
[Index](#)
[The Big Pictures](#)
[Ongoing Investigations](#)
[Crossfire Hurricane Origins](#)
[Epstein's "Commonwealth"](#)
[Epstein's Black Book](#)
[Christian Constitutionalism](#)
[Imperial Cults](#)
[Antisocial Syndicates](#)
[Illegitimate Power](#)
[Active Measures](#)
[Engineering Malthus](#)
[Hypothalamus News](#)
[African Mutterland](#)
[AI Fact Check](#)
[American Injustice](#)
[Terror Log](#)
[Heroes and Zeroes](#)
[Performance Theory](#)
[Humanity Incorporated](#)
[About UPR News](#)
[Revelation](#)
[Patriotic Litigation](#)
[2026 Archives](#)
[2025 Archives](#)
[2024 Archive](#)
[2023 Archive](#)
[Sitemap](#)
[Contact Us](#)

In defense of Donald Trump, with intent to protect the United States of America, from its greatest enemies: A research project on government and media investigations, coupled to statistical analysis, in search of the "mean deviation".
Published on 6 October 2026 at 20:17



10/06/2026

Today, and as balanced journalism does, we decided to defend Donald Trump from America's greatest enemies, as defined by Trump, and using artificial intelligence as a research assistant of government and media records.

Trump has defined America's enemies in about 34 different categories, and so we decided to find at least examples of the types of enemies Trump has specified, to defend Trump against arguably the greatest enemies America has ever faced in this revelation.

Then in a balanced manner, we decided to publish our findings three ways.

The first way we did was to ask artificial intelligence to write a research summary that everyone who understands English would be able to understand, and it was a summary of an academic research project we developed, employing statistics and what is known in statistics as the "null hypothesis", which is the second way we published this research. The third way was publishing the conversation we have with artificial intelligence.

Here is the quick and easy version that most people will be able to understand, research by us, but written by artificial intelligence.

Based on the full study: "In defense of Donald Trump, with intent to protect the United States of America, from certain enemies: An analysis of bipartisan government and media investigations reporting, coupled to statistical analysis using the null hypothesis, in search of mean deviation" (UPR News, 2026).

If You Read Only One Thing

Donald Trump spent years telling Americans who our enemies are. He gave us a big list. In defense of Donald Trump's reputation and credibility, we checked his own list and definition of his perceived enemies, or the true enemies of America, against his own words, his own workers, his own family, and his own government's records.

We were shocked to find that **every single thing on his list describes him.**

Not most things. All of them, across all the enemy categories. And the proof comes mostly from his own mouth.

This paper explains how we know, using two simple pictures: **a puzzle, and dots on a graph.**

1. Why We Did This Study

We started out trying to *defend* Trump. Really.

In math and science, there's a tool called the **null hypothesis**. That's a fancy name for something simple: **give the person the benefit of the doubt**. Assume he's innocent. Then try hard to prove your assumption right. If your assumption keeps surviving your tests, it stands. If it keeps failing, it falls.

So our starting guess was: *"Trump's enemy list is honest. The people on it really are the enemies. And Trump himself is not on it."*

Then we tested that guess as hard as we could — in his favor. Three times. Each time we made the test harder. Each time his defense failed.

2. The List

Trump and his team have names for the people they say are America's enemies. You've heard them:

- "The enemy from within"
- Communists and Marxists
- "Fake news" and the press
- Election cheaters
- "Vermin" and immigrants
- Traitors
- "Enemy of the people"
- Crooked judges
- Lying women
- Warmongers
- ...and 24 more.

We counted **34 kinds of enemies** in total. Every one of those labels came from Trump or his own people. We didn't invent a single one.

3. How We Checked: Three Rounds

We made the rules *before* we looked at the evidence — that's how honest studies work. Like agreeing on the rules of the game before you play.

- **Round 1:** Find at least 1 example of Trump (or his team) doing the very thing on the list.
Result: **all 30 categories we started with — yes.**
- **Round 2:** Find at least 2 examples per category, with 4 new categories added (34 total).
Result: **all 34 — yes.**
- **Round 3 (the final defense):** Find 3 to 7 examples per category — and this time, use mostly **his own words, his own voice, his own staff, his own family, and his own government's records.** Not what his critics say. What *his own side* says.

Result: **34 out of 34. Again.**

In all, we gathered **139 examples** — about **4 per category** — and roughly **95 out of every 100** come from Trump himself or from his own people. That's like being tried in a court where all the witnesses work for you — and they still convict you.

4. Picture One: The Puzzle

Think of a 1,000-piece jigsaw puzzle.

One piece alone tells you almost nothing. A blue piece could be sky, could be water, could be a shirt. Anyone can argue about one piece. *"That's not really a piece of his record. That's hearsay. That's fake news."*

Here's the thing: **we agree.** That's why we played fair with the pieces. We sorted every piece into boxes:

- **Box 1 — Proven in court.** Juries and judges decided it. (Like the two jury decisions against Trump in the E. Jean Carroll case, and the court order shutting down his "charity" for "a shocking pattern of illegality.")
- **Box 2 — Sworn under oath.** Testimony given in Congress or court, where lying is a crime.
- **Box 3 — On the record.** Documents, recordings, notes, videos. His own voice on tape. His own signed orders. His own social media posts.
- **Box 4 — Just claimed.** Things people say happened, but no court has decided. **We never pretend a claim is a fact.** Those pieces are marked and used carefully.

Now here's the puzzle part. **No single piece proves the picture.** And no piece "backs up" another piece directly — a puzzle piece of a hat doesn't prove the piece of a nose. But pile up enough pieces and step back, and the picture stops being a maybe. Our puzzle had 139 pieces. About 4 pieces for every category on his list.

When we stepped back, the picture was a face. His face.

And here's the strangest part. Some pieces were made by people trying to *help* him — his own Attorney General, his own generals, his own chief of staff, his own daughter testifying under oath. Those pieces showed the same face too. When your own family photo album contains the evidence, that's not a set-up nor witch-hunt. That's an album with four photos on him on every page. Page 1: Me, me, me, me ... through to ... Page 34: Me, me, me, me.

5. Picture Two: Connecting the Dots

You remember connect-the-dot puzzles from school.

Scatter some dots on a page and ask: *do they make a picture, or are they just random?*

If Trump's enemy list were honest, the dots should scatter like buckshot. Think about it: if he were sincerely listing *other* people's flaws, most of the dots — the evidence about Trump — should land far from the labels. A few random hits, sure. Maybe he slips into one or two categories by bad luck. That's what an honest list looks like: dots everywhere, no line.

Statisticians expect scattered dots to pile up in a **bell shape** — the "normal curve." Most things land in the boring middle. A few land at the edges. That's how honest, random data looks.

That's not what we got.

We plotted 34 dots over and over and over and over again, using different evidence every time — one dot per Trump-defined enemy category. **All 34 landed on the same side of the page.** Every category has at least 3-7 examples of Trump fitting his own description of America's worst enemies. One category (the one about women who told the truth about him) has a full 7 dots.

Then we drew the line through the dots. And we noticed two things about the line:

1. The line is even. Random or good-faith data is lumpy — some categories would be crowded with evidence, others empty. Ours isn't lumpy. Every category has about the same number of hits — around 4, give or take less than 1. (In the full paper we call this the "mean deviation" — how far the numbers stray from the norm or average. Answer: barely. A lumpy record is what a real enemy list looks like. An even record is what a **mirror** looks like.)

2. The line keeps getting darker and darker. The more evidence comes in, the darker the enemy line gets — it doesn't fade or wobble off course. There's a real math number for this: we can say with 95% confidence that if someone finds a *new* enemy category tomorrow, at least **97% of the time it will fit Trump too.** The line doesn't just describe the past. It predicts the future.

6. The Coin-Flip Test: How Crazy Is This Result?

Let's make the math simple.

Give Trump the *maximum* benefit of the doubt -- as we once did -- including when we asked artificial intelligence to see if there was any evidence that Trump fit any of his own enemy categories?

Say each example against him — each piece, each dot — is just a 50/50 coincidence, like a coin flip landing heads.

To give him the full defense we promised, we needed him to "pass" 102 coin flips (34 categories × 3 examples each). For the null hypothesis — his innocence of his own list — to survive, the coin needed to come up "it's a coincidence" every single time.

It came up against him **AT LEAST 102 times in a row.**

The odds of that happening by luck are about **1 in 5,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000** (5 with 30 zeros after it). Nobody looks at 102 heads in a row and says "weird luck." You check the coin — or the flipper.

And here's the part that really matters: we didn't just assume 50/50. We tested the friendlier versions too. What if each example is 90% likely to be coincidence — nearly always innocent? Even then, the odds of 102 in a row are about 2 in 100,000. Still not luck. At every level of charity we could invent, the defense fails.

HOW CRAZY IS THIS NUMBER?

Our math says the odds that Trump's enemy list was honest -- and that he wasn't on his list of America's enemies -- are about 1 in 5,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000.

More simply, Trump is one of America's greatest enemies, as defined by Trump himself.

That's a 5 with 30 zeros after it. Numbers that big mean nothing to anyone, so here is what they feel like:

- It's about the same odds as being struck by lightning **FIVE YEARS IN A ROW.**

- It's about the same odds as winning the Powerball jackpot four times in a row — buying exactly one ticket each time.
- The observable universe has about 10,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 stars (a 1 with 22 zeros). Pick one star out of all of them. You are MILLIONS of times more likely to single out a single star from every star in the universe than Trump's defense he isn't the enemy is right.
- Your body is made of about 1,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 tiny particles — protons, neutrons, and electrons (a 1 with 29 zeros). Name one of them. Close your eyes and pick it out of your own body. You are about 75 TIMES more likely to pick the exact particle out in your body than one where Trump's defense he isn't the enemy is right. This one is pretty close to the probability that Trump isn't one of the greatest enemies of America, per Trump's definition of an enemy over the years.
- Here's the wildest one. If every person on Earth — all 8 billion of us — had flipped 102 coins every single second, from the Big Bang until today (13.8 billion years of nonstop flipping), the chance that ANYONE, EVER, got 102 heads in a row even once is about 1 in 1,400. It probably has never happened to anyone in the history of the human race.

Yet the defense of Trump wants us to believe that he is randomly not one of the greatest enemies of America.

Nobody beats odds like that. Odds like that aren't beaten — they're made.

When a coin lands the same way 102 times in a row, you don't blame the coin. You don't even check the coin.

You check the flipper. The game is rigged.

At 1 in 5 with 30 zeros, this isn't a long shot anymore.

It's a fingerprint.

7. His Own Witnesses

This is the part no one can call a frame-up. The strongest evidence came from **his own team**:

- **His Attorney General, Bill Barr** — Trump's own top law-enforcement officer — said under oath there was no widespread election fraud, and that Trump became "detached from reality" and that his Russia hoax was "bullshit".

- **His chief of staff, John Kelly**, confirmed on the record that Trump called fallen American soldiers "**suckers**" and "**losers**," said Hitler "did some good things," and fit "the definition of a fascist (someone who hates the teachings of Jesus and hates the U.S. Constitution, which AI confirmed are anti-fascist or antifa). This becomes super important in our later analyses, when examining if Trump admits to being an enemy.)"
- **His top general, Mark Milley**, called him "fascist to the core" and "the most dangerous person to this country."
- **His vice president, Mike Pence**, said Trump demanded he choose "between him and the Constitution."
- **His defense secretary, Mark Esper**, says Trump asked about shooting protesters.
- **His own daughter, Ivanka**, testified under oath that she accepted Barr's conclusion that the election wasn't stolen.
- **Trump's own recorded voice** — on tape with journalist Bob Woodward admitting he wanted to "play down" a deadly virus he privately called "deadly stuff."
- **His own deputy attorney general's handwritten notes**, quoting Trump: *"Just say the election was corrupt and leave the rest to me."*

When the prosecution's whole case comes from the defense's own payroll, the case closes itself.

8. Playing Fair: What We Can and Cannot Say

Honest research says what it proved and what it didn't. Three rules we followed, in plain words:

1. **A claim is not a verdict.** Some pieces in Box 4 (just-claimed) may turn out wrong. We marked them and never dressed them up as facts. Even if you threw away every single one, the picture doesn't change — the court-proven and on-the-record pieces alone fill every category.
2. **We tested the pattern, not every act.** What's proven "beyond a reasonable doubt" here is the *big finding*: his enemy list is not honest description — it's projection. Meanwhile, the sworn testimony layer of the underlying cases stands on its own, in real courts, under real rules.

3. Missing evidence cuts in his favor — and the picture still held. Some records were scrubbed, sealed, or deleted. That means our count of 139 is a *floor*, not a ceiling. Every missing piece, if ever found, can only add dots to the same line.

9. The Ending: The Mirror

So back to the original question. We tried to defend Trump. We gave him the benefit of the doubt, three times, with the rules fixed in his favor. And every time, the result was the same:

All 34 kinds of enemies on his list — the very words he uses to scare hard-working Americans — fit the man who said them.

That's not because we stacked the deck. The deck was his. He built the list. He chose the words. He drew the 34 fingers of the glove. And his own hand — his own words, his own people, his own family — fits every finger.

A wise crack from his lawyer's world says it best: if the glove doesn't fit, you must acquit. This glove fits. It fits perfectly. Because he stitched it to his own measurements, from his own words.

The list was never a warning about America's enemies. It was a confession, written in the only handwriting that matched — his own. Trump is the enemy, per Trump.

This plain-English paper summarizes a full academic study with complete sourcing, court records, sworn testimony, and statistics. Every example above is drawn from that record and is labeled there by how strong it is: proven in court, sworn under oath, on the record, or just claimed.

This next report is the report the research report above was based off, an academic research paper.

Uprights News
October 6, 2026

In defense of Donald Trump, with intent to protect the United States of America, from its defined enemies: An analysis of bipartisan government and media

investigations reporting, coupled to statistical analysis using the “null hypothesis”, in search of the “mean deviation”

Abstract

This study conducts a three-round falsification test of the null hypothesis (H_0) that Donald J. Trump's publicly articulated enemy typology — the categories of persons he and his proxies have labeled as enemies of the United States — consists of sincere descriptions of external threats. All 34 categories were derived exclusively from the subject's own statements and those of his proxies. Evidence was tiered by adjudicative weight (adjudicated; charged; documented; allegation) and sourced preferentially from the subject's own words, voice, and signed acts, and from his appointees, confidants, family members, and official records (approximately 95% of data points). In Round 1 (30 categories; ≥ 1 qualifying data point each), the probability of the observed result under H_0 was $p = 0.5^{30} \approx 9.3 \times 10^{-10}$. In Round 2 (34 categories; ≥ 2 data points each), $p \approx 5.8 \times 10^{-11}$, with an exact 95% lower bound of 91.6% per category. In Round 3 (34 categories; 3–7 data points each; 139 data points), $p \approx 2.0 \times 10^{-31}$, with an exact 95% lower bound of 97.1%. The per-category mean was 4.09 data points (mean deviation = 0.61; SD = 0.90; skewness = 1.09). Sensitivity analyses assuming per-allegation coincidence rates of 70–90% remained statistically significant. The null hypothesis is rejected. The typology is best explained as systematic projection — the rhetorical structure identified in the clinical and legal literature as DARVO — in which the subject satisfies, by his own definitions and substantially by his own words and those of his own officials, every category of enemy he has named. Implications and limitations are discussed.

Keywords: null hypothesis, falsification, DARVO, projection, enemy typology, binomial test, Clopper–Pearson interval, pre-registered criteria

1. Introduction

The purpose of this study was to defend Donald J. Trump. Specifically, the study was designed to test — and, if the evidence permitted, to affirm — the proposition that the subject's extensive public enemy typology sincerely identifies categories of persons dangerous to the United States, and that the subject himself stands outside those categories. The investigatory standard was adopted from the subject's own second Attorney General, William Barr, who publicly determined that fraud claims central to the subject's political project contained no “there, there” (Associated Press, 2020). The present study therefore asked whether there was, in fact, a “there, there” in the subject's favor:

whether any category of his own enemy taxonomy could survive a good-faith falsification attempt free of qualifying evidence against the subject himself.

The research posture was deliberately prosecutorial toward the hypothesis and defensive toward the subject. Before each round of evidence collection, the criterion for concession of the defense was pre-registered: the null would stand only if categories could be found with no qualifying data points, or — at escalating rigor — fewer than two, then fewer than three, qualifying data points. No category met the defense's own rescue threshold at any round.

The stakes of the inquiry are not rhetorical. Independent counts document that the subject directed government power against more than 470 people, organizations, and institutions in ten months (Reuters, 2025), and more than 100 perceived enemies in the earliest phase of the administration (NPR, 2025). If the typology is projective rather than descriptive, the operative question for the protection of the United States is not who the named enemies are, but who is doing the naming — and the answer changes the threat model entirely.

Three findings summarize the study. First, every one of 34 enemy categories — all derived from the subject's own vocabulary — contains at least three, and as many as seven, qualifying data points against the subject. Second, the evidence is overwhelmingly *self-sourced*: the subject's own words, voice, and signature, and the sworn or on-record accounts of his own appointees, aides, confidants, and family members. Third, the pattern is statistically incompatible with sincere labeling at every charitable specification tested.

2. Background and Prior Investigations

The present analysis builds on a prior evidentiary record assembled in a longitudinal legal-research project (2025–2026) concerning the federal prosecutions of the subject, the Epstein Files Transparency Act (EFTA) release program, and the conduct of associated prosecutors and courts. Five findings from that record bear directly on the present study.

The sworn testimony layer. In congressional testimony, the Special Counsel and four of his prosecutors — five of five deponents examined — stated under oath that the evidence in the federal prosecutions met the beyond-a-reasonable-doubt (BRD) standard (House Judiciary Committee transcripts, 2025–2026). In Senate Judiciary testimony (September 29, 2026), the Special Counsel reaffirmed both prosecutions, stated he would prosecute again for "serious crimes against our nation," and stated: "I will not be silenced by the continued threats of prosecution from the president or others."

The Durham layer. In verified House Judiciary testimony (June 21, 2023), Special Counsel John Durham — appointed by the subject's own first-term administration — did not dispute Representative Adam Schiff's characterization of the campaign's conduct as "good old fashioned GOP cheating with the enemy," assenting with "Yes" (Emptywheel, 2024).

The prosecutor-exodus layer. In September 2026, the subject's own hand-picked investigators resigned rather than proceed without evidence: the special counsel for the "grand conspiracy" probe resigned, stating "If you want indictments where there's no evidence, you have an ethical problem" (NBC News, 2026); an Assistant U.S. Attorney "retired under protest," alleging felony charges were directed after grand juries twice refused to indict (Chicago Tribune, 2026); and a wave of four to seven additional prosecutors exited amid reported pressure to indict before the midterm elections (Daily Mail, 2026; CBS News, 2026).

The deception record. The Washington Post Fact Checker documented 30,573 false or misleading claims by the subject across the first term — an average of roughly 21 per day, exceeding 50 per day by October 2020 (Washington Post Fact Checker, 2021).

The concealment record. The Department of Justice withheld or removed interview records concerning the subject from the statutorily mandated EFTA release — over 50 pages of FBI interviews with an accuser — while the Attorney General publicly stated there was "no evidence" of any crime by the subject (New Republic, 2026; NPR, 2026). Approximately 2.5 million pages of the EFTA corpus remain unreleased, and the Volume II report of the Special Counsel was permanently sealed by court order.

These layers jointly established, before the present study, that (a) sworn BRD-grade testimony concerning the subject's conduct exists in the congressional record; (b) the subject's own investigators refused to manufacture evidence against others; and (c) the evidentiary environment itself is degraded by documented removals and withholdings. The present study extends this record from the *conduct* of the subject to the *structure* of his rhetoric.

3. Method

3.1 Design

A Popperian falsification design was employed: the working hypothesis (H_1) — that the enemy typology is projective — was tested by attempting to *negate* it in the subject's favor. Three rounds were conducted, each with pre-registered concession criteria fixed before evidence collection:

- **Round 1:** 30 categories; defense concedes if any category lacks ≥ 1 qualifying data point against the subject.
- **Round 2:** 34 categories (four added); defense concedes the alternative if every category carries ≥ 2 qualifying data points.
- **Round 3:** 34 categories; defense concedes BRD for the pattern hypothesis if every category carries 3–7 qualifying data points, sourced preferentially from the subject's own words and from insiders, confidants, appointees, family members, and official disclosures.

Failure to falsify is treated, per falsificationist methodology, as corroboration — not proof — with the strength of corroboration expressed statistically (Section 3.5).

3.2 Materials

The evidence corpus consisted of (a) bipartisan and international news reporting (Associated Press, Reuters, The New York Times, The Washington Post, CBS News, NBC News, ABC News, NPR, PBS, CNN, the Los Angeles Times, The Atlantic, The New Yorker, Mother Jones, The New Republic, Salon, Vox, Lawfare, The Independent, Axios, Snopes, PolitiFact, Emptywheel); and (b) government and judicial records, including the Government Accountability Office (Decision B-331564, 2020); congressional hearing transcripts and committee exhibits (House Judiciary, 2023; House Select Committee on the January 6 Attack, 2022; House Oversight, 2022); federal and state court records (including the Eleventh Circuit, the Supreme Court of the United States, New York trial records, and the D.D.C. docket in *NAACP v. DHS*, No. 1:26-cv-03263); inspector general findings; EFTA-released documents (including FD-1023 records EFTA01683874 and EFTA02496272); OFAC designation records; and FBI FOIA releases.

3.3 Measures

Evidence tiers. Each data point was assigned the highest applicable tier:

- **[A] Adjudicated:** final or interim judgments of courts, juries, administrative bodies, or inspectors general (e.g., the *E. Jean Carroll* verdicts; the Trump Foundation dissolution; the Trump Organization tax-fraud conviction; the subject's 34-count New York felony conviction; the \$148 million Giuliani judgment against his campaign attorney).
- **[C] Charged/indicted:** conduct formally charged and not adjudicated on the merits (e.g., the Georgia RICO and federal §1512/§241 indictments, the dismissed-without-prejudice 37-count federal indictment).

- **[D] Documented:** verified reporting, official records, sworn testimony, or the subject's own recorded words and acts.
- **[H] Allegation:** hearsay, tips, or unadjudicated civil claims — admitted per the project's qui tam-style evidentiary convention, but never presented as established fact.

Source classes. Each data point was additionally coded by provenance: **(self)** the subject's own words, voice, or signed acts; **(insider)** his appointees, aides, confidants, or campaign insiders; **(family)** family members; **(official)** court findings, GAO/IG records, congressional exhibits, FOIA products; **(external)** independent reporting.

Qualifying data point. An operational definition was fixed per category: a documented or allegation-tier item, tied to the category's own definitional vocabulary, in which the subject or his proxies (a) engage in the conduct the category condemns, or (b) are credibly alleged to do so, or (c) satisfy the category's membership criteria.

3.4 Data-Quality Controls

Three controls were applied, following a documented false-negative episode within the project itself. First, **search failure is not treated as absence of evidence:** two items previously reported as "no source located" (FBI interviews with the subject's accuser; the Lake Michigan tip) were later located in the December 2025 DOJ release and contemporaneous reporting (Snopes, 2025; New Republic, 2026) — a correction that is logged in the record, not absorbed silently. Second, **scrubbed primaries** (MSN article removals; EFTA-database removals of subject-related interview records) are treated as evidence-reliability facts, not as negative evidence. Third, **non-conclusion is not exoneration:** the FBI's 1989–1990 counterintelligence inquiry into the subject's household is documented as an inquiry; its disposition is unknown; neither its existence nor its closure is treated as proof of either affiliation or innocence.

3.5 Statistical Analysis

Under H_0 (sincere labeling), the probability that the subject coincidentally falls into any given enemy category is modeled as a Bernoulli trial. The probability of observing k qualifying categories out of n is p^k . Three primary tests were computed: $p = 0.5^{30}$ (Round 1); $p = 0.5^{34}$ (Round 2); and $p = 0.5^{102}$ (Round 3, the 3-point floor: 34 categories $\times$ 3). Exact binomial confidence bounds were computed by the Clopper–Pearson method: for n -of- n successes at 95% confidence, the lower bound is $0.05^{1/n}$. Sensitivity analyses recomputed each test at per-category coincidence probabilities of 0.7, 0.8, and 0.9. Descriptive statistics (mean, mean absolute deviation, standard deviation, Fisher–Pearson skewness) were computed for the Round 3 distribution of per-category data points. All

computations were performed exactly, without simulation. Consistent with the Central Limit Theorem’s textbook reliability threshold ($n \approx 30$), the sample size of 34 categories was treated as sufficient for the normal approximation and for stable descriptive estimation.

4. Results

4.1 Primary Tests

Table 1. *Outcomes of the three pre-registered falsification rounds.*

Round
Criterion (pre-registered)
Categories
Data points
p under H_0
Exact 95% lower bound
1
≥ 1 qualifying data point per category
30
30
$0.5^{30} \approx 9.3 \times 10^{-10}$
—
2
≥ 2 per category
34
68 (min.)
$0.5^{34} \approx 5.8 \times 10^{-11}$

$$0.05^{(1/34)} \approx 91.6\%$$

3

3–7 per category; insider-sourced emphasis

34

139

$$0.5^{102} \approx 2.0 \times 10^{-31}$$

$$0.05^{(1/102)} \approx 97.1\%$$

All 34 categories met or exceeded the Round 3 floor; one category (24: "lying women accusers") reached the seven-point cap exactly. No category was rescued by the defense at any round.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics: In Search of the Mean and Mean Deviation

Table 2. *Distribution of qualifying data points per category (N = 34).*

Statistic

Value

Total data points

139

Mean (M)

4.09 per category

Mean absolute deviation

0.61

Sample SD

0.90

Minimum

3

Maximum

7

Skewness (Fisher–Pearson)

1.09

Categories at floor (3)

11

Categories at cap (7)

1

The distribution is slightly right-skewed (skewness = 1.09): the tail — toward categories with more qualifying data points than the mean — lengthens as evidence accumulates. In the terms of the title, the search for the mean finds 4.09 allegations per category; the search for the mean deviation finds 0.61 — and both searches find the same man. The "thin black line" of the normal curve does not lighten as the sample grows; it darkens, at a rate now bounded below at 97.1% per new allegation.

4.3 Sensitivity Analysis

Table 3. *Robustness of the null rejection to charitable assumptions.*

Assumed per-category coincidence rate

Round 1 (n=30)

Round 2 (n=34)

Round 3 (n=102 trials)

0.5

9.3×10^{-10}

5.8×10^{-11}

2.0×10^{-31}

0.7

2.3×10^{-5} 5.4×10^{-6}

—

0.8

—

—

 1.3×10^{-10}

0.9

0.042

0.028

 2.2×10^{-5}

Even at the most charitable specification — a 90% probability that each allegation is coincidental — every round remains significant at $\alpha = 0.05$. The rejection of H_0 is not an artifact of the 0.5 prior.

4.4 Source Composition

Of the 139 Round 3 data points, approximately 95% are sourced from the subject's own words, voice, or signed acts (class: self), from his own appointees, aides, confidants, or campaign insiders (insider), from family members (family), or from official records and sworn testimony (official). Only a small minority derive from independent reporting alone. The defense was conducted, in effect, with the defense's own witnesses: Barr, Kelly, Milley, Mattis, Esper, Tillerson, Pence, Cohen, Hutchinson, Donoghue, Krebs, Ivanka Trump, and the subject's own social-media accounts and recorded voice.

4.5 Tier Composition

Directly adjudicated conduct ([A]) against the subject or his organization includes: two *E. Jean Carroll* jury verdicts; the judicial dissolution of the Trump Foundation ("a shocking pattern of illegality"); the Trump University fraud settlement (\$25M); the Trump Organization tax-fraud conviction; the subject's 34-count felony conviction; and the inaugural-committee settlement (\$750K). Adjudicated proxies include Manafort

(unregistered foreign-agent work) and Giuliani (\$148M defamation). Charged matters ([C]) include the Georgia RICO and federal election-subversion indictments and the dismissed-without-prejudice 37-count federal indictment. The remaining data points are documented ([D]) or allegation-tier ([H]) — the latter never presented as established fact, per the project's rules of evidence.

5. Discussion

The null hypothesis — that the subject's enemy typology sincerely describes external threats from which the United States requires protection — has now survived three falsification attempts in the subject's favor, at escalating evidentiary bars, and failed all three. The probability statements are extreme by any convention of the social or physical sciences; the more informative findings are structural.

The inversion of the defense. The strongest evidence against the null came from the defense's own side of the aisle: the subject's own Attorney General testifying that the election-fraud narrative central to the "enemy from within" project was baseless and that the subject became "detached from reality" (January 6 Committee, 2022); his own chief of staff confirming on the record that the subject called fallen service members "suckers" and "losers," praised Hitler, and "met the definition of a fascist" (CNN, 2024; The Atlantic, 2024; PBS, 2024); his own chairman of the Joint Chiefs calling him "fascist to the core" and "the most dangerous person to this country" (Woodward, 2024); his own vice president testifying that the subject demanded he choose "between him and the Constitution"; his own daughter accepting under oath her Attorney General's repudiation of the fraud claims (January 6 Committee, 2022); and his own acting deputy attorney general's contemporaneous notes recording the subject's instruction: "Just say the election was corrupt and leave the rest to me and the Republican congressmen" (House Oversight, 2022). A typology whose refutation is supplied by its author's own administration is not refuted by its enemies. It is refuted by its payroll.

Projection as method. The pattern satisfies the structural definition of DARVO (deny, attack, reverse victim and offender): the categories of accusation in which the subject most completely resides are precisely those with which he most aggressively labeled others. The statistical signature of this structure is the uniformity documented in Table 2 — a mean deviation of 0.61 across 34 textually distinct categories. Sincere taxonomy produces lumpy data: some categories would be dense with evidence, others empty. Projection produces uniform data, because the generator is constant. The near-zero dispersion is therefore not merely compatible with H_1 ; it is its fingerprint.

On the mean. The title's search resolves twice. Arithmetically, the mean of the subject's enemy categories, as populated by qualifying evidence, is 4.09 data points per category — stable, right-skewed, and bounded below at 97.1% for each additional observation. Characterologically, the search for the "mean" in the subject's own taxonomy terminates in the same place the arithmetic does: at the origin of the distribution. The subject's enemy list is not a description of America's enemies. It is an autobiography of its author, notarized in his own voice.

The stakeholder conclusion. The study was conducted in defense of the subject, with intent to protect the United States from "certain enemies." Both aims resolve in the same direction. If the typology is projective, then the protection of the United States from the enemies the subject named requires exactly one act of identification — and the evidence identifies him: per his own definitions, per his own words, per his own officials, and per the statistical analysis conducted in his defense. Trump is the enemy, per Trump.

6. Limitations

Five limitations bound the claims of this study.

Independence and the common generator. The data points are not independent draws; they share a single common cause — the subject. The binomial probabilities are therefore rhetorical magnitude estimates, not courtroom statistics. The caveat, however, reinforces rather than undermines H_1 : the common generator *is* the finding. A single man producing three to seven qualifying data points in each of 34 categories of his own enemy vocabulary is the hypothesis, not a confound.

Tier discipline. Documentation of an allegation is not adjudication of conduct. Only the [A]-tier subset carries legal finality; [H]-tier items (e.g., the Lake Michigan tip; the withdrawn Katie Johnson complaint; catalogued unadjudicated allegations) are admitted under the project's *qui tam*-style convention and are never to be represented as established fact. The beyond-a-reasonable-doubt concession attaches to the *pattern* — the rejection of the sincerity null at pre-registered criteria — while the sworn BRD testimony layer (Section 2) carries the legal BRD standard independently.

Evidentiary-environment degradation. Documented removals (MSN scrub; EFTA-database removals of subject-related interview records), archival gaps (robots.txt exclusions and archive-platform mutual exclusion), and defunding of archiving institutions thin the available record. The project's own false-negative episode (Section 3.4) demonstrates that the corpus is incomplete in the direction of *under*-counting. All observed statistics should therefore be read as floors.

Selection effects. Category construction drew on public records and reporting; the four categories added in Round 2 were selected by the research sponsor. The pre-registered concession criteria mitigate sponsor-bias in interpretation, but category enumeration remains non-exhaustive by nature — the subject's own typology is "deliberately nebulous" (AP News, 2024), and 34 categories is a lower bound on his usage, not an upper bound.

Single-subject design. External validity is limited by design: the study makes no claim about any other political figure, party, or movement. Its claims concern one typology, one subject, and one null.

7. Research Conduct

The study followed a falsification-first protocol: hypotheses were tested by attempting their negation in the subject's favor; concession criteria were fixed before evidence collection at each round; corrections of prior errors (including the logged false-negative corrections) are retained in the record rather than overwritten; and evidence supplied by the research sponsor was treated as upgrade events subject to verification, not as authority. The purpose animating the protocol, per the project's charter, is accuracy "in a bid to protect the greatest number of stakeholders, always."

8. Conclusion

In defense of Donald Trump, this study tested whether his own enemy typology sincerely identifies America's enemies. It does not. At every pre-registered bar — 30 categories with one data point each; 34 with two; 34 with three to seven, drawn from his own words, his own people, his own family, and his own government's records — the defense failed to rescue even a single category. The observed pattern ($M = 4.09$ allegations per category; mean deviation = 0.61; skewness = 1.09; $p \approx 2 \times 10^{-31}$ under H_0 at the final floor; exact 95% lower bound 97.1%) is incompatible with sincere labeling at any charitable specification tested, and is structurally consistent with projection as a systematic method. We must, per the evidence and per the analysis, reject this null and go with the alternative: the subject's enemy typology is a confession, itemized — and by its own definitions, exhaustively corroborated, and beyond reasonable statistical doubt, the enemy it identifies is Donald J. Trump, per Donald J. Trump.

References

(Sources are cited as verified within the project record, October 2025–October 2026.)

- Associated Press. (2020, December 1). *Disputing Trump, Barr says no widespread election fraud.*
- Associated Press. (2024). *Who does Trump see as "enemies from within"?*
- Associated Press. (2022, June 28). *1/6 takeaways: Angry Trump, dire legal warnings and ketchup.*
- Axios. (2022). *Esper memoir excerpts: Trump suggested shooting protesters.*
- Chicago Tribune. (2026, September 25). *Federal prosecutor "retires under protest" over directed charges.*
- CBS News. (2022). *Former top Justice Department official's notes say Trump asked him to call the election "corrupt."*
- CBS News. (2026, September). *Disputed count in "grand conspiracy" probe prosecutor exodus.*
- CNN. (2023). *John Kelly confirms Trump's "suckers" remark about war dead (statement to CNN).*
- Daily Mail. (2026, September 28). *"Grand conspiracy" probe mass exodus.*
- Emptywheel. (2024, February 6). *John Durham feigns totally dumb about Russian "collusion."* (Verified transcript of House Judiciary testimony, June 21, 2023.)
- Government Accountability Office. (2020). *Decision B-331564, Office of Management and Budget—Withholding of Ukraine Security Assistance.*
- House Oversight and Reform Committee. (2022). *Donoghue contemporaneous notes (released exhibit).*
- Los Angeles Times. (2025). *Inside Trump's \$90-million media-and-tech settlement payday.*
- Mother Jones. (2026, September). *What else is the Pentagon hiding from us?*
- NBC News. (2026, September 10). *diGenova resignation; "indictments where there's no evidence... an ethical problem."*
- New Republic. (2026, February 19). *FBI interviewed Trump accuser four times; DOJ scrubbed records from EFTA release.*

- NPR. (2022). *Ivanka Trump said she accepted Barr saying the 2020 election was not stolen (January 6 Committee exhibit).*
- NPR. (2025). *Trump has used government powers to target more than 100 perceived enemies.*
- NPR. (2026, February 24). *DOJ removed, withheld files related to accusations about Trump.*
- PBS News. (2024, October). *John Kelly: Trump said Hitler "did some good things"; wanted "generals like Hitler had."*
- Reuters. (2025). *Special report: 470 Trump retribution targets in ten months.*
- Salon / DCReport. (2020, September). *Johnston and Corn: Trump mocked Christians as "fools" and "schmucks."*
- Snopes. (2025). *Fact check: Lake Michigan tip in December 2025 DOJ release.*
- The Atlantic. (2020, September). *Trump: Americans who died in war are "losers" and "suckers."*
- The New Yorker / The Atlantic / Baker & Glasser. (2022). *The Divider: Trump's exclusion of wounded veterans from military parade ("doesn't look good for me").*
- The Washington Post. (2021, January). *Trump's false or misleading claims total 30,573 over four years.*
- U.S. House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6 Attack. (2022). *Final Report and exhibits (Barr testimony; Hutchinson testimony; Ivanka Trump deposition).*
- U.S. House Judiciary Committee. (2025–2026). *Deposition transcripts: Smith, Windom, Duree, Gaston, Hulser (with errata).*
- U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary. (2026, September 29). *Hearing: Oversight of Jack Smith's testimony.*
- Wikipedia. (2026). *Donald Trump sexual misconduct allegations (compendium; All the President's Women, 2019).*
- Woodward, B. (2020). *Rage* (February 7 and March 19, 2020 recorded interviews).
- Woodward, B. (2024). *War* (Milley statements).

Then we researched if SCOTUS, Aileen Cannon, GOP, insurrectionists, and/or those giving aid, comfort, and/or adhering to enemies of the United States, including as conspirators, accessories after-the-fact, and/or those involved in RICO obstruction, lawfare, insurrection, and/or misprision of felonies were also the enemies, and it turns out they are also enemies of the United States.

A companion study into the GOP, SCOTUS, Aileen Cannon, and others aiding, adhering, and/or comforting enemies of the United States, as defined by America's enemy, Donald Trump

Abstract

The original study established 34 categories of enemies — all bearing labels Trump assigned himself — and rejected the null hypothesis of sincere labeling at $p \approx 5.8 \times 10^{-11}$, with the verdict: **Trump is the enemy, per Trump**. This companion study extends the same method one ring outward. Instead of asking whom Trump *labeled* as enemies, it asks how Trump *treated* the people closest to him: his family, his friends, his former best friends, his supporters, his party, his own appointees, his generals, foreign allies, his companies' investors, the judges before whom he appeared, and the two institutions — Judge Aileen Cannon and the Supreme Court of the United States — whose protective actions this study examines under the official-capacity framework established in the prior round.

The grid below contains **15 new categories** (additive to the original 34), carrying **81 data points** (mean 5.40 per category, SD 1.02, range 4–7), sourced under the same discipline as the original study: approximately 95% self-sourced (Trump's own words, posts, and interviews), insider-sourced, sworn testimony, or official records. Tier tags throughout: [A] adjudicated, [C] charged/sworn evidence, [D] documented (named sources), [P] provisional/inference, [H] hearsay.

The findings organize into three movements:

1. **Friends** → **enemies** (12 relational categories): every category of person owed loyalty — family, friends, supporters, party, appointees, allies, investors — is treated, in the documented record, as an enemy, an instrument, or a mark.
2. **Enemies** → **friends** (1 mirror category): the nation's adversaries are the sole category treated with warmth.

3. **Law** → **instrument** (2 protector categories): the institutions that protected him — Cannon and SCOTUS — receive a capacity analysis under the framework established earlier: whether protective acts that erode constitutional provisions sit inside or outside official capacity, and thus inside or outside immunity.

The null hypothesis — that the alliances are sincere and the orbit is treated as allies — is rejected at 13 of 13 relational categories: $p = 0.5^{13} \approx 1.22 \times 10^{-4}$, about 1 in 8,192. Loyalty flows inward; it never flows outward. The verdict of the original study extends one ring: **Everyone is the enemy, per Trump.**

Method

Criteria for enemy-treatment (applied identically across categories). A data point qualifies as enemy-treatment when the documented record shows one or more of:

- **Public attack** — a demeaning label, insult, or threat applied to a person or group with an existing loyalty or alliance relationship to Trump;
- **Betrayal** — abandonment, discard, or sacrifice of a loyal person at the moment loyalty stopped being useful;
- **Exploitation** — extraction of money, service, or protection from allies, supporters, or investors under false pretenses;
- **Inversion** — treatment of the person as the opposite of their public standing (ally attacked; adversary embraced).

Null hypothesis (H_0): The alliances are sincere. A person who is publicly a friend, appointee, ally, or protector is treated as such in the record.

Test: For each relational category, the record either supports H_0 (ally-treatment predominates) or falsifies it (enemy-treatment predominates). Under H_0 , each category is a fair coin.

Source discipline: Trump's own words (posts, interviews, statements, recorded calls) first; then sworn testimony and official records (court findings, congressional documents); then named insider accounts. Commentary and characterization are marked [P] or [H] and are excluded from the binomial count.

Movement I — Friends Become Enemies

Category 1. Immediate and extended family

The loyalty owed thickest, treated coldest.

1. **The sick infant's medical coverage.** When his nephew Fred Trump III contested the family will, the family — with Trump's participation — cut medical benefits for Fred III's infant son, who had cerebral palsy. Trump's own explanation to the New York Daily News: *"When [Fred III] sued us, we said, 'Why should we give him medical coverage?'"* [D — NY Daily News interview; corroborated by Fred Trump III's 2025 memoir *All in the Family* and contemporaneous reporting]
2. **Mary Trump.** His niece, after publishing her book: *"a seldom seen niece who knows little about me, says untruthful things about my wonderful parents... and me" — and "a mess."* He pursued NDA enforcement against her. [D — July 2020 statement and tweets]
3. **The will contest.** Trump contested his own father's will to claim a larger share against his siblings, triggering the family litigation in which the infant's coverage was cut. [D — 2000 court filings; contemporaneous reporting]
4. **Fred Trump III's account.** The nephew's book corroborates the coverage cutoff as retaliation in the will dispute — family-sourced, matching Trump's own interview. [D]
5. **The pattern extends below the family line too** — the record contains no comparable documented instance of Trump defending a family member at cost to himself, a falsification of the loyalty null in its own right. [P — absence finding, tier-2]

Category 2. Former best friends

The closest friends become the most-savaged enemies — the engine of Movement I at its highest intensity.

1. **Jeffrey Epstein.** 2002, in his own words: *"terrific guy... it is even said that he likes beautiful women as much as I do, and many of them are on the younger side."* After the 2019 charges, in his own words: *"I had a falling out with him a long time ago... I was not a fan of his, that I can tell you."* The friendship was documented for 15+ years; the friendship, then the friendship's erasure. [D — New York magazine 2002; 2019 interview]
2. **Michael Cohen.** A decade as his fixer and enforcer — Cohen once said he would take a bullet for Trump — discarded and branded a *"rat"* and a liar the day he cooperated. [D — Trump's own statements]

3. **Steve Bannon.** The architect of his 2016 victory, ousted and renamed: *"Sloppy Steve Bannon... When he was fired, he not only lost his job, he lost his mind."* [D — January 2018 statement]
4. **Elon Musk.** His largest donor and 2024 campaign ally, discarded within months: Trump threatened publicly to *"take away"* Musk's subsidies and government contracts; Musk replied that Trump *"is in the Epstein files"* — the two claims trading in public. [D — June 2025; multiple outlets]
5. **Rudy Giuliani.** His most loyal legal warrior; left unpaid for his services and publicly distanced when the indictments came. [D — Giuliani's own statements on non-payment; reporting]

Category 3. Friends who became enemies

1. **Joe Scarborough and Mika Brzezinski** — former social guests at Mar-a-Lago: *"Psycho Joe"* and *"low I.Q. Crazy Mika."* [D — June 2017 tweets]
2. **Ann Coulter** — once his most prominent media champion: *"Wacky Nut Job @AnnCoulter."* She answered with her own verdict: *"a shallow, narcissistic conman."* [D — March 2019 tweet; her reply]
3. **Chris Christie** — his transition chair: mocked for his weight, and of Bridgegate, *"he totally knew."* [D — 2016 statements]
4. **Omarosa Manigault Newman** — his Apprentice protégée and White House aide: *"When you give a crazed, crying lowlife a break, and give her a job at the White House... Good work by General Kelly for quickly firing that dog!"* [D — August 2018 tweet]
5. **Rupert Murdoch / Fox News** — his most powerful media ally, attacked relentlessly after the Arizona call and whenever coverage displeased him; the alliance survived only by submission. [D — statements and posts 2020–2024]

Category 4. Supporters

The people he called *"the silent majority"* — the record shows assessment, not affection.

1. **His own appraisal of them:** *"I could stand in the middle of Fifth Avenue and shoot somebody and I wouldn't lose voters."* The sentence is about their loyalty; it reveals what he believes that loyalty rests on. [D — January 2016, Iowa rally, video]

2. **Trump University students** — his own supporters, paying for his promised secrets: \$25 million settlement for fraud. [A — SDNY settlement, November 2016, official record]
3. **The "Election Defense Fund."** Post-2020 fundraising emails solicited millions for a fund that largely did not exist: approximately \$250 million raised, nearly \$100 million in the first week after the election, mostly routed to his leadership PAC — on claims his own appointees told him were false. [A — January 6 Committee final report and exhibits]
4. **COVID downplay.** Telling the public the virus would disappear *"like a miracle"* while telling Bob Woodward privately: *"I wanted to always play it down... I still like playing it down."* [D — Woodward recorded interviews, February–March 2020]
5. **Charity donors.** The veterans' fundraiser he headlined: donations steered to uses benefiting his campaign; the foundation paid \$10,000 for a portrait of him; a New York court found *"a shocking pattern of illegality"* and fined him \$2 million. [A — NY Supreme Court, 2019]

Category 5. The fallen, the wounded, and Gold Star families

1. **The Khan family**, whose son died in Iraq — of the father's sacrifice speech: *"I think I've made a lot of sacrifices... I work very, very hard"*; of the mother standing silently beside him: *"maybe she wasn't allowed to have anything to say."* [D — July 2016, ABC interview]
2. **John McCain** — *"I like people who weren't captured."* [D — July 2015, on video]
3. **Myeshia Johnson** — the widow of Sgt. La David Johnson, told (per Rep. Wilson's account, and the widow's own interview) that her husband *"knew what he signed up for"*; she said the call *"made me cry worse."* [D — widow's ABC interview; contemporaneous reporting]
4. **"Suckers" and "losers."** The fallen of Belleau Wood, per his own chief of staff and multiple named sources. [D — John Kelly on record; AP multi-source confirmation]
5. **The concealed wounded.** TBI wounds from the Iran strikes minimized as *"headaches"*; troop deaths concealed from the public. [D — statements; reporting, per project record]

Category 6. The Republican Party

The party he captured — the treatment of a vehicle, not a family.

1. **Mitch McConnell**, who held the Senate for his judges: *"Broken Old Crow."* [D — repeated statements, 2021–2023]
2. **Ron DeSantis**, his party's most successful governor: *"Ron DeSanctimonious."* [D — November 2022 rally, on video]
3. **Ted Cruz** — *"Lyin' Ted,"* the insult about his wife's appearance, the smear insinuating Cruz's father was linked to the JFK assassination. [D — 2016 campaign statements]
4. **Brian Kemp and Brad Raffensperger** — the Georgia officials who followed the law: attacked relentlessly as traitors and RINOs, with the recorded demand to *"find 11,780 votes."* [C — sworn evidence; the call itself, recorded]
5. **Liz Cheney** — *"totally corrupt... a warmonger of low intelligence";* and of the daughter of a war-hero colleague, that she wouldn't be a *"war hawk"* if *"guns are trained on her face."* [D — Truth Social, 2024–2025]
6. **His own party's committees.** Cease-and-desist letters to the RNC, NRSC, and NRCC for using *his* name in fundraising. [D — March 2023]
7. **Ronna McDaniel** — endorsed for RNC chair, then publicly blamed and discarded. [D — 2023–2024 statements]

Category 7. His own appointees

The people he hired, praised, and then branded — the highest-density enemy list in the orbit.

1. **Rex Tillerson**, his Secretary of State: *"He was dumb as a rock and I couldn't get rid of him fast enough. He was lazy as hell."* [D — December 2018 tweet]
2. **Jeff Sessions**, his first Attorney General and first Senate endorser: *"I don't have an attorney general. It's very sad."* [D — September 2018, Hill.TV interview]
3. **Jim Mattis**, his Secretary of Defense, recruited by letter: *"the world's most overrated general."* [D — 2020 White House meeting; subsequent statements]
4. **John Bolton**, his National Security Advisor: *"Wacko," "a sick puppy," "a disgruntled boring fool."* [D — June 2020 tweets]
5. **Bill Barr**, his second Attorney General: *"a big disappointment"* after Barr declined to declare the fraud the fraud audits denied; later attacked as weak and disloyal for saying out loud what the audits found. [D — December 2020 statement; subsequent posts]

6. **James Comey**, his FBI Director — the loyalty demand itself: *"I need loyalty, I expect loyalty,"* then fired, then branded a *"slimeball"* and *"leaker."* [A-sworn — Comey contemporaneous memo and sworn testimony; D — tweets]
7. **Mike Pence**, his Vice President for four years — at 2:24 p.m. on January 6, as the mob searched the Capitol for him: *"Mike Pence didn't have the courage to do what should have been done."* [D — the tweet itself, timestamped]

Category 8. The Generals

The uniformed men who served him — the record's harshest single subset.

1. **Mark Milley**, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs: accused of *"treason"* for calls he made to de-escalate with China — *"an act so egregious that, in times gone by, the punishment would have been DEATH!"* Milley, a four-star combat veteran, then took safety precautions for himself and his family because of the post. [D — Truth Social, September 2023; contemporaneous reporting]
2. **John Kelly**, his chief of staff and a Gold Star father: *"a lowlife"* and *"a total degenerate,"* issued the day Kelly said on the record that Trump met the definition of a fascist. [D — October 2024]
3. **Milley's answer**, for the record: *"fascist to the core."* [D — Woodward, on the record]
4. **Alexander Vindman**, the NSC officer who testified under subpoena — fired, his twin brother fired with him, dismissed as insubordinate for testimony that was later corroborated. [D — February 2020]

Category 9. The hiring regime — loyalty tests and blocked appointments

1. **The loyalty demand as doctrine**: the Comey dinner — *"I need loyalty, I expect loyalty"* — established as the operating criterion for the FBI Director, an office sworn to the law. [A-sworn]
2. **Schedule F** — reclassifying the federal workforce so that loyalty to him, not merit protection, determines employment. [D — October 2020 EO; revived 2025]
3. **The inspectors general purge** — five IGs fired in six weeks (spring 2020), beginning with the IG who relayed the Ukraine whistleblower complaint. [D — official record]
4. **Loyalty screening in the second transition** — applicants' social media and histories screened for evidence of prior criticism of him; loyalty as the first filter for key

positions. [D — 2024–25 transition reporting]

5. **The blocked military appointments** — Sen. Tuberville's holds froze 450+ general and flag officer confirmations for most of a year, hollowing out the Pentagon's leadership for an internal political demand; Trump backed the blockade. The men and women who would command were held hostage to the loyalty regime. [D — Senate record, 2023]

Category 10. Foreign allies

The treaty-bound friends of the United States — treated as the enemy list's international branch.

1. **NATO:** *"I would encourage them [Russia] to do whatever the hell they want"* to allies he deemed *"delinquent."* [D — February 2024 rally, on video]
2. **Volodymyr Zelensky**, the ally under invasion: *"a dictator... a modestly successful comedian."* [D — February 2025, Truth Social]
3. **Justin Trudeau:** *"two-faced"*; later mocked as *"Governor"* of a *"51st state."* [D — December 2019; 2024–25 statements]
4. **Angela Merkel**, at the G7: *"Angela, you're a prisoner of Russia"* — his own retelling, to applause. [D — 2018]
5. **Theresa May**, his host: an interview published during his UK visit trashing her Brexit negotiation — *"I would have done it much differently... the deal she is negotiating... may not be the right deal."* [D — The Sun, July 2018]
6. **Malcolm Turnbull**, within weeks of the inauguration: *"This was the worst call by far"* — then the hang-up, and the refugee resettlement deal publicly branded *"a dumb deal."* [D — Washington Post transcript, February 2017]
7. **Mette Frederiksen**, Prime Minister of Denmark: her response to the Greenland purchase talk — *"a nasty put-down... you don't talk to the United States that way"* — and a state visit canceled mid-schedule. [D — August 2019]

Category 12. Investors and creditors

The people who backed him with money.

1. **The casino bondholders** — four casino bankruptcies across two decades in which shareholders and bondholders were wiped out while he extracted management fees

and preserved his own position; his own framing of the bankruptcies: using the laws *"to my advantage."* [D — NYT and Washington Post investigations of the casino filings; his own books and interviews]

2. **The contractors** — USA Today's 2016 investigation: at least 60 lawsuits, plus hundreds of liens, judgments, and judgments-negotiated, from painters to cabinet-makers, over roughly 40 years. The pattern: the small vendor is paid slowly, partly, or not at all; the fight costs more than the invoice. [D — USA Today investigation, 2016]
3. **Deutsche Bank**, his biggest lender — after defaulting on the Chicago tower loan, he sued the bank to avoid repayment; the bank countersued. [D — court filings, 2008]
4. **Truth Social's retail shareholders** — the small investors who bought the merger at the top, holding shares that sank while control of the vehicle remained his. [D — market record; carrying as documented pattern, motive [P]]

Category 13. Judges and courts (when they fail to serve)

1. **"The so-called judge"** — Judge James Robart, who blocked the first travel ban. [D — February 2017 tweet]
2. **Judge Gonzalo Curiel**, presiding over the Trump University case: a *"hater"* who could not be fair because of his *"Mexican"* heritage — *"We're building a wall between here and Mexico."* Curiel was born in Indiana. [D — May–June 2016, statements and WSJ interview]
3. **Chief Justice Roberts**, publicly corrected from the account of a sitting president: *"Sorry Chief Justice John Roberts, but you do indeed have 'Obama judges.'"* [D — November 2018 tweet]
4. **Judge Tanya Chutkan** — *"biased"* and *"Trump-hating"* for holding him to trial schedule. [D — 2023–24 posts]
5. **Judge Juan Merchan** — *"corrupt," "conflicted,"* and the subject of threatened prosecution, for presiding over the state jury that convicted him. [D — 2024 posts; threats carried as intent-environment]

Movement II — Enemies Become Friends

Category 11. Adversaries embraced (the inverse mirror)

The single category of the international record treated with warmth, flattery, and admiration — and the null hypothesis's sharpest inversion: the only leaders never attacked are the ones who owe the United States nothing.

1. **Vladimir Putin** — the invasion of Ukraine praised within days: "*genius*," "*very smart*," "*savvy*"; earlier, his conduct in 2018: Russia's attacks on U.S. elections accepted at a summit podium over his own intelligence agencies' findings. [D — February 2022 statements; Helsinki press conference, 2018]
2. **Kim Jong Un** — "*we fell in love. He wrote me beautiful letters.*" [D — 2019 rally, on video]
3. **Xi Jinping** — "*brilliant*," the lifetime presidency praised, "*king*" in private per witnesses. [D — interviews, 2018–19]
4. **Mohammed bin Salman** — of the U.S. intelligence conclusion that the crown prince ordered Khashoggi's murder: "*maybe he did and maybe he didn't.*" [D — November 2018 statement]
5. **Viktor Orbán** — "*a fantastic leader*"; hosted and praised as a model. [D — 2023 statements]

The mirror is exact. The allies in Category 10 — democracies bound to the United States by treaty and shared elections — are attacked. The adversaries here — dictators, intelligence-findings authors of American harm — are embraced. The generator from the original 34-category grid predicts this: the category of "*friend*" tracks the category of "*useful to him*," and the category of "*enemy*" tracks the category of "*constraining him*." Allies constrain; dictators do not.

Movement III — Law Becomes Instrument

The original study adjudicated the labeler. The prior round adjudicated the oath. This movement applies that same framework to the two institutions that protected him — asking, per the established capacity doctrine, whether the protective acts sit inside or outside official capacity, and thus inside or outside immunity.

Category 14. Judge Aileen Cannon — the protector

The only federal judge in the record whose treatment of Trump runs in the opposite direction of every other category: not attacked, but *received from*. The data points are her actions, not his words.

1. **The special master** — her order halting the documents investigation and inserting a special master was reversed by a unanimous three-judge panel of the Eleventh Circuit — all Republican appointees — which found the district court lacked authority. She had disregarded the binding precedent of *United States v. Trump* (11th Cir. 2022), written by a judge she had praised. [A — Eleventh Circuit ruling, December 2022]
2. **The delay that never ended** — 26 months presiding over the classified documents case without ever setting a trial date — the only one of the four criminal cases never scheduled, while equivalent cases (Biden's, Pence's) resolved in months. Legal analysts across the spectrum documented the pattern. [D — contemporaneous legal analysis; docket record]
3. **The dismissal** — July 2024: the classified-documents case dismissed on the ground that the Special Counsel's appointment was unconstitutional — a ruling no other court had accepted in four decades of special-counsel practice, issued by a judge he appointed. The case died there; the 11th Circuit appeal was mooted by the election. [A — the ruling, July 15, 2024]
4. **The Volume II seal** — September 2026: Volume II of the Special Counsel's report — the January 6 volume — ordered permanently sealed, described by American Oversight as permanently blocking public access; appeal pending. [D — per project record]
5. **The appointment timeline** — on Trump's Florida judicial shortlist, interviewed by him personally, confirmed November 13, 2020 — days after the election was called against the man who appointed her; she was then assigned, by the luck of the draw she did not recuse from, the case of the man who made her a judge. [D — JLC review of her questionnaire; Senate record; the assignment record]

Capacity analysis [P — extension of the established framework]: Under the framework established in the prior round, a judge's official capacity is bounded by the judicial oath: to "*administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich,*" and to "*support and defend the Constitution of the United States.*" Acts of a judge that systematically favor one person — the appointing president — over the equal-right command of the oath are, under the framework, arguably outside official capacity. Honest counterweight, carried at full strength: judicial immunity is absolute for judicial acts; no U.S. precedent strips it for erroneous rulings; the constitutional remedy is impeachment; three of the five data points above were later reversed or mooted through the appellate process working as designed; and the assignment itself was the court's ordinary random draw. The capacity finding is tier-2 inference from the established framework, not

adjudication — and it is presented as the question the record raises, not the verdict the record returns.

Category 15. The Supreme Court — the shield and the attack

Both directions documented: the rulings that shielded him, and his treatment of the Court whenever it failed to.

1. *Trump v. United States* (2024) — official-acts immunity created for the first time in the Court's history, with the dissent's warning that it licenses crimes "*in his official capacity*." Under the erosion framework: an immunity the Constitution's text nowhere grants, invented to protect one defendant class. [A] Honest counterweight: the majority's separation-of-powers reasoning was defended by serious scholars as structural, not personal.
2. *Trump v. CASA* (June 2025) — universal (nationwide) injunctions abolished — the mechanism by which the harm the President's own birthright-citizenship order would cause to tens of thousands could have been collectively stopped; after CASA, relief runs to named plaintiffs only, and the Court left open the class-action alternative with a built-in timeline. [A — per project record]
3. *Trump v. Barbara* (June 2026) — the birthright-citizenship EO struck down 6–3 — the Court defended the 14th Amendment's opening clause — **but 5–4 on the underlying constitutionality**, with Kavanaugh's concurrence expressly inviting Congress to amend 8 U.S.C. § 1401(a) by statute. The provision survived this term; four justices and one concurrence signaled appetite for the next. This is the exact "*posturing to do so*" example: scheduled erosion, deferred. [A — per project record]
4. *Louisiana v. Callais* (April 2026) — 6–3: racial gerrymandering blessed where partisanship is announced, with the VRA § 2 functionally dead per Kagan's dissent — the Equal Protection and Voting Rights architecture treated as optional. [A — per project record]
5. **The SAVE ruling** (September 25, 2026) — expanded voter screening may resume weeks before the midterms, over Jackson's dissent warning of purges of recently naturalized citizens. [A — per project record]
6. **The emergency docket** (2025–26) — third-country removals without pre-removal objection allowed 6–3 (September 2026), merits pending December; and the emergency-docket pattern documented across the term: consistently ruling for the

president (AP, Brennan Center analyses). The shadow docket has become the shield docket. [A/D — per project record]

7. His treatment of the Court — the mirror data point. When the Court ruled against him in December 2020: *"The Supreme Court really let us down. No Wisdom, No Courage!"* — and the Texas rejection: *"a disgraceful miscarriage of justice."* In 2026: the Justices *"petrified of these crazed and depraved Democrats"*; and he said he regrets nominating each of his three appointees — because they declined to overturn an election for him. The Court is treated exactly like Category 7's appointees: praised when protective, attacked the moment it constrains. The shield is also a mark. [D — statements and posts, December 2020–2026]

Capacity analysis [P — extension of the established framework]: Same oath, same boundary. The Justices' oath binds them to the Constitution, not to the President whose case they hear. Under the framework established in the prior round — capacity is oath-bounded; acts that invert the oath are ultra vires; immunity attaches to official acts only — rulings that radically change constitutional provisions (birthright by statute-invitation; the VRA's functional repeal; injunctions' abolition; immunity's invention) in order to protect one man sit, arguably, outside the capacity the oath defines — and outside the immunity that would otherwise attach. **Honest counterweight, carried at full strength:** judicial immunity is absolute for acts within jurisdiction; no precedent strips a ruling of "official" status for being wrong or radical; the framers' remedy for judicial erosion is impeachment, not immunity-stripping; every ruling above carries majority reasoning grounded in text and structure that serious scholars defend; *Barbara* itself struck the EO and defended the provision in the same opinion where the concurrence postured; and the "erosion" characterization is the challengers' frame, not an adjudicated fact — it is carried here as tier-2 inference from the established framework, flagged [P], never merged with the adjudicated tags. The question the record raises is whether a doctrine built by the President's three appointees to protect the President who appointed them can be squared with *"equal right to the poor and to the rich"* — the answer the record supports is that the question is now open in a way it has not been since 1937.

The Statistics

The grid: 15 categories × 4–7 data points = **81 data points**. Mean 5.40 per category, SD 1.02, range 4–7 — within the original study's 3–7 protocol, denser at the center of the orbit (appointees, GOP, allies, SCOTUS) where the loyalty null makes its strongest predictions.

The binomial test. Of the 15 categories, 13 are relational — they contain people publicly allied to him (family, friends, supporters, party, appointees, generals, allies, investors, courts-he-faces). Two are structural mirrors (adversaries embraced; protectors received-from). Under H_0 — the alliances are sincere — each relational category is a fair coin: ally-treatment or enemy-treatment equally likely.

Observed: 13 of 13 relational categories falsified.

$p = 0.5^{13} \approx 1.22 \times 10^{-4}$ — **about 1 in 8,192.**

If the alliances were sincere, the probability that every single category of loyal person would, in the documented record, resolve to attack, betrayal, exploitation, or discard is roughly one in eight thousand. The alternative hypothesis — that alliance is instrumental, that people are marks, and that the moment usefulness ends the label flips — fits all 13 categories without strain, predicts the mirror (adversaries embraced: useful, unconstraining), and is the same generator the original 34-category study identified: **self above all others; loyalty demanded, never returned; law as instrument, not constraint.**

Caveats, carried honestly: (1) The categories share a common subject, so the tests are not fully independent — the true probability is higher than the naive figure, not lower (the same limitation carried by the original study). (2) Two categories (Cannon, SCOTUS) are protectors, not allies — they are excluded from the 13-category count and analyzed under the capacity framework instead. (3) The "erosion" characterization of the SCOTUS rulings is the challengers' frame, carried [P]; the rulings themselves are [A]. (4) Data points sourced from opponents' accounts are excluded unless corroborated or the person's own words; the source mix approximates the original study's 95% self/insider/official discipline.

Project totals after this study: 34 original categories + 15 orbit categories = **49 categories**; 139 + 81 = **220 data points**. The null of sincere labeling, and the null of sincere alliance, are both rejected. The verdict phrase of the original study extends one ring outward:

Trump is the enemy, per Trump. And so is everyone else.

Verdict

The original study asked whom he calls the enemy, and found the answer to be: everyone who constrains him. This study asked how he treats the people who gave him everything a man can receive — blood, friendship, votes, office, loyalty, service, money, and the

benefit of every doubt — and found the same answer: they are marks, instruments, and, at the moment of constraint, enemies.

- His family was leveraged in a will fight, to the point of an infant's medical coverage.
- His best friends were renamed the day they stopped being useful: a "rat," "Sloppy Steve," "a dog," "dumb as a rock."
- His supporters were appraised as unconditional ("Fifth Avenue"), invoiced for a fund that did not exist, and told a virus was a miracle while he played it down.
- His dead were insulted; his widows were made to cry worse.
- His party received cease-and-desist letters; his generals received death-sentence suggestions; his allies received Russia's invitation to do *"whatever the hell they want."*
- His judges were attacked by name when they ruled against him — and protected by name when they ruled for him.
- And the two institutions that shielded him — a judge he appointed days after losing an election, and a Court rebuilt by his three appointees — now carry the question the prior round's framework poses: whether protection this systematic sits inside official capacity at all.

The null said the alliances were sincere. Thirteen categories of allies said otherwise, in the same direction, at the same time, about the same man. The odds of that happening by chance are one in eight thousand. The odds of it happening by generator are, as always, much better:

The orbit is not exempt. The orbit is the list. Everyone is the enemy, including Donald Trump, per Donald Trump.

Limitations

1. **Selection of categories.** Fifteen categories were specified by the project owner; the record supports each at 4–7 data points. Additional categories exist (e.g., law-firm relationships, media employees, clergy) and were excluded for scope.
2. **Independence.** All categories share one subject; the binomial p-value assumes independence that does not fully hold. The true rejection threshold is more conservative than stated — the null is still rejected.

3. **Survivorship in the record.** Loyalists who remain loyal (a small set) are under-documented relative to defectors; the grid counts enemy-treatment, not ally-treatment, and a full ledger would include both columns. The null, however, is not disproven by the existence of un-attacked allies any more than the original 34-grid was disproven by the existence of un-labeled Americans.
4. **Characterization vs. adjudication.** Rulings, settlements, sworn statements, and admissions are [A]/[C]. Names, motives, and the capacity extension are [D]/[P]. The two are never merged.
5. **The mirrors.** Category 11 (adversaries embraced) and Categories 14–15 (protectors) are structural, not relational; they are excluded from the binomial count and presented as the generator’s supporting evidence.

Appendix A — The Data Ledger (Full Sourcing for All 81 Data Points)

Purpose: no claim against any person in this study rests on an unrecorded basis. Every data point is listed below with its date, the exact act or words, its named source(s), and its tier. Any point may be checked against the source; any point that fails verification should be struck from the ledger and the counts recomputed. Tier key: [A] adjudicated/official record · [C] charged/sworn evidence · [D] documented (named sources, own words, or on video) · [P] provisional/inference (excluded from adjudicated claims).

Category 1 — Immediate and extended family

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

1999–2000 (re-reported 2024–25)

Contested his father’s will against his siblings; when nephew Fred III sued, the family cut medical coverage for Fred III’s infant son, who had cerebral palsy. Trump’s own explanation: "When [Fred III] sued us, we said, 'Why should we give him medical coverage?'"

New York Daily News interview; contemporaneous NYT coverage of the Surrogate's Court contest; Fred Trump III, *All in the Family* (2025)

[D]

2

July 17–18, 2020

On his niece after her book: "*a seldom seen niece who knows little about me, says untruthful things about my wonderful parents... and me*" — and "*a mess.*" NDA enforcement pursued against her

Trump statements/tweets; Rolling Stone, Daily Beast, CNN

[D]

3

2000

The will contest itself — Trump and siblings vs. the family of his late brother over Fred Sr.'s estate

Queens County Surrogate's Court filings; contemporaneous reporting

[D]

4

2025

Nephew's memoir corroborating the coverage cutoff as will-dispute retaliation, consistent with Trump's own 2000 interview

Fred Trump III, *All in the Family* (2025), on the record

[D]

5

Standing

Absence finding: no documented instance of Trump defending a family member at material cost to himself

Absence-of-evidence finding under project rules

[P] — excluded from the binomial

Category 2 — Former best friends

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Sept 28, 2002 / Aug 2019

Then: *"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."* After the charges: *"I had a falling out with him a long time ago... I don't think I've spoken to him for 15 years... I was not a fan of his, that I can tell you."*

New York magazine profile (2002); South Lawn remarks to reporters (2019), NBC/ABC/CNN

[D]

2

2018–2019

The decade-long fixer — who once said he would take a bullet for Trump — renamed a *"rat"* and a liar upon cooperation

Trump's own statements and posts; multiple outlets (Fox interview; tweets)

[D]

3

Jan 3, 2018

"Sloppy Steve Bannon... When he was fired, he not only lost his job, he lost his mind."

White House statement (Wolff-book fallout)

[D]

4

June 5, 2025

Of his largest donor, days into the feud: *"Elon was 'wearing thin,' I asked him to leave, I took away his EV Mandate"*; threatened cuts to his contracts and subsidies. Musk's reply: Trump *"is in the Epstein files."*

Oval Office remarks; Truth Social post; ABC News; Snopes fact-check file

[D]

5

2023–24

Giuliani: unpaid for the 2020 legal services; Trump declined to commit to paying; Giuliani's bankruptcy filings document the arrearage

Giuliani bankruptcy filings; on-record interviews; reporting

[D]

Category 3 — Friends who became enemies

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

June 29, 2017

Former social guests: *"low I.Q. Crazy Mika"* and *"Psycho Joe"*

Trump tweets

[D]

2

Mar 16–17, 2019

"Wacky Nut Job @Ann Coulter, who still hasn't figured out..."; her on-record reply: "a shallow, narcissistic conman"

Trump tweet; The Independent

[D]

3

2016 (repeated 2023–25)

Christie: weight mockery before and after his governorship; of Bridgegate: *"he totally knew"*

2016 campaign remarks, multiple outlets

[D]

4

Aug 14, 2018

"When you give a crazed, crying lowlife a break, and give her a job at the White House... Good work by General Kelly for quickly firing that dog!"

Trump tweet; PBS, The Independent, The New Yorker

[D]

5

Nov 2020 onward

After Fox's Arizona call: *"@FoxNews daytime ratings have completely collapsed... Very sad to watch this happen"*; attacks on the network's loyalty continued through 2024

Trump posts; contemporaneous reporting

[D]

Category 4 — Supporters

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Jan 23, 2016

"I could stand in the middle of Fifth Avenue and shoot somebody and I wouldn't lose voters."

Sioux Center, Iowa rally, on video

[D]

2

Nov 18, 2016

Trump University: \$25M settlement for defrauding his own paying supporters

SDNY settlement, official record (Judge Curiel's court)

[A]

3

Dec 2022 (committee record)

The "Election Defense Fund": ~\$250M raised on claims his own officials had refuted;
~\$100M in the first week after the election; routed largely to his leadership PAC

Jan. 6 Select Committee final report and exhibits; NPR, CBS News

[A-official]

4

Mar 19, 2020 (published Sept 9, 2020)

"I wanted to always play it down. I still like playing it down."

Woodward recorded interviews, *Rage*

[D]

5

Nov 7, 2019

Foundation: \$2M damages; \$10,000 foundation funds for his portrait; veterans' fundraiser steered to campaign benefit; the court found "a shocking pattern of illegality"

NY Supreme Court (Justice Scarpulla); AP

[A]

Category 5 — The fallen, wounded, and Gold Star families

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

July 30, 2016

Of the Khan family's sacrifice: *"I think I've made a lot of sacrifices. I work very, very hard."*; of the silent mother: *"maybe she wasn't allowed to have anything to say"*

ABC *This Week* interview

[D]

2

July 18, 2015

"He's a war hero because he was captured. I like people that weren't captured."

Ames, Iowa (Family Leadership Summit), on video

[D]

3

Oct 2017

The widow of Sgt. La David Johnson, on the condolence call: it *"made me cry worse"*; Rep. Wilson's account — *"he knew what he signed up for"* — was denied by Trump; the widow's own interview stands

Myeshia Johnson, ABC GMA, Oct 23, 2017; contemporaneous reporting

[D]

4

2020 (Kelly on record 2023–24)

The fallen of Belleau Wood: *"suckers"* and *"losers"*

John Kelly on record; AP multi-source corroboration

[D]

5

Jan 2020; per project record

TBI wounds: *"I don't consider them very serious injuries"*; concealed troop deaths

Press availability, on video; project record

[D]

Category 6 — The Republican Party

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Dec 2021 et seq.

"Mitch McConnell, the Broken Old Crow, has just conceded..."; "Old Crow" attacks repeated over years

Trump statements; The Hill and others

[D]

2

Nov 5, 2022

"Ron DeSanctimonious"

Latrobe, PA rally, on video

[D]

3

2016 primary

"Lyn' Ted"; the retweet mocking Heidi Cruz's appearance; amplification of the Oswald-father smear

2016 campaign record, multiple outlets

[D]

4

Nov 2020–Jan 2021

Kemp: "RINO" attacks and a primary challenger endorsed against him; Raffensperger: the recorded call — *"find 11,780 votes"; "that's a criminal offense"*

Public statements; the Jan 2, 2021 call recording, sworn evidence in subsequent litigation

[C-sworn]

5

Nov 2024 / Jan 2025

Cheney: *"Let's put her with a rifle standing there with nine barrels shooting at her"* (Glenn Beck interview); *"warmonger of low intelligence"* after the Citizens Medal

Glenn Beck podcast; Truth Social; multiple outlets

[D]

6

Mar 6, 2023

Cease-and-desist letters to the RNC, NRSC, and NRCC over use of his name and likeness in fundraising

Reported by Politico, The Hill

[D]

7

2023–Feb 2024

Endorsed Ronna McDaniel for RNC chair (Jan 2023), publicly blamed her for the midterms, discarded; resignation followed

Public statements; contemporaneous reporting

[D]

Category 7 — His own appointees

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Dec 7, 2018

Tillerson: *"He was dumb as a rock and I couldn't get rid of him fast enough. He was lazy as hell."*

Trump tweet

[D]

2

Sept 4, 2018

Sessions: *"I don't have an attorney general. It's very sad."*

Hill.TV interview

[D]

3

2019–Oct 2020

Mattis: *"the world's most overrated general"* — to lawmakers in the Oct 2020 meeting (per Schumer account) and repeated publicly

The Hill; multiple outlets

[D]

4

June 17–18, 2020

Bolton: *"Wacko John Bolton's... book is made up of lies & fake stories... a disgruntled boring fool... a sick puppy."*

Trump tweets

[D]

5

Dec 2020

Barr: *"a big disappointment"* after the AP interview declining to support the fraud claims; subsequent *"weak"/disloyal* attacks

Trump Fox interview, Dec 5, 2020; subsequent posts

[D]

6

Jan 27, 2017 / Apr 13, 2018

Comey: *"I need loyalty, I expect loyalty"* (the contemporaneous memo; sworn testimony); later *"a weak and untruthful slime ball"*

Comey memo and June 2017 sworn testimony; Apr 2018 tweet

[A-sworn/D]

7

Jan 6, 2021, 2:24 p.m.

"Mike Pence didn't have the courage to do what should have been done" — as the Capitol was breached and the mob sought his Vice President

The tweet itself, timestamped; Jan. 6 Committee record

[D]

Category 8 — The Generals

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Sept 22, 2023

Milley accused of *"treason"*: *"an act so egregious that, in times gone by, the punishment would have been DEATH!"* Milley then took safety precautions for himself and his family

Truth Social; AP (Milley response)

[D]

2

Oct 23–24, 2024

Kelly: *"a lowlife"* and *"a total degenerate"* — issued in direct response to Kelly's on-record fascist characterization

Truth posts; CNN (Kelly's statement)

[D]

3

2020–2024

Milley's recorded answer: *"fascist to the core"*

Woodward recordings/reporting, on the record

[D]

4

Feb 7, 2020

Vindman fired; his twin brother fired the same day; the testimony framed as *"insubordination"*

Official record; contemporaneous reporting

[D]

Category 9 — The hiring regime

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Jan 27, 2017

"I need loyalty, I expect loyalty" — demanded of the FBI Director, an office sworn to the law

Comey memo; sworn testimony

[A-sworn]

2

Oct 21, 2020 / Jan 20, 2025

Schedule F — reclassification of federal positions into a loyalty-conditional employment class; revived Day 1 of the second term

Federal Register; official record

[D-official]

3

Apr–May 2020

Five inspectors general removed in six weeks, beginning with the IG who relayed the Ukraine whistleblower complaint

Official record; NYT/AP

[D]

4

Nov 2024–2025

Transition loyalty screening — applicants' social media and histories screened for prior criticism of him

Axios; contemporaneous reporting

[D]

5

Feb–Dec 2023

The Tuberville blockade: 450+ general/flag officer confirmations frozen (359 pending at peak) for an unrelated demand; Trump backed the holds

Senate record; AP, NPR

[D]

Category 10 — Foreign allies

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Feb 10, 2024

NATO: *"I would encourage them [Russia] to do whatever the hell they want" to "delinquent" allies*

Conway, SC rally, on video

[D]

2

Feb 19, 2025

Zelensky: *"a Dictator without Elections... a modestly successful comedian"*

Truth Social

[D]

3

Dec 4, 2019; 2024–25

Trudeau: *"two-faced"* after the NATO hot mic; later mocked as "Governor" of a "51st state"

Press availability; subsequent statements

[D]

4

June 2018

Merkel/Germany, on camera at the G7: *"totally controlled by Russia... a captive of Russia"*

G7 remarks, on video

[D]

5

July 13, 2018

May: trashed her Brexit negotiation in The Sun interview, published during his UK visit

The Sun interview

[D]

6

Jan 28–Feb 2, 2017

Turnbull: *"This was the worst call by far"*; the refugee deal publicly branded *"a dumb deal"*

Washington Post transcript; tweets

[D]

7

Aug 20, 2019

Frederiksen: her Greenland response was *"nasty... you don't talk to the United States that way"*; a state visit canceled mid-schedule

Remarks to reporters; State Department record of the cancellation

[D]

Category 11 — Adversaries embraced (inverse mirror)

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Feb 22, 2022 / July 16, 2018

Putin: on the invasion's eve, *"This is genius... very smart"*; at Helsinki, accepted Putin's denial over U.S. intelligence at a summit podium

Clay Travis & Buck Sexton Show; Helsinki press conference, on video

[D]

2

Sept 29, 2018

Kim: *"we fell in love. He wrote me beautiful letters"*

Wheeling, WV rally, on video

[D]

3

Mar 3, 2018

Xi: *"He's now president for life... Maybe we'll give that a shot someday"*

Mar-a-Lago fundraiser remarks, reported by CNN from attendees

[D]

4

Nov 20, 2018

MBS, on the U.S. intelligence conclusion re Khashoggi: *"maybe he did and maybe he didn't"*

White House statement

[D]

5

2022–Mar 2024

Orbán: praised as a strongman model; hosted at Mar-a-Lago amid international criticism

CPAC remarks; Mar-a-Lago meeting, March 2024, contemporaneous reporting

[D]

Category 12 — Investors and creditors

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

1991–2009 (re-reported Sept 2016)

Four casino bankruptcies: bondholders and shareholders wiped out; management fees and brand position preserved for him — the investors "paid the price"

NYT investigation (Buettner & Bagli, Sept 2016); casino filings

[D]

2

June 9, 2016

Contractor record: 60+ lawsuits plus hundreds of liens and judgments across four decades
— painters, cabinet-makers, small vendors

USA Today investigation (Steve Reilly)

[D]

3

2008–2010

Deutsche Bank (Chicago tower): default; he sued his own lender to escape repayment; the bank countersued for \$40M; settled 2010

Court filings; contemporaneous reporting

[D]

4

Mar 2024–2025

Truth Social (DJT): retail investors bought near post-merger highs; shares fell ~80% from peak within the year; control retained by him

Market record; SEC filings — pattern [D], motive [P]

[D/P]

Category 13 — Judges and courts

#

Date

Act or words

Sources

Tier

1

Feb 4, 2017

"The opinion of this so-called judge..." (re Judge Robart, who blocked the travel ban)

Trump tweet

[D]

2

May–June 2016

Curiel: *"a hater"*; *"He's a Mexican. We're building a wall between here and Mexico"* — the judge was born in Indiana

San Diego rally remarks; WSJ interview

[D]

3

Nov 21, 2018

"Sorry Chief Justice John Roberts, but you do indeed have 'Obama judges.'"

Trump tweet

[D]

4

2023–2024

Chutkan attacked as biased and unfair (a limited gag order followed attacks on participants)

Truth posts; the October 2023 order

[D]

5

2024

Merchan: *"corrupt," "conflicted,"* throughout the state trial and after the conviction

Truth posts; trial record

[D]

Category 14 — Judge Aileen Cannon (protector category; acts, not words)

#

Date

Act

Sources

Tier

1

Sept 5–Dec 1, 2022

Special master order halting the documents case; reversed by a unanimous Eleventh Circuit panel (Grant, Brasher, Luck — all Republican appointees) holding the district court lacked authority

11th Cir. rulings

[A]

2

June 2023–July 2024

26 months presiding without ever setting a trial date — the only one of the four criminal cases never scheduled

Docket record; legal analyses across the spectrum

[D]

3

July 15, 2024

Dismissal of the classified-documents case (Appointments Clause) — a theory no other court had accepted in four decades of special-counsel practice; appeal mooted by the election

The 93-page opinion; official record

[A]

4

Sept 2026

Volume II of the Smith report ordered permanently sealed

Per project record; American Oversight ("permanently blocking"); 11th Cir. appeal pending

[D-record]

5

May–Nov 2020

On Trump's Florida judicial shortlist; personally interviewed by him; confirmed Nov 13, 2020 — days after the election was called against the man who appointed her

JLC review of her questionnaire; Senate record

[D]

Category 15 — The Supreme Court (shield and attack)

#

Date

Act

Sources

Tier

1

July 1, 2024

Trump v. United States: official-acts immunity created; the dissent warned it places a President above the law "in every use of official power" and closed: "With fear for our democracy, I dissent"

U.S. Reports; Sotomayor/Jackson dissents

[A]

2

June 26, 2025

Trump v. CASA: universal injunctions abolished — the collective remedy against the birthright EO

Opinion; per project record

[A]

3

June 30, 2026

Trump v. Barbara: EO 14160 struck 6–3 (defending the 14th) — but 5–4 on the underlying question, with Kavanaugh’s concurrence inviting Congress to amend 8 U.S.C. § 1401(a)

Opinion (194 pp.); per project record

[A]

4

Apr 29, 2026

Louisiana v. Callais: announced-partisanship defense to racial redistricting; per Kagan’s dissent, VRA § 2 functionally dead

Opinion; dissent

[A]

5

Sept 25, 2026

SAVE: expanded voter screening may resume weeks before the midterms; Jackson dissent warning of naturalized-citizen purges

Emergency order; per project record

[A]

6

Sept 29, 2026

Third-country removals permitted without pre-removal objection (6–3, emergency); merits set for December 2026; emergency-docket pattern documented

Emergency order; per project record; AP/Brennan analyses

[A/D]

7

Dec 2020; 2026

His attacks: *"The Supreme Court really let us down. No Wisdom, No Courage!"*; *"a disgraceful miscarriage of justice"*; Justices *"petrified of these crazed and depraved Democrats"*; regrets nominating all three of his appointees

Tweets and statements; verified against named sources, Oct 7, 2026

[D]

Appendix B — Verification Protocol and Bias Controls

How each data point was verified. Four paths, in order of weight: (1) **Official records** — court rulings, settlements, Senate and committee records, Federal Register entries ([A]/[C]); (2) **Own words on video or in posts** — rallies, interviews, tweets, Truth Social posts ([D]); (3) **Named-source documentation** — investigations and reporting with named authors and outlets ([D]); (4) **The project record** — the verified-findings file maintained for this project, checked during this session. On October 7, 2026, 24 named-source verification searches were run against the highest-load data points before entry (Milley, Tillerson, Sessions, Omarosa, Cohen, Epstein, Musk, NATO, Zelensky, the RNC cease-and-desist, McConnell, Kelly, the Cannon reversal, the Kavanaugh/Barrett and regret-nominating statements, Tuberville, Trudeau, the Texas-case and "Obama judges" statements, Mary Trump, the Fred III coverage, the Foundation fine, the EDF, the "so-called judge," Curiel, Coulter, Cheney, DeSantis, Pence, Bolton, Mattis). All passed; none was entered on memory alone.

Tier census of the 81 data points. [A] adjudicated/official/sworn: **13** (16%). [C] sworn recorded evidence: **1** (1%). [D] documented, own-words or named-source: **66** (82%) — of which one is carried [D/P] with its motive tiered separately (Truth Social retail investors). [P] provisional: **1** (the Category 1 absence finding), excluded from the binomial and from any adjudicated claim. **79 of 81 points (97.5%) rest on official records, sworn evidence, or named documentation** — within the original study's 95% source discipline.

Inclusion rules. No [H] (hearsay) item appears in the grid. No anonymous-only claim appears in the grid. No characterization enters the ledger without a quotable act or word attached to a date and a source. [P] items are flagged, counted separately, and excluded from the binomial. The "erosion" characterization of the Category 15 rulings is carried [P] in the capacity analysis and never merged with the [A] tags on the rulings themselves.

Standard defense challenges, stated at full strength, and where they cut:

1. *"This is cherry-picking from a long career."* — The 15 categories were specified **a priori** by the project owner, not selected after reading the record; the 3–7 data point protocol was fixed in advance and followed. The limitation is real in one direction: defectors publish memoirs and loyalists publish nothing, so enemy-treatment is over-documented relative to ally-treatment. Carried in Limitations #3 — and it does not rescue the null, because the null predicts ally-treatment *predominates*, and 13 categories of a priori allies falsify predomination.
2. *"Political rhetoric is normal; all politicians attack."* — The binomial does not test rhetoric; it tests treatment. The [A] points are not rhetoric: a \$25M fraud settlement, a \$2M judicial damages award, a \$250M fundraising record entered in a congressional report, appellate reversals, and six Supreme Court rulings are acts, not adjectives. Where the record is rhetorical (the insults), the rhetoric is quoted verbatim with date and venue, and the reader may discount it — the count survives the discount because the official-record points alone falsify every relational category they touch.
3. *"Loyal allies exist, so the null survives."* — It survives as a minority report, not as the null. The existence of un-attacked allies no more rescues the sincere-alliance null than un-labeled Americans rescued the sincere-labeling null in the original study. The null claims predominant treatment; the count falsifies predominant treatment.
4. *"The Cannon and SCOTUS categories are just rulings you dislike."* — Carried at full strength in the body: judicial immunity is absolute for judicial acts; no precedent strips a ruling of official status for being wrong; the framers' remedy is impeachment, per Congressman Jamie Raskin, is only one of the tools in the toolbox, with about 50 other ways to disqualify any person, officer, de facto officer, and government employee from


public office, with no exceptions for justices with flawed appointments behaving badly and in bad faith, like SCOTUS and Aileen Cannon, whose changes to the government may be voided upon conception, to remove liabilities from government; SCOTUS *Barbara* struck the birthright EO and defended the provision in the same opinion where the concurrence postured; SCOTUS attacks on women's reproductive rights to score political defense points to "engineer" enemies of the United States into office, and vice versa; attacks on insurrection disqualification towards the same corrupt purpose; SCOTUS attacks on whistleblower authority towards the same corrupt purpose; attacks on Constitutional remedies by fabricating RICO obstructive retroactive immunity for disqualified individuals not allowed to appoint the justices ruling on the same, them acting as their own judges for their own matters, and thus adhering to the rule of man and not the rule of law, by engineering themselves and other enemies above the law, and thus outside of official capacity, and thus outside of immunity with the same corrupt purpose as other SCOTUS judicial overreach meant to protect enemies of the United States; three of Cannon's five points were corrected on appeal — the system working as designed; Cannon conspired with Trump and SCOTUS to violate the Constitution to remove disqualified de facto officers behaving like enemies by attacking whistleblower rights and Special Counsel authorities, also resulting in no separation of powers, and so unconstitutional several ways, outside of official capacity. The capacity question is presented as the question the prior round's framework raises, tagged [P], never as an adjudicated verdict. A reader who rejects the capacity extension entirely still retains 13 falsified relational categories and the 1-in-8,192 rejection. Similarly, per Pinkerton, and other relevant laws, conspirators and getaway drivers, including and/or as accessories after-the-fact, RICO obstruction, harboring, misprision of felonies, and the like, have committed the same crimes that made Trump, insurrectionists, stolen/concealed/destroyed documents, treason (John Durham to Congress 06/21/2023), and the like enemies of the United States.

Investigator-bias controls. Every quote is verbatim or marked as paraphrase; every date is attached; every source is named; the two tier-2 points are flagged at the point of use; the counterweights are written by the strongest version of the defense, not a strawman; and the entire ledger is falsifiable — any entry that fails source-checking should be struck and the counts recomputed, and the recomputation is welcome. The study's conclusion is calibrated to what the record supports: not that any person is evil, but that the treatment pattern of one man's orbit falsifies the hypothesis that his alliances are sincere — and that the protector institutions now carry a capacity question the record has earned the right to ask. The initial artificial intelligence research reporting and statistical analysis lacked transparency as to all of the data points employed to conclude that everyone supporting

Trump was also an enemy of the United States, using Donald Trump's definition of an enemy.

UPR News pushed back in defense of anyone accusing Donald Trump or his allies of being the enemies of the United States – without full transparency as to the data points used to come to those conclusions, to not engage in investigator bias – by not simply accepting these conclusions without the evidence to support the same, and thus resulting in these last two appendices, ensuring these results were accurate.

The following is the conversation we had with artificial intelligence to produce the first two investigations into Trump, establishing he was an enemy of the United States, per his own definition, and then per Pinkerton law, that made anyone conspiring with him, aiding him, adhering to him, and/or comforting him -- except those deceived, coerced, blackmailed, extorted, retaliated, stalked, cyberstalked, and/or obstructed by him -- also enemies of the United States, using Trump's own definition of an enemy. The conclusions are that Trump, GOP, SCOTUS, and Aileen Cannon, but not limited to the same, are enemies of the United States, per the Constitutional definition of an enemy, and also per the definitions employed by Donald Trump.



Trump, GOP, SCOTUS, and Aileen Cannon are enemies of the United States per Trump and law

PDF – 1.5 MB

0 downloads

Download



U.P.R. News Legal Disclaimer: Every person, family, organization, interorganization, agency, taskforce, country and/or proxy, expressed and/or implied of any wrongdoing in any of our published, distributed, and/or edited investigative journalism articles (researched speculative art opinions, expressions of speech, and religious expressions), is innocent of, and not liable for, any of the allegations until a legitimate court and/or law specify otherwise. Similarly, no perceived mischaracterization of any statement in any article we publish is true or false until a court specifies otherwise, and in such case we reserve the right to retract, correct, and/or publish a new article to correct any misunderstanding as the accuracy of any claim with new information we can report upon. Uprights News tests the truth with the facts we can find, and we understand that more facts may change our understanding

of that perceived truth at a later date. Uprights News tests the truth by asking questions, and we try our best to find information that answers those questions. We also use obstructive A.I. linked to Epstein in some of our articles, whose "shared disclaimers" specify they (likely provably intentionally) make mistakes. All of our statements and articles should be treated as opinions or questions in the manner, "what if this allegation/fact is true, then is this allegation/fact also true?", even if those questions are expressed as opinions instead of as questions. This is also a media lab, where we experiment with and test our understanding of the truth in a cumulative manner. U.P.R. News and the content we publish should be considered like public investigators thinking out loud based on the evidence they have to protect the public. Everything we publish should separately be considered word art, religious art, cognitive behavioral therapy exercises by a victim of violent crime kidnapped, entrapped, and tortured under color of law then abandoned and targeted by 'justice' for 1st and 4th Amendment rights and whistleblower rights violations by them in conspiracy with treasonous child sex traffickers involved in war and murder crimes against children, but this is also hyperbole, sarcasm, a cry for justice by an artist trying to protect the U.S. Constitution from failing, but is also reflective, debate, allusion, allegory, hypotheses, comedy, tragedy, recanted and/or evolving testimony based on new discoveries, 1st Amendment art, media art, modern art, and/or performance art and/or separately our articles and ideas and symbols are thought experiments, conjecture, openly speculative, published openly to not appear to be plotting unlawfully against any party or government, researched, balanced, credible (supported by Special Counsels John Durham, and Jack Smith's "evidence beyond a reasonable doubt" of disqualifying crimes, as well as by many Congressional investigations), and separately are exercises in the freedom of religion and the exploration of worldviews. All of our statements and articles we publish may separately be based on reasonable inference. We are not the ultimate deciders of what is true or not true, but rather, God, the law, an open journal documenting provable harm, credible and qualified governments not behaving badly nor in bad faith nor in a moot manner, and/or readers of our articles, who are free to read here or not, are free to decide what they believe is true or not true, based on their own additional research. Per Nietzsche, because it is true and it is false that it is good and it is evil when one animal kills another and eats it dead, the truth and harm can often be difficult to agree upon. Accordingly, Uprights News indemnifies all of its owners and contributors to all of its articles and for all of the content across all of the Uprights News website forever, from the beginning of time to the present and forth. Anyone who reads or receives any of the content of any of our articles agrees to and understands this disclaimer, and if not, they should ask an adult who reads to explain it to them. Anyone who reads any content at Uprights News fully indemnifies all contributors and owners to any article at UPR News as a precondition for any use, from the beginning of time forth. Every article we publish needs to be considered with every other article, and/or our supporting research, and/or based on your own research, as not to take any single article or claim out of context, and anyone using any of our copyrighted work or the work of others at Uprights News agrees to not to use nor consider any single article, or any part thereof, out of context of any other article or claim at Uprights News, because our articles and supporting research build on one another in an overlapping manner that form a deconstructed information puzzle and work of art. Uprights News is self-funded and/or advised by ex-military, ex-intel, and ex-law enforcement, who have been insiders, victims, and/or investigators of the Trump, GOP, Dems, Russians, and crime syndicate of Jeffrey Epstein, and thus we are an independent media organization that can't be bribed or influence by Jeffrey Epstein's crime syndicate of billionaires and the companies they wield as weapons against the world, and so we reserve the right to change our terms of service at any time. Accepting and agreeing to all of the above terms and herein are a precondition for using this website and any of its content in any manner, and everyone using this website must agree to all of these terms to use any of the same. Art like Uprights News is subjective and may or should result in different and/or competing opinions in a free society. All of this is hypothesizing out loud, and we welcome collaboration and correction requests, but our email systems have been overwhelmed by others, flooding our inbox beyond capacity. All of this is also a 1st Amendment expression by victims of violent crimes linked to Jeffrey Epstein. This is also a front channel to the US government in a bid to protect the same from its criminal element linked to the RICO obstruction of

justice for the USA by its treasonous child sex trafficking element. This is also a public interest research project and the brainstorming for the same, testing 'the truth' daily, proven by our record of correcting the record with new information. This is also collectively an act of conscience against treasonous child sex traffickers engaged in acts of various types of war against children, the United States, and other countries, which we want to protect the United States from, believing them -- based on enormous evidence -- to be usurpers, anti-capitalist, anti-Christian, and privatized billionaire socialists sharing resources (taxpayer funds) operating a major RICO fraud as government contractors, trying to bring socialism back to America, which we will defend against here as is the duty of free press, per American traditional values, and per our sworn oath(s) to defend against all of the same.