which the ligature was supposedly hung—was approximately

forty-two inches from the floor, calculated from the standard eight-inch height of cinder blocks including grout and the two-inch gray band at the bottom of the wall. The average man's neck in a seated position would be approximately thirty inches from the floor, compressed to about twenty-four inches by the pull of a ligature. A loose knot subtracts several more inches. The total distance between the attachment point and the body reaches approximately eighteen inches or less—physically insufficient to suspend a body. There was not enough space between the bar and the floor for a seated adult male to be suspended. The officer's claim of one-inch suspension was an assumption based on seeing a ligature around a dead man's neck, not an observation of actual suspension.

This matters because the medical examiner's report describes fractures of the thyroid cartilage and one side of the hyoid bone, with the trachea pressed against the back of the neck—injuries requiring the enormous downward force created by full body weight in a suspended hanging. Simple asphyxiation from leaning forward against a ligature would not produce these fractures. If Epstein was not suspended—and the mathematics of the space say he could not have been—then the medical examiner's findings are inconsistent with

the physical scene. And if the fractures are real, they are more consistent with someone manually pulling a ligature tight around his neck from behind, which is strangulation, not suicide.

The ligature itself has never been identified. One nurse stated it was still around Epstein's neck when she arrived. Another nurse saw "a noose fabricated out of bed sheets" but could not recall whether it was around his neck or on the ground. Other witnesses reported seeing no noose at all. The medical examiner was provided with a noose that was demonstrably not the actual ligature—too tidy, too uniform, the wrong material. The piece of fabric always shown in photographs hanging from the bed frame—the one presented to the public as the instrument of death—was confirmed not to be what was used. It hangs perfectly straight with no indentations or bends, confirming it was oriented as found, never subjected to the stress of supporting body weight. A separate piece of fabric on the floor may have been the actual ligature, but the medical examiner said it still didn't fully match. Nobody knows what was actually used to kill Jeffrey Epstein. The object that ended his life—or the life of whoever was in that cell—has never been officially recovered, identified, or explained.

A medical note from July 28, 2019—twelve days before the death—documents that Epstein's right arm was numb and hanging, that he could not make a fist with his right hand, and that he had numbness in his neck. Anti-tear prison linens are engineered to resist exactly what they were allegedly used for. Tearing them into strips requires substantial grip strength and sustained force. A man who could not make a fist twelve days earlier did not shred them by hand.

The autopsy describes "genitalia atraumatic and of a normal circumcised man." Multiple victims, independently and consistently, described Epstein's genitals as lemon-shaped and extremely deformed—a distinctive abnormality that would be immediately obvious to any medical examiner conducting an autopsy. These cannot both be true. Either the victims are lying about a detail they had no reason to fabricate—a detail so specific and so consistently reported across multiple witnesses that fabrication would require coordination—or the autopsy does not describe the body of Jeffrey Epstein.

The press release announcing that Epstein had been found unresponsive was dated Friday, August 9. He was found unresponsive at 6:33 AM on Saturday, August 10. The press release was dated the day before it described.

On the morning of August 10, a decoy body was assembled from boxes and bed sheets, placed in a white OCME vehicle, and driven past the assembled press corps while the actual body—or whatever was transported—departed in a black vehicle. Forensic professionals have described this procedure as "exceptionally unusual." Nobody has explained why it was done. Nobody has been asked to explain it in a way that requires an answer. The ears and nose visible in the gurney photographs—the images taken as the body was wheeled out—appear significantly different from known photographs of Epstein, a discrepancy attributed to post-mortem changes and camera angles by those who accept the official account, and attributed to something else by those who do not.

Forty percent of the American public, according to recent polling, believes Epstein is still alive.

※

Among the documents found in his cell: a note. Not a suicide note. An escape plan.

Handwritten in Epstein's nearly inscrutable script, it is a diagram of extraordinary specificity. At its center: "MIA US"—if he goes missing in the United States,

what follows. Branches radiate outward. "Red notice = ext"—Interpol issues a red notice, which means extradition. "Visas"—he would need forged documents. "No rights"—his legal protections change depending on the country. "EST tax" or "EXT tax"—estate tax, the financial implications of being declared dead. "Banks"—access to money. A specific name appears next to dollar signs. Below it: "Guards." Below that: "Government clear"—looking for a government where he would be clear to go. Below that: "Muslim"—considering Muslim-majority countries. Below that: "Q-SA"—Qatar, Saudi Arabia. Both of which appear in the forged passport found in his suitcase: Austrian identity, Saudi address. Below that: "Nigeria!" underlined with an exclamation point—a country that does extradite to the United States, suggesting he had considered and rejected safer options for reasons that aren't documented.

On another branch: "Gangsters." "Extort, kidnap"—concerns about what might happen to him in certain countries. "Island and people." "K = !!!"—if he is declared dead, does the red notice go away, with three exclamation points. A small sketch that appears to be a map of the United States. "Nicole"—a name with no further context.

A hand-drawn picture of what appears to be a private airport, resembling Teterborough—a name that appears approximately seven thousand times in the Epstein files—with the name "Brad" written clearly on top of it. "Medical/PT"—patient, suggesting transport as a medical patient. "G/computer PB, VI"—matching exactly how Ghislaine Maxwell referred to her computers in Palm Beach and the Virgin Islands in her own emails. "Mara?"—possibly a name, possibly code. "LSR"—unidentified initials appearing more than once.

And written in black ink, when everything else is in blue: "Jet-US prop." The different ink means he returned to the document. He came back and added to it. This was not a one-time scribble, not a moment of idle fantasy in a jail cell. It was an iterated plan, revisited and developed over time.

On a separate page, flipped upside down: dates "2002 to 2005," two coded initials, and then: "Jail out = 10." "Nothing at all." "No [something] me."

On a third page: "Blankets"—he had documented excessive blankets in his cell, confirmed in the Inspector General's report. "AVR"—the cameras, which were confirmed non-functional by the official account and confirmed functional by the footage that exists. "Medi"—medical, the method by which those who believe he

escaped think he was transported out. "Watch!"—with exclamation point.

If he killed himself, why was he planning an escape in two colors of ink? If he escaped, who died in his cell, and why doesn't the autopsy match victim descriptions of his body? If he was murdered, who wrote the note, and why was it left behind? And in every scenario—suicide, murder, escape—the cameras that he wrote "AVR" next to weren't working according to the official account but were demonstrably recording to the functional DVR system. The blankets he referenced were piled in his cell. The medical transport he described is the method escape theorists believe was used. The decoy body made from sheets and boxes was used to misdirect the press. The press release was dated before he died. And the estate tax—the bureaucratic detail he noted in the margin—remains the kind of consideration that a man planning to fake his own death would need to address, and that a man planning to kill himself would not.

Every question the note answers generates three more, and the answers are in the half of the files that remain unreleased, or in the three minutes edited from the surveillance footage, or in the footage from the camera that was recording to DVR1 all along, or in the minds of

guards who fell asleep at the precise moment required, feet from a cell whose occupant they were specifically assigned to monitor.

※

Ghislaine Maxwell was convicted in 2021 on five federal charges including sex trafficking of a minor. She was sentenced to twenty years. No other person has been charged. The FBI's own internal documents designated eight individuals as suspected co-conspirators. As of February 2026, four have been named: Leslie Wexner, Lesley Groff, Jean-Luc Brunel, and Maxwell. Brunel died by apparent suicide in a Paris prison in 2022—the second person connected to the Epstein case to die in custody under disputed circumstances. Four names remain redacted. Two members of Congress who have reviewed the unredacted files have stated publicly that they identified six men who are "likely incriminated." The DOJ has announced that no further prosecutions will be pursued.

The files contain more than the names of co-conspirators. They contain what Woody Allen, in a short story published years before his own name appeared in the files, described Epstein as: "a collector of people." The re-

leased photographs tell their own story. A photo of Bill Gates at a dinner, sandwiched in the files between redacted images of people in various states of undress—every image above and below the Gates photograph redacted, every partially clothed figure obscured, and Gates sitting in the middle of the sequence, smiling. A photo of Donald Trump, followed immediately in the file sequence by photographs of large bags of cash, including what appear to be non-US currency. Howard Lutnick testifying under oath that he saw Epstein only once and ran away terrified, then files showing he visited the island with his family.

An FBI report investigating the claim that the Reddit username "MaxwellHill" belonged to Ghislaine Maxwell. A screenshot from the account shows a post asking which American states allow the youngest marriage. The phrasing—"American states"—is not how an American would write that sentence. It is how a British person would. Maxwell is British. The FBI investigated the account. The results of the investigation are in the files. The conclusion is redacted.

Epstein had a World of Warcraft account. He had been kicked off Xbox Live. He had a Fortnite account that was charged $25.95 in V-Bucks on May 7, 2019—two months before his arrest. In his emails, Epstein

discusses video game franchises like Call of Duty exclusively as investment opportunities, never with personal enthusiasm. The gaming accounts were not for him. They were created for someone. The V-Bucks were purchased for someone. In the context of a child sex trafficking operation, the most parsimonious explanation for a sixty-six-year-old billionaire maintaining active accounts on platforms used predominantly by minors is not that he was an avid gamer.

An email to Epstein describes "Bob Pyrie" asking whether Murray Gell-Mann—the Nobel Prize–winning physicist—would be a good candidate for "the Zodiac," described as "one of those last secret type societies." Twelve members at any time, each representing a zodiac sign. Members allegedly include Paul Volcker, someone named "Howdy whose family owns the town," Bob Pyrie representing Cancer "the sign not the month," and Tom Brokaw. "You are a member until your death but if you get senile they put you into eccentric orbit and not invite you to meetings." "No minorities or women allowed." "The only way to get you in is if someone dies." Epstein's reply: "Murray doesn't play well in groups." The email reads as though it should be satirical. It does not appear to be.

※

And then there is the content of the conversations. Not the coded ones, but the ones conducted in plain language, between people who apparently believed no one would ever read them.

In November 2025, the House Oversight Committee released emails from Joscha Bach, a German cognitive scientist who held positions at MIT's Media Lab and Harvard's Program for Evolutionary Dynamics—both funded, in significant part, by Epstein. The financial entanglement was substantial: Epstein donated approximately $300,000 to MIT specifically for Bach's hiring, covered his rent, his flights, his medical bills, his children's private school tuition. Total support exceeded a million dollars. Bach confirmed visiting Epstein's island "together with director of science foundation and his family."

In a July 2016 email chain that began as a discussion of Chomsky's linguistics, Bach wrote that Black children "lag behind (and never catch up) in cognitive development even after controlling for family income," attributing this to biological factors, describing Black children's brains as "slower at learning high-level concepts." He called fascism "probably most efficient

and rationally stringent way of governance, if someone could pull it off in sustainable way." He described climate change as potentially a "good way of dealing with overpopulation." He told Epstein: "I find your 'political incorrectness' very fascinating... now I think you are simply entirely unconstrained in your thoughts." Elsewhere in the correspondence—though the email formatting makes it difficult to determine who is writing at certain points—there are discussions of modifying the cognitive capacity of Black children through genetic intervention, of "genetic switches" that could alter racial characteristics. The line between Bach's words and Epstein's becomes blurred in places, which is itself part of the problem: the record is not clean enough to attribute, and not ambiguous enough to dismiss.

These are not fringe communications from anonymous accounts. These are emails between a man who held positions at the world's most prestigious scientific institutions and a convicted child sex offender who funded those positions—who paid for the scientist's hiring, his housing, his children's education, his travel, his medical care. The ideas being discussed—racial eugenics, the genetic modification of children's intelligence along racial lines, the optimization of fascist governance—are being discussed not as hypotheticals

in a philosophy seminar but as practical possibilities between a scientist and his patron. A patron who operated a private island wired for surveillance, who trafficked minors on an industrial scale, who kept binders of CDs in locked suitcases, who ordered increasing quantities of sulfuric acid as investigations closed in, and who funded the Harvard Program for Evolutionary Dynamics—a name that, in the context of everything else in these files, sounds less like an academic department and more like a mission statement.

This does not prove that Epstein was running a eugenics program. It proves that the intellectual infrastructure for one was being funded by a child sex trafficker and discussed in his private correspondence with the scientists he was paying. The distance between discussing "genetic switches" that could modify racial characteristics and actually attempting to implement such modifications is a distance that, in any other context, would be considered a matter for investigation. In this context, it is a matter for nobody, because the investigation has been closed.

※

This is the documented baseline. Dozens of underage victims. Industrial-scale abuse. Two prepared indictments never filed. A plea deal that immunized unnamed co-conspirators. A death in custody with edited footage, sleeping guards, switched camera labels, nonfunctional DVR systems that were demonstrably functional, a ligature that was never recovered, an autopsy that doesn't match the body it claims to describe, a press release dated before the event it announces, and a decoy body assembled from boxes and sheets. A second death in custody in a different country. Eight suspected coconspirators, of whom one was convicted, two are dead, and four remain unnamed. Two congresspeople who say they've seen evidence of six implicated men. A DOJ that says it's done. A forged Austrian passport with a Saudi address and a classified FBI file attached to its alias. A Treasury special agent credential wallet. Binders of CDs, one of which disappeared from the inventory. Hidden cameras purchased from a spy store, installed in a Kleenex box, with surviving footage. An email instructing the destruction of surveillance recordings. Ten 55-gallon drums of sulfuric acid ordered for a private island in increasing quantities as investigations intensified. Thousands of emails in a documented code language that no institution will decode. An escape

plan in two colors of ink with a hand-drawn airport. A man who couldn't make a fist twelve days before he allegedly tore anti-tear linens into strips. A video game account for a sixty-six-year-old who discussed games only as investments. A secret society with no women or minorities. A urologist prescribing erectile dysfunction pills and then suggesting pizza. A photo labeled "age 10." A Harvard professor asking about torture. A Reddit account researching child marriage laws. Six hundred billion-dollar names and four redacted ones and a Department of Justice that has announced the matter is closed.

This is not the conspiracy theory. This is what the conspiracy theory is built on top of. And it is, on its own, without any embellishment, one of the most damning indictments of institutional failure in the history of the American justice system. Every additional claim—the coded language, the intelligence connections, the blackmail operation, the more extreme allegations—is an extension of a pattern that is already fully established in the official record. The question is not whether the institutions failed. They failed. The question is whether they failed through incompetence or through complicity, and at what point the distinction between those two things ceases to be meaningful.

※

The global consequences have been strangely asymmetric. In Europe, careers have ended. The United Kingdom's ambassador was fired. A former Norwegian prime minister was charged. A crown princess apologized publicly. Slovakia's national security adviser resigned. France's Jack Lang stepped down. Multiple countries opened formal investigations. The European response has been what you would expect when evidence of elite complicity in a pedophile network becomes public: shock, accountability, consequences.

In the United States—the country where the network was headquartered, where the abuse occurred, where the investigation was sabotaged, where the defendant died in federal custody, where the files were produced—almost nothing has happened. A CNN poll in January 2026 found that six percent of Americans said they were satisfied with the government's disclosures. Two-thirds believed the government was deliberately withholding information. And yet: no prosecutions. No resignations. No formal congressional investigation with subpoena power directed at the named associates. The Deputy Attorney General announced on February

2 that there would be no additional charges. The matter, in the eyes of the Department of Justice, is closed.

It is closed because closing it is the only option that doesn't unravel everything. The files name—in emails, in flight logs, in financial records, in photographs—people who sit at the center of American power. Not at its fringes. Not in its shadows. At its center. In its boardrooms, its courtrooms, its newsrooms, its Oval Office. The reason the American response has been muted is not that America cares less about child abuse than Norway. It's that in Norway, the implicated figures are foreign diplomats and former officials who can be sacrificed without destabilizing the state. In America, the implicated figures are the state. They are the people who run the institutions that would have to investigate them. The FBI cannot investigate the FBI's own failure to investigate. The DOJ cannot prosecute the DOJ's own decision not to prosecute. The media cannot report on its own twenty-year failure to report. Every institution that would normally function as a check has been compromised—not by conspiracy, necessarily, but by proximity, by complicity, by the simple structural fact that the people who would need to be investigated are the people who run the institutions that do the investigating.

This is not how conspiracy theories describe the world. Conspiracy theories describe a world of shadowy cabals meeting in secret rooms, pulling strings from behind a curtain. What the Epstein files describe is something more banal and more terrifying: a world in which everyone knew, no one acted, and the reason no one acted is that acting would have required confronting people they depended on—for funding, for access, for career advancement, for the maintenance of the systems they all inhabited together. Not a conspiracy. A culture. A class. A set of mutual understandings so deeply embedded in the social fabric of elite life that they never needed to be spoken aloud. You don't need a secret handshake when everyone already knows the rules.

※

There is a threshold beyond which horror becomes its own protection.

Small crimes are dangerous to their perpetrators because they are believable. Embezzlement, bribery, tax fraud—these crimes fit inside the existing model of how the world works. When evidence emerges, people can process it. They can be outraged. They can demand accountability. The scandal functions. The system works.

But there exists a category of crime so extreme that it exceeds the processing capacity of the average human mind. Not because people are stupid or credulous, but because the mind is a homeostatic system that maintains a functional model of reality, and some truths are incompatible with a functional model. The mind encounters the claim, recognizes that integrating it would require dismantling its entire framework for understanding the world, and declines. Not consciously. Automatically. The way a circuit breaker trips. The lights go out not because the wiring is bad but because the load exceeded what the system was built to carry.

And this creates a paradox that has no solution. The worse the crime, the harder it is to believe. The harder it is to believe, the less likely it is to be investigated, prosecuted, reported, or even discussed. The less likely it is to be discussed, the safer the perpetrators. The safest crime is the one that is so terrible that no one can accept it as real. You don't need to hide it. You don't need to suppress it. You don't need to buy off journalists or threaten witnesses or redact documents—though all of those things help. The primary defense is the crime itself. Its extremity is its camouflage.

This is not a new observation. It has been made by prosecutors who work on cases involving organized child sexual abuse. It has been made by clinicians who treat survivors. It has been made by investigators who have watched cases collapse not because the evidence was insufficient but because the evidence described something that judges, jurors, and the public simply could not accept. The phrase that appears in the literature is "the unthinkable." Not unthinkable because it requires imagination to conceive—unthinkable because the mind refuses to think it. The refusal is not a choice. It is a reflex. And the reflex protects the perpetrator as surely as any cover-up.

So here is where we are. We have three and a half million pages of documents. We have three million more that are unreleased. We have an FBI that deployed a thousand agents to redact rather than investigate. We have a DOJ that tracked congressional oversight activities. We have coded communications that no one will decode. We have traumatized witnesses whose testimony is discredited by the severity of what was done to them. We have two deaths in custody. We have a deputy attorney general who says it's over. We have six percent public satisfaction. We have half the documents. We have four unnamed co-conspirators. We have a cam-

era system whose own footage contradicts the official account of its failure. We have an autopsy that doesn't match the body. We have a ligature that was never found. We have a press release from the future. We have a decoy body made of boxes. We have an escape plan in two inks. We have a forged passport linked to a classified file. We have a gap between what the files show and what anyone is willing to do about it that is large enough to fit an entire civilization inside.

And we have, floating at the edges of the discourse, claims so extreme that they cannot be evaluated by any available instrument. Not confirmed. Not denied. Suspended. Claims that children were farmed—bred or acquired and raised in isolation, never seeing daylight, for purposes that the mind refuses to complete the sentence about. Claims of eugenic experimentation—not as allegation but as documented discussion in emails between a billionaire child trafficker and the scientists he funded at Harvard and MIT. Claims of cannibalism—a word that appears in the name of a restaurant in an email about beef jerky, which is not about beef jerky, in a correspondence that is not about food. These words look insane on the page. They are supposed to look insane on the page. That is how the mechanism works. But the person writing this essay did not want to include them,

and that reluctance is itself diagnostic—it is the circuit breaker tripping, the reflex that says: if I write these words, I become one of those people, and everything else I've written becomes contaminated by association. The very structure the essay describes is operating on the essay itself, in real time, and the author's instinct to self-censor is indistinguishable from the instinct that has kept every journalist, every prosecutor, and every institution from looking directly at what the files contain.

So look at what we are being asked to hold in our heads simultaneously. A convicted child sex offender who managed billions of dollars with no visible source of income, whose mentor was documented by multiple governments as an intelligence asset, who possessed a forged Austrian passport with a Saudi address linked to a classified FBI file, who carried a Treasury special agent credential wallet, who operated a private island wired with hidden cameras purchased from a spy store and installed in Kleenex boxes, who ordered ten 55-gallon drums of sulfuric acid for that island in quantities that tripled as investigations closed in, who instructed associates to destroy surveillance thumb drives, who flew heads of state and tech billionaires to that island on a private jet called the Lolita Express, who died in fed-

eral custody in a cell where the cameras were switched between DVR systems so that footage appeared to be lost when it was in fact recording to the functional system, where the ligature was never recovered, where the autopsy describes anatomy that multiple victims say is not his, where the press release was dated before the death, where a decoy body was wheeled past the press, whose escape plan was written in two colors of ink with a hand-drawn airport and mentions of blackmail, assassination, Saudi Arabia, estate tax, and the very cameras and blankets found in his cell, whose associates communicated for years in a food-based code that the FBI's own bulletins identify as pedophile network terminology, whose emails contain a urologist prescribing erectile dysfunction pills and then suggesting pizza, a photo labeled "age 10" with no context, discussions of racial eugenics with Harvard scientists he funded, an offer to buy a baby that was never denied, a reference to a restaurant called Cannibal Cooks in an email about jerky that isn't jerky, a conversation about shrimp and sharks that ends with "an aquarium full of girls," a casual mention of the king of Saudi Arabia, a torture video shared with a UAE sultan, a secret society with no women or minorities, a Reddit account researching child marriage laws, and a Fortnite account charged

twenty-five dollars in V-Bucks two months before his arrest—whose victims describe experiences so extreme that their minds encoded them as encounters with the devil and alien abductions, whose co-conspirators remain unnamed and uncharged, whose files—the ones that have been released—run to three and a half million pages that no one has read, and whose remaining files—another three million pages—sit unreleased in a Department of Justice that has announced the matter is closed.

Find the benign explanation. Take your time. Find the reading of this in which every element resolves into something ordinary: the food language is really about food, the escape plan is a doodle in one color of ink and not two, the eugenics discussions are intellectual exercises, the surveillance cameras were for home security and installed in Kleenex boxes for aesthetic reasons, the code names are nicknames, the camera labels were switched by accident, the DVR failed on the day of the transfer by coincidence, the footage gaps align with every significant event by chance, the physical board was erected to protect the dignity of the deceased and not to block the camera that was supposedly not recording, the press release was a typo, the decoy body was standard procedure, the autopsy is correct and the

victims are wrong about the anatomy of the man who abused them, the forged passport is a souvenir, the special agent wallet is a novelty item, the classified FBI file attached to the alias is a bureaucratic quirk, the sulfuric acid was for the pool, the diamonds and foreign cash are traveling money, the missing CD binder is an inventory error, the spy cameras were for birdwatching, the instruction to destroy thumb drives was digital housekeeping, the billion dollars came from savvy investing, the island was a retreat for serious thinkers, the Fortnite account was his, the torture video was a joke, the baby offer was a misunderstanding, the "age 10" photo was a birthday party, the Cannibal Cooks restaurant is a coincidence, the shrimp are shrimp, the sharks are sharks, the aquarium is an aquarium, and the hundred-odd children were an unfortunate lapse in an otherwise distinguished life of philanthropy. Find that reading and hold it up to the light and see if it casts a shadow that matches the shape of what you're looking at.

The claims exist in a zone where the normal tools of verification have been disabled—by institutional failure, by information warfare, by the pre-discrediting of analytical frameworks, by the psychological circuit breaker that trips when the load exceeds capacity. They exist in a zone where the people who dismiss them and

the people who believe them are both operating on insufficient evidence, because the sufficient evidence is in the half that hasn't been released, or in the minds of witnesses whose minds were shattered by the thing they witnessed, or in communications that use a code system that no one will decode, or in investigations that were never conducted, or in files that disappeared from a website overnight, or in footage from a camera that was recording all along to a system that nobody will produce.

This is not a conclusion. There is no conclusion available. Every conclusion requires a foundation, and the foundation has been removed.

※