



## Newly Released Jeffrey Epstein Photos Raise More Questions Than They Answer

*This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.*

**Dimitri Lascaris (DL):** Good day, this is Dimitri Lascaris coming to you from Montreal, Canada for Reason2Resist on December 14th, 2025. On Friday, December 12th, the US House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Governance released nearly 100 photos that the committee had obtained from the estate of Jeffrey Epstein. In this report, we're going to share with you and discuss the most interesting of these photos. And to cut to the chase, I'm going to explain to you why I believe that this is part of a larger scam being perpetrated by both the Republicans and the Democrats to persuade you of two things: One, that their side is more transparent than the other. And two, that you've received more than enough disclosure about what actually happened in the decades-long Jeffrey Epstein scandal. And before I get into it, let me just remind our audience that if you find this video to be informative, please do like and share it. And if you're not already a subscriber to Reason2Resist, we're now rapidly approaching 114,000 subscribers. We've grown rapidly, but we want to be able to reach more people with our unapologetic resistance journalism. And so you can help us to do that by becoming a subscriber if you're not already one.

Now, as a preface to my getting into what has happened over the last couple of days and why I think that it is part of a scam, I just want to remind people, you may not already know this, that the reason why I spend a lot of time on this program talking about what I consider to be frauds and manipulations being perpetrated by the elites is because it was basically the primary responsibility of my job as a securities class actions lawyer who represented plaintiffs for some 15 years in securities class actions litigation against large companies and their executives. It was my job to detect and to prove fraud. And over the course of doing that kind of work, I think it's fair to say because it's something that I did every day, it was my bread and butter and my ability to make a living and to fulfill my obligations to my clients depended upon my being able to detect frauds that others weren't able to see and to prove to a court of law an independent arbiter based upon credible and persuasive evidence that a fraud had in fact occurred. And also to be able to identify the perpetrators of it.

And so, since transferring from full-time securities class actions lawyer to doing full-time resistance journalism, I've applied the skills that I learned in the course of my career as a securities class actions lawyer to domestic politics and to international relations. And so that's why a big focus of my program has been what I regard as political frauds. And I think we're witnessing one here yet again. Or at least the latest chapter in an ongoing fraud relating to the nefarious activities of this pedophile Jeffrey Epstein. So the photos you're about to see from me are revealing in and of themselves. But to fully understand the significance of these photos, it's important to understand the background of their release.

As I mentioned at the top, the photos were just released by the Democrats, not by both sides, but by the Democrats on the House Oversight Committee. Now that committee is comprised of 47 members – it's a pretty large committee – 26 of whom are Republicans, and 21 of whom are Democrats. The Republican members include Marjorie Taylor Greene from Georgia, although she's just one of many Republican members, and the Democratic members include Ro Khanna from California, who was a co-sponsor of the Epstein Files Transparency Act, that Donald Trump was more or less forced to sign into law on November 19th of this year. The chairman of this committee is James Comer from Kentucky, and the ranking Democrat is Robert Garcia from California.

Shortly after the photos were released on Friday, Robert Garcia fielded questions from the press about the photos on Capitol Hill. The exchange between Garcia and the press lasted for about seven minutes. And I think it would be useful for us to focus on the highlights of that seven minute commentary. And let's begin with his introductory statements as he descended the steps outside the Capitol.

**Interviewer:** I wonder if we can talk about the latest document production that you all just made. Can you talk about the context that we don't have around these images at this point? Because it's just photos, although it comes from emails and the computer.

**Robert Garcia (RG):** Sure, let me just begin by saying that obviously the Oversight democrats have been committed to transparency and any time that we receive information from whether we've sent the subpoena or whether we have fought to get the information, we're going to put it out to the public. And that's, I think, the most important thing. Obviously just last night we received about 95,000 photographs from the Epstein estate. I want to be clear, our committee Oversight Democrats have gone through maybe about 25,000 of them so far. So there's an enormous amount of photos we have not gone through. It will take days and weeks to ensure that we go through those photos and that a redaction is done in the appropriate way. Let me just also say that clearly we have put out I think maybe 15 to 20 of those photos this morning – Democrats have. We will continue to put out more photos in the days and weeks ahead. But I just caution folks that the redaction process and ensuring that we are protecting the survivors and the women who were abused by Epstein are protected.

**DL:** So you saw that right out of the gate, the very first thing that Garcia – and we should assume that Garcia gave some thought beforehand to what he was going to say to the press.

He knew that he was going to get asked about these photos. I'm sure that he didn't go in there unscripted. And the very first talking point he wanted to establish is "hey, we the Democrats, we are committed to transparency". Even though that wasn't the question. The question wasn't, "who's more committed to transparency?" No, the question was, what should we take away from these photos? What can we expect in the days ahead? And so he went out of his way to position his party as the champions of transparency. And also to point the finger at the Trump administration that it is withholding the truth, even though it has a few days left before it has to reveal the Epstein files subject to the requirements of the Epstein Files Transparency Act that Trump signed into law November 19th.

Now, at the same time as Garcia was stressing the extraordinary and impressive transparency of the Democrats, he admitted that the committee had reviewed about 25,000 of these 95,000 photographs already. Yet it released, according to him, fewer than 100 of them on Friday. That's less than 0.4% of the photos the committee had actually reviewed. Now, if the Democrats on the committee are so committed to transparency, then why did they release less than 0.4% of the photos they had reviewed after receiving them on Thursday night? And as you'll see, they redacted many of the faces they showed in the photos they released. So if they were concerned about protecting survivors and victims, they could have simply dealt with that by redaction. And that isn't a reason to release a tiny proportion of the photos they had actually had the opportunity to review. So let's listen to what Garcia said next.

**Interviewer:** What else do you expect you'll see when more of these come out?

**RG:** I will say that there's obviously 95,000 photos. There are many, many photos of women and some of Epstein's properties, which is a significant portion of these photos. These photos were basically in the possession of the Epstein estate. And so that includes pictures that maybe were sent to Epstein, perhaps he took himself. We know there's some that he took himself and that others took, but they were in his possession. And so that is what's important. And obviously, there are photos of powerful men and folks that we want to have an opportunity to speak with and ask questions of. The thing right now that's the most important is there is one man who has the power to release the files and get to the truth and bring justice to the survivors, and that's Donald Trump. And Donald Trump right now needs to release the files to the American public so that the truth can come out and can actually get some sense of justice for the survivors.

**DL:** So yet again, he goes out of his way to say, hey man, we're the champions of transparency, it's Donald Trump who is withholding the truth from the public. And in the same breath, Garcia discloses that quote unquote "powerful men" appear in photos that have yet to be released and that may never be released for all we know, and that the committee would like to speak with some of them. Now, why doesn't he disclose the identities of any of those powerful men? Why doesn't he say anything about what those powerful men are doing in those photos? Even if he has some legitimate reason for not identifying any of them, not a single one of them at this time, why didn't he at least describe in general terms what they had actually seen those powerful men doing in those photos? But in fact, he discloses zero useful

information about who those powerful men are and what they are seen to be doing in the photos.

Now, in the clip I just showed you, Garcia also does a bait and switch by criticizing the Trump administration for not revealing the Epstein Files when he's asked about the documents that he and other Democrats on the committee have just released. It's important to understand that the Department of Justice has a mountain of Epstein material obtained through its criminal investigations into Jeffrey Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. But this body of evidence is separate from the evidence that is in the possession of this committee and that has been acquired by this committee. The committee, of which Garcia is the ranking Democrat, has obtained a body of evidence directly from the estate of Jeffrey Epstein, pursuant to a subpoena that the committee issued to the Epstein estate earlier this year, in August, to be precise. And in a minute, I'm going to show you that subpoena. It's useful to understand the extraordinary breadth of it for purposes of our discussion.

But the point I want to make right now is that Trump controls the release of the files that the DOJ, the Department of Justice, has obtained through its criminal investigations into Epstein and Ghislaine Maxwell. And as far as I can tell, Trump does not control the release of the files that the committee has obtained directly from the Epstein estate, pursuant to the committee's subpoena. Therefore, although Garcia is right to criticize Trump for concealing the DOJ's Epstein files, he himself has not explained why his committee, the committee of which he is the ranking Democratic member, has only disclosed less than 0.4% of the 25,000 photos that they reviewed since Friday night. Now, let's listen finally to a more, shall we say, melodramatic explanation of what is in the unreleased photos. Here's what Garcia had to say about that.

**Interviewer:** What is your plan going to be on the 19th though if the DOJ does not release these files?

**RG:** Right now our plan is to demand that the president release the files and we'll see what he does on the 19th. But I think again, these pictures, some of these photos are really disturbing. And I know we put some out today. There are many others. And some of the other photos that we did not put out today are incredibly disturbing.

**Interviewer:** Will you subpoena the estate for the email components attached to them?

**DL:** You heard it, folks, directly from the horse's mouth. Some of the unreleased photos are quote unquote "incredibly disturbing". This, of course, is an important acknowledgement, and yet Garcia gives zero explanation as to why he considers some of the unreleased photos to be incredibly disturbing. Now, you saw that there was quite a significant gathering of corporate media hacks around Garcia shoving their microphones into his face. And you heard the first question that was posed by a so-called journalist standing in that gaggle of reporters after Garcia's revelation that some of these photos were incredibly disturbing. And what she asked was not the most obvious question. Let's be very clear here. Again, you don't have to be a

rocket scientist or a fraud detection specialist to understand this. The most important outstanding question in the entire sordid, disgusting criminal Epstein affair is this: Did any of Epstein's powerful associates engage in any pedophilia themselves with Epstein's victims or in other forms of sexual abuse? That is the question that people are rightfully preoccupied with, and that question has not been answered in any meaningful way by the people in government and law enforcement who are in a position to know.

And so if you were actually doing your job as a journalist, if you actually were a journalist, the moment that you heard Garcia say that the content of unreleased photos was incredibly disturbing, the next question you would have asked is: do those photos show any of Epstein's powerful, influential associates engaging in sexual relations with a minor or with adult women who might have been abused by Epstein? That would have been the obvious question, but that question didn't come from that reporter. And in fact, nobody in that throng of supposedly inquisitive reporters put that most obvious question to Garcia. And if Garcia had answered that question, simple yes or no, yes, the photos, the incredibly disturbing photos do show powerful associates of Epstein engaging in sexual relations with a minor or engaging with an adult woman, but in an abusive, non-consensual manner – if he'd answered that question, honestly, he wouldn't have been required to disclose the identities of any of the victims.

He could have stopped at that point and said, Look, I can tell you that it does disclose that, these photos do reveal that, but I'm not going to tell you at this time who the victims are and we're not going to actually show you the photos at this time. And we're not going to tell you at this time who the perpetrators are, but we are going to tell you that, in our opinion, those photos do reveal and substantiate that at least some associates, powerful associates of Jeffrey Epstein, engage in sexual relations with a minor or sexually abused adult victims of Jeffrey Epstein. He could have answered that question without compromising any sensitive information. And instead, not only did he not give the answer to that question, he wasn't even asked the question.

Now, as I mentioned, some 95,000 photos were obtained pursuant to a subpoena issued by the committee to the Epstein estate. The subpoena was sent to the Epstein estate in August of this year. And I want to underline that the committee's subpoena asked for far more than photos of Epstein and his associates. So let's take a look at the schedule to the subpoena, which identifies the documents that the estate of Epstein is required to produce. And here you can see it's a three-page schedule. I'll just take you through it quickly. On the first page, number one: "All entries contained within the reported leather-bound book compiled by Ghislaine Maxwell for Jeffrey Epstein's 50th birthday". Then it's: "The last willing testament of Epstein. All non-disclosure agreements executed by Epstein or his agent with any individual or entity from January 1990 to 2019". That's a very interesting request. "The September 24, 2007 non-prosecution agreement between the US Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida and Mr. Jeffrey Epstein". This was an agreement pursuant to which Epstein received an incredible sweetheart deal for his rampant criminality. "5. All documents and

communications relating and referring to the September 24, 2007 non-prosecution agreement between the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida and Mr. Epstein".

Let's go down here. I'm just quickly going over this. "8. All entries from Jeffrey Epstein's address contact books. 9. All flight logs of arrival and/or departure for all aircraft. 10. Documents sufficient to show all bank accounts with corresponding account numbers opened by or associated with Jeffrey Epstein from January 1, 1990 through August 10th, 2019". I believe that's the day upon which he was supposedly killed. And let's quickly go over to the second page of this schedule. 12, at the top. "Epstein's calendars in whatever format, currently in the custody of the estate. 13. All documents and communications, including but not limited to manuals or instruction booklets – blah, blah, blah – relating to properties owned, rented, operated, or used by Epstein from January 1st, 1990 to August 10th, 2019". 19 years at what looks like eight separate addresses. And look at the properties this guy owned or rented. Wow. He's got this thing on the Upper East Side in New York City. He's got a Palm Beach property. He's got some ranch in New Mexico. He's got Avenue Foch – I've walked down that avenue when I was living in Paris, it's quite a pricey avenue. He's got apparently an apartment there in Paris, France. Going down the list, he's got, as we all know now, a couple things in the US Virgin Islands.

And then item 14 on this list: "All video, including security and CCTV or still photography". So they're not just asking for photos, still photos, they're asking for videos taken at any property owned, rented, operated, or used by Epstein during this 19-year period. And again, it lists some eight properties that are known to have been owned or rented by Epstein during that 19-year period. And then 15, this is the third and final page of the schedule: "All documents and communications to or from and or referring or relating to the following individuals: a) Virginia Guiffre, and b) all presidents and vice presidents of the US not otherwise listed in request 10a" in this schedule. And that'll pretty much, I think, give you a good flavor of just how incredibly expansive this subpoena is. And in general, the estate, unless it can establish some privilege applicable to any of the requested documents, is required and will have been required already to produce this huge body of evidence to this committee directly. So as we can see, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the subpoena issued by the committee to the Jeffrey Epstein estate in August of this year requires that the estate produce to the committee a hell of a lot more than those 95,000 photos they say they received on Thursday night. And the question then arises why has the committee not released that information with appropriate redactions where appropriate to protect the identities of survivors and victims of Jeffrey Epstein. And recall that the FBI says there were over a thousand, over a thousand victims of Jeffrey Epstein.

Now, a couple of weeks ago, I published a report in which I analyzed the Epstein Files Transparency Act. That's the legislation that Donald Trump passed into law on November 19th. I'll put a link to that video for those who are interested in my analysis of the legislation, I'll put a link to it in the description to this particular video on YouTube. As I explained, that act requires the Department of Justice to release the Epstein files by December 19th of this year. So we're talking less than a week from now. And it's interesting, and I'll come back to

this, the timing of this extremely tiny but embarrassing release for Donald Trump, that happened just six days before the deadline for the Trump administration to release the Epstein files in the possession of the Department of Justice.

At the time that the act became law in November, its sponsors crowed that they had achieved a big victory for transparency. But as I explained in my report on this legislation published a couple of weeks ago, it has gaping holes in it, so huge that Donald Trump himself could drive a truck through them. And he will undoubtedly exploit those carve outs in the legislation to release a minimum of scandalous evidence. And there's no question that the Democrats have to understand this. They have to understand that the legislation which Ro Khanna himself championed and about which they have crowed so much, in fact has huge carve-outs in it that virtually guarantees that the most scandalous material is not going to be disclosed to the public by the Trump administration.

So, my point here is that both the Democrats and the Republicans are withholding large amounts of critically important evidence. The Dems are bending over backwards to blame the concealment of the Epstein files on Trump and the Republicans, but there are plenty of reasons to blame the Democrats as well. They could have forced this issue, in fact, long before Trump returned to the White House in January of this year, but they did not do that. So no one should trust them now to come clean. It will be necessary for Americans to continue to apply pressure on both the Republicans and the Democrats to ensure that the public learns the whole truth about Epstein's powerful and depraved friends.

So now let's turn to the photos released on Friday. And I'll confine myself to what I believe to be and what I think you would consider to be the most interesting of the photos released at that time. So let's start with the one that's probably gotten the most coverage from the press. This is, as you can see, a photograph of Donald Trump with six women. I mean, I'm calling them women. For all we know, they are minors, they're in their teens, or maybe one or more of them are in their teens and others are not. We just don't know. At the same time, just based upon what we can see here, it's possible that all of those females are adults. But with their faces redacted, and what we can see in these photos, it's just not possible to say with any certainty whether any of those women is a minor or was a minor at the time this photograph was taken, nor is it possible to say with any certainty that any of these females were adults at the time that the photo was taken. And tellingly, the committee for some reason hasn't told us. They could have said "in this photograph, some of the females you see there, one or more of them, we have determined them to have been minors at the time". Or they could say, "one or more of them, we have determined them to have been victims of Jeffrey Epstein". Or they could say, "no, in fact, every single one of these women was of adult age at the time that the photograph was taken". Why wouldn't they release that information? Why would they leave us in a state of uncertainty? They could tell us the answers to those important questions without revealing the identity of any one of these females in this photograph, but for reasons that have not been disclosed, and frankly, I can't imagine what legitimate reason they could have for not at least telling us that much, we remain in the dark about all of that. But the key thing here is that by just by publishing a photo of a younger Trump, and do note how young

he looks in this photograph, with three females scantily clad or provocatively-attired females on each of his arms and their faces blacked out, the Democrats on this committee understood perfectly well that there was inevitably going to be an upsurge of speculation as to why their faces had been blackened out and whether that meant that one or more of them was a minor at the time and/or was a victim of Jeffrey Epstein.

So now let's take a look at another of the photos released on Friday, which featured Donald Trump. Here you can see Trump. It looks to me like he's even younger than he was in the prior photo. I lived in New York back in the 1990s, at which time Trump was a big wheel in the shyster real estate sector in New York City. And his fame was concentrated there in the Big Apple, and he frequently appeared on television. He was a regular on the local news networks. And just based on what I can recall about what Trump looked like back in the day, I would say that this photo dates back to the 90s, maybe the early 2000s. But my guess is it's back in the 90s. One thing is for sure, you know, Trump had been partying with Jeffrey Epstein for a good long time before he distanced himself from the pedophile. Now, I want to point out here, and this is the main reason why I want to show you this photo, that you have here an adult woman whose face has not been blacked out. So it's very clear, just based on this photograph, that the committee didn't simply black out the face of any female who happened to appear in one of these photos. And you'll see, I'm going to show you other photos where the faces of females have been blacked out, and photos where the faces of females have not been blacked out. And so clearly they were using some criteria to determine whether or not they were going to black out the faces of females in these photos. We're told that the main criterion that they employed was to protect the identities of the victims and of minors.

But again, they're kind of leaving us in the dark about exactly why any particular redaction was made. And they've not come out and said explicitly that the faces of females in photos with Donald Trump have been redacted precisely because they were determined to have been victims of Jeffrey Epstein, or because they were determined to have been minors at the time. There's really no excuse for the committee not being crystal clear about this. Why were the faces of females in these photos redacted and why were others not redacted? And I think to be perfectly blunt about it, that this uncertainty that they're leaving in our minds about exactly why they redacted some faces, not others, is intentional. They want to leave us in a state of uncertainty for reasons that I'm going to come back to.

So let's look at a third photo with Trump. Here you can see Trump, he appears to be on a private jet. Again, this time we have a female sitting beside him whose face has been redacted. Just looking at that photograph, it's possible that the female is an adult, it's possible that the female is a minor. You just can't tell from this image, especially with the face of this individual redacted. So why did they redact her face and not the face of the woman in the prior photograph? We're left to guess about that, to speculate, but the committee has not told us unequivocally why.



So now let's move on to some of these other dirtballs who were known to have frequented Trump. In here you can see a photograph of Steve Bannon, the Trump acolyte and mega influencer, mega mega influencer sitting at a desk with the disgraced pedophile who has in front of him an empty glass of wine. And interestingly, he also has on his desk photographs which have faces of females that have been redacted. So why have they been redacted? Did Epstein have on his desk pictures of underage females with whom he was in a compromising position or who were posing in a sexually suggestive manner? Did he have those sitting on his desk when he was meeting with Steve Bannon? Did Steve Bannon not notice those photographs when he was sitting there? And if he had noticed them, why didn't that cause him some concern? I mean, if their faces are blacked out, presumably that's because they were minors. And you can see in the photograph in the center of the picture, which is to Bannon's left, I mean, that looks to me like a young female lying down on a couch. Only the top half of her body is covered, and it looks like her legs are naked and it's not even clear that she's wearing any underwear. That does look from a distance like a sexually suggestive photo. The fact that the face has been blacked out indicates – but doesn't prove – that this female is a minor and/or a victim of Jeffrey Epstein. So again, this photo is sitting there just a couple of feet away from Steve Bannon. Did he not notice this photo? Did it not cause him to be extremely concerned about what was going on in the Epstein household?

So now let's move on to another picture of Steve Bannon. And here you can see Steve Bannon chummed up with Woody Allen. We don't know what year that is, we don't know where that is. I would guess that's some part of some palatial residence of Jeffrey Epstein, but that's just a guess, and I could be wrong about that. Now, as you may recall, Woody Allen, who appears, by the way, in four of the newly released photos, has been mired in sexual controversy for a long time. In August 1992, actress Mia Farrow alleged that Allen, with whom she began a romantic relationship in 1980, had sexually molested their adoptive daughter Dylan Farrow, then aged seven, in Mia Farrow's home in Bridgewater, Connecticut. Allen repeatedly denied the allegation, which was investigated and dismissed by both the judge in the custody case and New York Social Services in Connecticut, it was investigated without charges being filed. Allen and Mia Farrow had three children together, two adopted, Dylan and Moses, and one biological Satchel, now known as Ronan Farrow. A few months before Farrow made this allegation, she discovered that Allen and Soon-Yi Previn, whom Farrow had adopted with her former husband André Previn, had begun a sexual relationship in December 1991. At that time, Sun Yi Previn was about 20, 21 years old, and Allen was about 56. Now, to be clear, Alan has never been convicted of pedophilia, but at least this much is clear. I mean, the man at the age of 56 became involved sexually with a 20 or 21-year-old who was the adoptive child of his partner, Mia Farrow. I think we can safely say that at a bare minimum, Woody Allen is a creep.

Now, returning to Steve Bannon, there's one photo in this batch that is quite distressing for those of us who have admired Noam Chomsky for many years, and it's this photograph. Now, as many of you may know, it has already been established that Noam Chomsky had a friendship, and it appears to have been a significant friendship, a warm friendship with Jeffrey Epstein in the years following Epstein's conviction in Florida for having sex with a

minor. It was well known, widely known by the time Noam Chomsky became and remained Jeffrey Epstein's friend that Epstein was a rapacious pedophile, that he was unrepentant. Really, there's no genuine indication of remorse on his part for the crimes that he committed and the extraordinary suffering that he caused to so many girls and young women. And for some reason which befuddles me and many others Noam Chomsky nonetheless decided to become Jeffrey Epstein's friend and to remain his friend for years.

Now, I've said over and over again and I'll repeat it here that I don't think people should be stigmatized for their crimes if they show the fortitude and decency to learn from their mistakes and to become reintegrated into society as productive and ethical members of the community. I believe in wiping the slate clean. People make mistakes and we as a society should encourage reform and reintegration of convicted criminals into our communities. The thing is with Jeffrey Epstein there's absolutely indication that Epstein had any interest in helping to make amends to his victims, to society. In fact, he never was punished properly for it. He never paid a fair price for the horrors that he inflicted on over a thousand victims, and never expressed anything that appeared to be sincere remorse for what he had done. He continued to hang out with the rich and powerful, and continued to live in an extraordinarily privileged manner after the sweetheart deal that the criminal law enforcement authorities gave to Epstein. So there's no reason to believe that at the time that Noam Chomsky became his friend and was his friend, that Epstein was reformed and had committed himself to becoming a productive member of the community, a law-abiding and ethical member of the community.

So that was enough difficulty for us, those of us who have respected Noam Chomsky as I have for many years. But to see him in this photograph with Steve Bannon – you know, okay, Bannon didn't do the things as far as we know, there's not been demonstrated that Bannon did the things that Jeffrey Epstein did, but Bannon's politics are in every sense of the word offensive to those of Noam Chomsky, those that he championed during the course of his life. Does that mean that he should never have a discussion with Steve Bannon? They shouldn't have any interaction with Steve Bannon? No, I wouldn't go that far. But just looking at this photo, man, it looks like they're well beyond the point of having robust intellectual exchanges, and that there's a certain camaraderie between them. And I must say I have a lot of difficulty understanding that.

Now let's take another look at a photo involving Woody Allen. Here you can see a photograph of Allen on the right, Epstein on the left, having a jovial conversation over coffee. And between them is another female whose face has been blacked out. Again, just from this distance, that could be somebody who is a minor, that could be somebody who is a young adult. It's hard to tell, impossible really to say, just based on what we can see in this image, whether or not this female is an adult. And we're left to speculate that because her face has been redacted, she was a minor and or a victim of Epstein, but we just don't know. And for some reason, the committee is not telling us whether or not she's a minor or a victim of Epstein. And if they don't know, if the reason why they've redacted her face is because they don't know whether she's a minor or a victim of Epstein, then why don't they just tell us that?

"We redacted her face because we're not sure. And we need more time to figure it out". But again, they haven't disclosed anything, not even whether or not they're in a state of uncertainty about her identity. And so we're all just left to speculate about the reasons for the redaction, and they know perfectly well that a lot of people, probably a large majority of people, are going to draw the most adverse inference about who this young lady is. In other words, she is indeed a minor and a victim of Epstein.

So let us then move on to yet another photo of Woody Allen and the depraved sexual predator Epstein. And you can see here Allen's sitting at what looks like some kind of you know multimedia terminal. He's in a director's chair, it looks like he's got headphones around his neck, a lot of electronic equipment. It looks like he's either in a studio or he's on set. And for some reason, the disgraced pedophile is there with him. What he was doing on set or in a production studio of Woody Allen is an interesting question. Was he there looking for new victims to exploit? This is an important question. And I imagine Mr. Allen could provide us with an answer to that question. But as far as I know, he has no interest in helping us to understand the scope and nature of his relationship with Jeffrey Epstein.

And then another photo produced out of that little tiny batch by the committee on Friday features none other than the disgraced war criminal Ehud Barak. By now we all know that Barak was a close associate of Jeffrey Epstein, met with him on dozens of occasions after he was convicted of pedophilia, that Barak's right-hand man, who was a high-ranking official within the national security apparatus of the genocidal Israeli entity, stayed for extended periods on several occasions at Jeffrey Epstein's residence in New York. This doesn't really add anything new to our understanding, which is relevant to the point I'm going to make at the end of this report. But it's just another piece of evidence and a mountain of evidence that Jeffrey Epstein had a very, very close relationship with senior Israeli officials and the Israeli security apparatus.

Then moving on, the committee also published this photo. There he is, the one and only Bill Gates, one of the richest men in the world, and none other than the disgraced – yeah, I've used the word disgraced a lot in this report with good reason, I would say. You know, these are all people who should live in infamy and already do, many of them. And so it's interesting how Prince Andrew is looking at Gates. Gates seems to have a kind of expression on his face as if to say, "you know, I'm trying to look innocent here. And Andrew, you're not doing a good job of projecting innocence", because if anything, Andrew has the look of a man who's guilty or is about to engage in reprehensible conduct. Whether that's the case or not, who knows? But it's quite a striking image. And right between them you can see that they have blacked out another face. This time it's a male. Looks like a male, a man standing there with a tie. Why they've blacked out this person's face, that would be interesting. Is this person a minor? I don't think so. Is this person a victim of Jeffrey Epstein? Probably not, yet for some reason, again unexplained, the committee chose to black out this individual's face.

Now here is another photograph of Mr. Microsoft standing beside a pilot outside somebody's private jet. I don't know if that's the Lolita Express. Maybe somebody in our audience can say

but looks like he's a happy man, Mr. Gates, and he's about to get on to this private jet or maybe he's just getting off with some all important billionaire documentation.

And moving on from this photograph, we then come to Bill Clinton. And I think that this is an interesting photograph for a couple of reasons. First of all, it tells us absolutely nothing that we didn't already know. I'm not sure who the young woman on Bill Clinton's right is. She might be the partner of the man who's on our left side of the photo. But she definitely looks like an adult. And maybe others again who are watching this video can identify who that woman is. Obviously the woman on Bill Clinton's left is Ghislaine Maxwell, and there's Epstein. This was taken, obviously, fairly early on. Bill Clinton looks quite young in that photograph. I wonder whether he was even president at the time. He may well have been. It may have been after his presidency, shortly after his presidency, but he certainly looks a lot younger than he does today. Again, they have not redacted the faces of any of the individuals in this photo, so presumably they didn't think there was any sensitive information there. And it's interesting that the one and only photograph included in this batch of Bill Clinton doesn't contain anything we didn't already know and doesn't feature any individual whose face the committee thought it appropriate to redact. Again, I'm going to come back to that in a moment, what I think all of this means.

Now, let's move on here and have a look at the few remaining photos that I thought worthwhile to point out to you. Here's a photograph of Larry Summers, the former president of Harvard. Who's the individual across from him? I believe that's his spouse, but I'm not entirely sure. And the person sitting to Summers' right could be Woody Allen. I wouldn't rule out the possibility that that's Dershowitz, but I think it's most likely Woody Allen. In any case, again, this is a prominent figure from Democratic Party politics. Larry Summers served as Treasury Secretary in a Democratic administration, very closely tied to the Democratic Party leadership. And this doesn't tell us anything we didn't already know. In fact, we knew worse than this. We knew that from a prior release of documents, I believe it was a leaked document, actually, an email released a few weeks ago, which effectively destroyed whatever little credibility Larry Summers had left. Larry Summers was asking the convicted pedophile for dating advice involving a woman at Harvard for whom Summers describes himself as a mentor. So that's much worse than this. And so this doesn't add anything. What it does by including this photograph is it doesn't heighten the embarrassment for the Democrats or for Summers, because we already knew worse than this about Summers. But it does convey the impression that the Democrats who sit on this committee and who decided to release this stuff were being nonpartisan because they threw in a couple of prominent Democrats. Namely Summers and Bill Clinton. But what they threw in is not in any way, shape, or form enlightening us beyond what we already knew.

So then let's move on. A couple of more photographs I wanted to show you. There is a photograph of the gazillionaire Richard Branson with Jeffrey Epstein in some exotic location. They're all having a good laugh there. Now the individual who is seated to Branson's right wearing the blue jean short sleeves shirt – my understanding based on media reports is that this person is Dean Kamen, a biotech guru who is based in New Hampshire. And upon the

release of this photograph, Camen issued the following statement: "I have been a guest of Richard Branson on his Necker Island a number of times for conferences and fundraisers. I believe this photo must have been taken during one of these events many years ago. I have no knowledge of any of the horrific actions of Jeffrey Epstein other than what I have learned from news reports". Sounds like he's saying, hey man, I don't know where this was taken or when this was taken. Well, whether you do or you don't, fact of the matter is, if you met a man like Jeffrey Epstein, whether it was 10 or 15 years ago, given the stature that he had at that time, and his notoriety, I think you're likely to have remembered that, Mr. Kamen, but whatever.

Let's move on. Finally, shall we call it the *pièce de résistance*: Trump novelty condoms, at \$4,50 a piece. And as you can see, there's the Donald depicted on the packaging with the words, "I'm huuuuge". Now that's not something I've seen before. I don't think we've been shown the Trump novelty condoms. Undoubtedly the Democrats understood that this was going to be embarrassing to Trump. And it is new, although it's very, very far indeed from the worst that we know about Donald Trump. In any case, those are all the photos that I considered worthy of mention in this report.

So with that, I'd like to sum up what I think is going on here. And in my view, the timing is always quite instructive. So we are, as I said, just less than a week away from the deadline for releasing by the DOJ of the Epstein files. We know that the legislation, which was co-drafted by Republicans and Democrats, that there are gaping holes in it that will virtually guarantee that the most incriminating evidence is going to be withheld by the Trump DOJ. The Democrats know this. I think that they timed this little tiny release, less than a week from the deadline for Trump's DOJ to comply with the Trump Epstein Files Transparency Act, in order to maximize embarrassment for Trump. They did release some new information about Trump, like that photograph with the six young females whose faces have been redacted, the Trump novelty condoms. And there's another photograph of Trump with the face redacted of a woman or a younger female, again, raising a suspicion about whether that was a minor, but there's no confirmation of that.

All of this was done purely for one reason. We're getting these photos now at this time from the Democrats on the committee for one reason, and that is to embarrass Donald Trump before he has to meet a deadline, which they know he is not going to actually comply with at the end of the day, or he's not going to actually make full disclosure before the 19th of December, because the legislation that they co-sponsored, the Democrats, allows him, gives him pretext to withhold huge amounts of incriminating evidence. So all of this is just a game to them. It's all about positioning themselves as the transparency champions while depicting their opponents as the enemies of transparency when in fact the Democrats and the Republicans are in cahoots together trying to right to the 11th hour to withhold the most damaging information about the powerful men who moved in Jeffrey Epstein's circle of influence.

So I suggest, my friends, that what you take away from this analysis, and this is really the main point I want to make, is: do not assume that we are going to get full disclosure from either the committee or the Trump DOJ by December 19th, pursuant to this legislation or their supposed commitment to transparency. It's going to take a lot more work. Progress has been made in uncovering the truth about this circle of predators and thieves and liars. But we have a lot of work remaining to be done, and it'll be absolutely critical in the weeks and the months ahead for the public to maintain pressure on both the Republicans and the Democrats to come clean. This is Dimitri Lascaris coming to you from Montreal, Canada on December 14th, 2025.

**END**

---

**We recently launched our crowdfunding campaign so that we can continue our independent and non-profit journalism in 2026. Support us today:**

**BANKKONTO:**

Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.  
Bank: GLS Bank  
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600  
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

**PAYPAL:**

E-Mail:  
PayPal@acTVism.org

**PATREON:**

<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

**BETTERPLACE:**

Link: [Click here](#)