# THE TRUMP EXTRACTION

**An Investigative Triptych**

**Robert Wright**

***The Systems Changed.***

***The Mechanism Didn't.***

**August 2026**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

## PREFACE

For more than a century, the Trump family has occupied a prominent place in American business, culture, and politics. Its rise has been explained in many ways: entrepreneurship, branding, real estate, celebrity, media, and political influence. This work examines a different possibility.

It asks whether the historical record reveals a recurring pattern in which wealth, influence, and power were accumulated through the exploitation of existing systems and institutional opportunities rather than through the creation of new productive value. It does not begin by assuming that such a pattern exists. Instead, it examines whether the documentary record supports that conclusion.

Each generation of the Trump family operated within a distinct economic, political, and institutional environment. The question is not whether those environments changed—they clearly did—but whether the underlying mechanism remained recognizable as opportunities, institutions, and historical circumstances evolved.

This investigation neither seeks to defend nor to condemn. Its purpose is to determine whether the available historical evidence supports interpreting three generations of the Trump family's public career through the analytical framework introduced in the chapters that follow.

This Investigative Triptych pursues three complementary objectives.

First, it presents a documented historical narrative examining whether a recurring extraction model can be observed across three generations of the Trump family.

Second, it assembles and preserves the documentary record supporting that narrative so readers may independently evaluate the evidence, distinguish documented fact from reasonable inference, and understand the basis for each conclusion.

Third, it identifies unresolved questions, missing records, and investigative pathways that remain available to future researchers, journalists, historians, auditors, inspectors general, congressional oversight bodies, law-enforcement authorities, courts, and others with the authority necessary to complete the public record.

Although the institutional environment changes dramatically from one generation to the next, the investigation asks whether a recognizable underlying mechanism persists across those changes.

The investigation proceeds chronologically.

Panel I examines Friedrich Trump during the Klondike Gold Rush, asking whether the family fortune began by recognizing that the greatest opportunities often lay not in extracting gold from the earth, but in extracting value from the economy surrounding those who sought it.

Panel II examines Fred Trump during the expansion of federally supported housing, asking whether the unprecedented partnership between government and private enterprise created institutional opportunities that sophisticated developers learned to exploit.

Panel III examines Donald Trump within the interconnected institutions of media, branding, politics, religion, and executive authority, culminating in the Freedom 250 and Mining Executive Authority investigations and the questions they raise concerning public accountability, administrative capacity, institutional oversight, and the exercise of public authority.

Each Panel stands as an independent historical case study. Together, they test a single proposition: whether a recurring mechanism of extraction can be observed across profoundly different institutional environments.

Whether the historical record ultimately supports that proposition is the question this investigation invites the reader to decide.

---

## METHODOLOGY

This report is organized as an investigative examination rather than a conventional biography. It begins not with a conclusion, but with a hypothesis.

To test that hypothesis, this Investigative Triptych applies the same analytical framework to three chronological case studies. Each Panel begins by establishing its historical context, examines the relevant evidence, identifies characteristics consistent with the Extraction Model where supported by the record, and concludes with an assessment of what that generation contributes to the broader inquiry.

Throughout each Panel, the same four questions are asked:

• What institutional system existed?

• What vulnerabilities characterized that system?

• How were those vulnerabilities used to accumulate wealth, influence, or power?

• Did the underlying mechanism persist as institutions evolved?

The framework permits comparison across changing historical circumstances without treating any single Panel or controversy as sufficient to establish the broader hypothesis.

This report relies primarily on publicly available evidence, including statutes enacted by Congress, legislative materials, government reports, official financial records, court documents, corporate records, contemporaneous newspaper accounts, academic scholarship, historical publications, and other primary or authoritative secondary sources. Wherever practical, conclusions are supported by citations that enable readers to examine the underlying evidence independently.

Because historical investigations frequently encounter incomplete, conflicting, or fragmentary records, this report distinguishes carefully among three levels of evidentiary certainty.

Documented Fact refers to information directly supported by reliable evidence.

Reasonable Inference refers to conclusions that logically follow from documented facts but are not themselves explicitly stated in a primary source.

Unresolved Question identifies issues for which the available record remains incomplete or insufficient to support a reliable conclusion.

Particular attention is given to statutory accountability and the administration of public funds. When congressional appropriations or government programs are examined, the report seeks to reconstruct the public accounting trail through official budget execution documents, financial reporting systems, congressional reports, agency disclosures, audits, and other governmental records. Where those records permit independent verification, they are used to evaluate the movement and disposition of public funds. Where the public record does not permit reconstruction of that accounting trail, the absence itself is treated as a documented finding rather than evidence of wrongdoing. Missing documentation may reveal limitations in the publicly available record, but it does not, standing alone, establish misconduct.

In addition to reconstructing documentary records, the report examines the relationship between institutional action and public accountability. Statutes, appropriations, executive actions, administrative implementation, financial disbursements, reporting requirements, audits, and public disclosures rarely occur simultaneously. The analysis therefore considers whether meaningful intervals existed between the exercise of authority or expenditure of public resources and the point at which sufficient documentation became available to permit independent public accountability.

The existence of such an interval does not imply misconduct. It is an observable characteristic of institutional systems whose significance must be evaluated through the evidence developed in each Panel.

## THE EXTRACTION MODEL

As used throughout this report, extraction refers to the accumulation of wealth, influence, or power primarily through the exploitation of existing systems, institutional weaknesses, or human vulnerabilities rather than the creation of new productive value. The systems themselves may differ dramatically. Frontier economies, federal housing programs, financial institutions, media ecosystems, political organizations, and governmental authority each operate according to their own rules. Yet each also creates opportunities that may be recognized and exploited by individuals who understand how those systems function.

Extraction is an analytical rather than moral or legal category. It may occur within existing legal frameworks, in areas where law, regulation, enforcement, and ethical responsibility do not align, or through conduct later judged unlawful. The term describes a mechanism—the strategic transfer of value from institutions, governments, markets, or populations to private individuals or organizations—without presuming criminality, motive, or moral character.

A recurring characteristic of extraction is adaptation. Institutions evolve over time, and successful extractive strategies evolve with them. Opportunities available during the Klondike Gold Rush differed fundamentally from those created by twentieth-century federal housing programs, just as both differ from those presented by modern media, political institutions, executive authority, and digital communication. If a recurring mechanism exists, it should therefore be expected to appear in different forms rather than through identical conduct.

This investigation proposes that extraction commonly operates through a sequence of identifiable stages.

First, an institutional system creates opportunity. Whether through government policy, market expansion, public investment, technological innovation, or social change, new structures emerge that distribute resources, authority, or economic advantage.

Second, those systems develop vulnerabilities. Complexity, limited oversight, imperfect regulation, fragmented accountability, or rapidly changing conditions create opportunities that are not equally recognized by all participants.

Third, individuals positioned to recognize those opportunities convert institutional advantage into private benefit. The methods employed vary according to the system itself, but the underlying mechanism remains consistent: value is transferred through strategic exploitation of the system rather than through the creation of entirely new productive capacity.

Finally, institutions respond. Laws are amended, regulations strengthened, oversight expanded, or public expectations change. The original opportunity narrows or disappears, and extraction shifts toward newly emerging systems where comparable vulnerabilities remain.

A further characteristic is the interval between institutional action and meaningful public accountability. As described in the Methodology, decisions or transfers may occur before sufficient documentation becomes available for independent scrutiny. That interval does not establish misconduct itself, but it can become significant when evaluating how institutional opportunities operate in practice.

The Extraction Model is not intended to prove the investigation's hypothesis. Instead, it provides readers with a consistent analytical framework that can be tested against the documentary evidence presented in each Panel. If the evidence supports the model, it strengthens the broader hypothesis. If it does not, the hypothesis must be reconsidered. In either case, the documentary record—not the model itself—remains the final authority.

## PANEL I

### Friedrich Trump - Extraction on the Frontier

### Historical Context

Every period of rapid economic expansion produces its own mythology. Fortunes are remembered. Fortunes lost are forgotten. The Klondike Gold Rush, like the California Gold Rush before it, entered American and Canadian folklore as a story of rugged individualism, extraordinary perseverance, and sudden wealth. Popular imagination remembers prospectors standing knee-deep in icy streams, discovering rich veins of gold through determination, endurance, and luck.

The historical reality was considerably more complex.

Gold discoveries create more than miners. They create entire economies. Thousands of people converge on isolated regions almost overnight, bringing with them demand for food, shelter, transportation, equipment, entertainment, financial services, and every necessity required to sustain life in environments often incapable of supporting such rapid population growth. While only a small percentage of prospectors ultimately discovered significant deposits of gold, nearly every participant became a customer in this newly emerging economy.

As a result, the greatest fortunes associated with many gold rushes were not always earned by extracting precious metals from the ground. They were often accumulated by those who supplied the miners, financed their expeditions, transported their equipment, sold provisions, operated lodging, or provided the countless commercial services that transformed temporary mining camps into functioning frontier communities.

The Klondike Gold Rush exemplified this broader economic phenomenon. Between 1896 and the early years of the twentieth century, tens of thousands of prospectors traveled north toward the Yukon after news spread of major gold discoveries along the Klondike

River.[1] Most arrived with dreams of personal fortune. Many endured extraordinary hardships. Relatively few achieved lasting financial success through mining itself.[2]

Yet the influx of people generated something equally valuable: an economy built upon the needs of those pursuing gold.[3]

It was into this rapidly expanding frontier economy that Friedrich Trump entered.

**The Frontier Economy**

The Klondike Gold Rush was more than a mining boom. It was the rapid creation of an entirely new frontier economy under some of the harshest conditions in North America. Gold may have attracted the population, but sustaining it required an extensive commercial infrastructure that scarcely existed before the rush began.

The journey alone demanded enormous preparation. Canadian authorities required prospectors entering the Yukon to carry approximately one year's worth of provisions, a policy intended to prevent starvation in a region where local food production was virtually nonexistent. The required supplies—food, clothing, tools, tents, fuel, and equipment—often weighed close to a ton.[4] Before many prospectors ever reached a mining claim, they had already invested much of their available capital simply to get there.

Those who completed the journey entered an economy defined by scarcity. Every necessity had to be transported over mountains, rivers, or frozen trails.[5] Limited transportation, extreme weather, and rapidly growing settlements combined to drive prices well above those in established cities. Food, lodging, freight services, livestock, equipment, and everyday consumer goods all commanded substantial premiums because demand consistently exceeded local supply.

---

[1] Pierre Berton, *Klondike: The Last Great Gold Rush, 1896–1899* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1972), 3–70.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Parks Canada, "Chilkoot Trail National Historic Site," Government of Canada, accessed July 31, 2026.
[5] Berton, *Klondike*, 121–220.

The result was an economy in which commercial opportunity extended far beyond mining itself. Merchants sold provisions. Teamsters transported freight. Boat builders moved people and supplies along the Yukon River. Hotel operators provided lodging to an increasingly transient population. Restaurants, saloons, entertainment venues, and numerous other businesses emerged to serve thousands of individuals who required food, shelter, recreation, and companionship while pursuing uncertain fortunes.

Before examining the businesses Friedrich Trump established, it is helpful to understand the man himself, the circumstances that brought him to North America, and the economic instincts that would shape his approach to opportunity on the frontier.

**Building the Enterprise**

Friedrich Trump did not arrive in North America with substantial capital, established business connections, or a clear path to wealth. Born in Kallstadt in the Kingdom of Bavaria in 1869, he was the son of a local winegrower. His father died when Friedrich was still young, leaving the family with limited financial resources and few opportunities for significant economic advancement.[6]

Like millions of Europeans during the late nineteenth century, Friedrich immigrated to the United States seeking opportunities unavailable in his homeland. He arrived in New York in 1885 at the age of sixteen and initially worked as a barber, learning a trade that provided modest but steady income. During his early years in America, there is little evidence that he possessed substantial wealth or extraordinary social standing. His circumstances were those of many recent immigrants attempting to establish themselves through ordinary employment.[7]

The rapidly changing American economy, however, offered possibilities unavailable in rural Bavaria. As reports of mineral discoveries spread across the American West and later into the Canadian Yukon, successive waves of migration created temporary frontier economies

---

[6] Gwenda Blair, *The Trumps: Three Generations That Built an Empire* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), 15–22.
[7] Blair, *The Trumps*, 22–26.

wherever new mining districts emerged. These settlements were characterized by explosive population growth, limited infrastructure, and constant demand for commercial services.[8]

Instead of remaining in established eastern cities, Friedrich demonstrated a willingness to follow opportunity to regions where economic conditions were changing most rapidly. Before reaching the Klondike, he spent time in the Pacific Northwest, participating in commercial ventures that served mining communities rather than engaging in mining itself.[9]

The businesses he established reflected that practical understanding of frontier economics and became the first documented example examined in this report of what later chapters identify as the Extraction Model.

**Restaurants, Hotels, and Brothels**

As prospectors poured into the Yukon, frontier settlements expanded with remarkable speed. Towns that scarcely existed months earlier became crowded commercial centers almost overnight. Their populations fluctuated constantly as miners arrived, departed, struck claims, or abandoned unsuccessful expeditions. Despite this uncertainty, one characteristic remained remarkably consistent: every newcomer required food, shelter, and basic services regardless of whether gold was ever discovered.

A miner might or might not find gold. He would, however, need meals, lodging, warmth, comfort, supplies, and a place to rest.

Working with business partners, Friedrich established a succession of restaurants and hotels in rapidly developing mining communities, including Bennett and later Whitehorse. These establishments were strategically located along major transportation routes where large numbers of prospectors paused before continuing toward the gold fields or returning

---

[8] Parks Canada, "Chilkoot Trail."
[9] Blair, *The Trumps*, 22–35.

south.  Their locations ensured a steady flow of customers regardless of individual mining success.[10]

Contemporary newspaper advertisements and business notices reveal that these establishments offered considerably more than simple accommodation. They promoted well-prepared meals, comfortable rooms, and attentive service at a time when such amenities were scarce. In an environment defined by harsh weather, exhausting travel, and primitive living conditions, comfort itself became a valuable commodity.

Historical accounts also indicate that some of Friedrich Trump's establishments catered to the broader recreational demands common throughout frontier mining camps. Restaurants, saloons, gambling, alcohol, and prostitution frequently developed alongside mining settlements wherever large populations of predominantly male laborers accumulated with disposable income and few forms of organized social life. These activities were neither unique to Friedrich Trump's businesses nor unusual within frontier commercial districts. They formed part of a larger service economy that emerged repeatedly throughout nineteenth-century mining regions across North America.

One contemporary advertisement for the Arctic Restaurant and Hotel became particularly notable for its promise of "Private Rooms for Ladies," language widely understood at the time as a discreet reference to prostitution.  While historians continue to debate the precise nature and extent of these operations, the documentary record leaves little doubt that such language carried meanings readily recognized by contemporary readers. Whether viewed as marketing, euphemism, or direct commercial practice, the advertisement illustrates the willingness of frontier entrepreneurs to provide whatever services the market demanded.[11]

In that sense, the restaurants, hotels, and associated services represented more than successful frontier enterprises. They constituted the first documented example examined in this report of an approach that would reappear, in different forms and under different

[10] Blair, *The Trumps,* 72–93.
[11] “Arctic Restaurant,” *Whitehorse Star*, May 1, 1901.

institutional conditions, across subsequent generations: identifying where value was already moving through an existing system and positioning oneself to participate in that flow rather than creating an entirely new one.

**Miner of Miners**

Popular histories often remember the Klondike through its successful prospectors. Their discoveries became the legends of the Gold Rush, reinforcing the enduring image that wealth belonged primarily to those who uncovered gold-bearing ground.

The documentary record suggests a more nuanced reality.

The overwhelming majority of prospectors never became wealthy. Many returned home with little or nothing to show for months of hardship. Some never recovered the money they invested simply reaching the Yukon. Yet throughout this period, businesses supplying the mining camps continued to generate revenue regardless of whether individual miners succeeded or failed.

His financial success depended upon participation in an economy created by mining rather than mining itself. Every meal sold, every room rented, every shipment supplied, and every service provided drew its value from the continuous movement of thousands of prospectors through the frontier economy. Gold discoveries fueled demand, but the commercial system surrounding those discoveries generated opportunities for wealth of its own.

From an economic perspective, Friedrich Trump reduced one of the greatest risks confronting individual prospectors. A miner's income depended upon uncertain geological success. A hotel proprietor's income depended upon the far more predictable needs of a growing population. Even unsuccessful miners required food, lodging, transportation, and provisions. Their failure to discover gold did not eliminate demand for those services; in many cases, it prolonged it.

In modern economic terms, he positioned himself upstream from individual success and downstream from collective demand. As long as people continued pursuing gold, commerce continued flowing through businesses that served them.

That business judgment marks the first clear appearance of the pattern examined throughout this Investigative Triptych. Instead of competing directly for the resource that attracted public attention, Friedrich Trump identified the larger system supporting that pursuit and established enterprises designed to benefit from its continued operation.

It is for this reason that Friedrich Trump may reasonably be described—not as one of the miners—but as a miner of miners. He did not extract gold from the earth. He extracted gold from those who came to extract gold from the earth.

This distinction provides the first historical expression of the Extraction Model. In later generations, the institutions would change. Mining camps would give way to federal housing programs, mass media, political organizations, and governmental authority. Yet the central question would remain remarkably similar: not what system existed, but whether opportunity was consistently found within the systems built by others.

**Another Kind of Extraction**

Friedrich Trump was not alone in recognizing that the Klondike economy offered opportunities to those who understood that the prospectors themselves could be more reliable sources of wealth than the gold they pursued.

One of the most notorious examples was Jefferson Randolph “Soapy” Smith.

Smith arrived in Skagway, Alaska, as thousands of stampeders were passing through the town on their way toward the Klondike. Unlike Friedrich Trump, Smith did not build his enterprise primarily around providing legitimate food and lodging. He assembled an organized network of confidence men, gamblers, and accomplices who profited by separating newly arrived travelers from their money.

Among the most ingenious operations associated with Smith was a fraudulent telegraph office. Skagway had no functioning telegraph connection to the outside world, but travelers could enter the office, pay to send messages to relatives and business associates back home, and sometimes receive apparent replies. The wires, however, did not connect Skagway to the outside world. The telegraph operation created the appearance of communications infrastructure where none actually existed and extracted money from travelers who had little practical means of discovering the deception.

Smith's organization employed other methods as well. Rigged gambling games, shell games, confidence schemes, and accomplices posing as helpful local residents targeted newcomers unfamiliar with the town.[12] The transient character of the gold rush made such schemes particularly effective. New prospectors continually arrived carrying money and supplies, while victims frequently moved onward toward the Yukon before they could effectively challenge those who had cheated them.

The comparison with Friedrich Trump requires an important distinction. The surviving record does not justify equating Friedrich Trump's documented commercial enterprises with Soapy Smith's criminal confidence schemes. Friedrich operated restaurants and hotels that provided actual goods and services for which customers paid. Smith's organization deliberately relied upon deception and fraud.

What they shared was not a method, but an economic insight.

Both recognized that the migration itself had created an economy. Thousands of people were moving toward a distant resource carrying money, equipment, expectations, and immediate needs. The gold might enrich only a fraction of them. The population pursuing it, however, created opportunities every day.

The frontier therefore supported multiple forms of extraction. Some entrepreneurs sold meals, beds, transportation, equipment, alcohol, entertainment, and companionship.

---

[12] Smithsonian National Postal Museum, “Banking on the Stampeders — Dyea vs. Skagway,” National Postal Museum, Smithsonian Institution, accessed September 14, 2026.

Others exploited gambling, deception, or outright fraud. The methods ranged from legitimate commerce to criminal enterprise, but all depended upon the extraordinary concentration and movement of people produced by the Gold Rush.

The migration itself became an economy, from which people found remarkably different ways to profit.

**Return to Germany**

By the opening years of the twentieth century, Friedrich Trump had accumulated considerably more wealth than he possessed when he arrived in North America as a teenage immigrant. The Klondike Gold Rush was beginning to mature. Temporary mining camps were evolving into more permanent communities, transportation was improving, and government institutions were becoming more firmly established across the Yukon.

Those changes altered the business environment that had made Friedrich's frontier enterprises so profitable.

During the height of the gold rush, commercial activity had expanded faster than governmental oversight. Restaurants, hotels, gambling establishments, saloons, and houses of prostitution flourished in communities where thousands of transient miners created enormous demand and regulation often lagged behind development. As civil authority became more firmly established, law enforcement increasingly sought to impose order on frontier settlements. The North-West Mounted Police, whose responsibilities were later assumed by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, intensified efforts to regulate gambling, prostitution, and other activities that had become commonplace during the boom years.[13]

It was during this period of transition that Friedrich Trump sold his business interests and left the Yukon.

---

[13] *North-West Mounted Police Records, Dawson City Detachment, Klondike Gold Rush, 1897–1903*, Héritage / Library and Archives Canada.

The timing has attracted the attention of several historians. Although the documentary record does not establish a single reason for Friedrich's departure, the changing regulatory environment forms an important part of the historical context. His decision coincided with a period in which frontier vice businesses faced increasing official scrutiny and enforcement. Whether those developments materially influenced his decision cannot be stated with certainty, but the chronology is sufficiently close to merit consideration alongside other factors, including his financial success and his desire to return home.

In 1901 Friedrich returned to Kallstadt with the intention of settling permanently. Having achieved financial security, he and his new wife, Elisabeth Christ, sought to establish a prosperous future in Bavaria. From Friedrich's perspective, he had accomplished what many immigrants hoped to achieve: build a successful enterprise abroad and return home with the means to begin a new chapter.

The Bavarian government viewed his return differently.

When Friedrich emigrated in 1885, he had departed Bavaria without completing the compulsory military service required of young men under Bavarian law. Authorities regarded his departure as an unlawful emigration intended to avoid that obligation. Although more than fifteen years had passed, the issue remained unresolved.

In 1905 Bavarian officials formally determined that Friedrich Trump had forfeited his right to reside in the Kingdom. His appeals were rejected, and he was ordered to leave Bavaria. Despite his financial success and desire to remain, the decision stood.[14]

Friedrich and Elisabeth returned to the United States, where the family established permanent roots. The capital accumulated in the frontier economy would not remain an isolated chapter in the family's history. It became the foundation upon which the next generation would build—this time within a very different system of opportunity.[15]

[14] Kate Connolly, "Donald Trump's Grandfather Was Deported from Germany," *The Guardian*, September 29, 2016.
[15] Ian Frazier, "An Immigrant Named Trump," *The New Yorker*, October 1, 2016.

**The Emergence of the Extraction Model**

Historical investigations begin with evidence rather than conclusions. The purpose of this first Panel has been to determine whether Friedrich Trump's business career reveals more than the success of an ambitious immigrant. Specifically, it has asked whether the historical record demonstrates a recognizable pattern of wealth creation.

The evidence suggests that it does.

This approach was neither unique nor unlawful. Countless merchants, freight operators, bankers, and hotel proprietors prospered in much the same way. Friedrich Trump's historical significance lies elsewhere. His documented business career provides a particularly clear example of a broader economic principle: enduring wealth is often created by recognizing where value already exists within an expanding system.

In this report, that principle is described as the Extraction Model.

One generation alone cannot establish a recurring family pattern. It can, however, establish a documented point of comparison.

This Panel does not argue that Friedrich Trump's methods predetermined the actions of his descendants. Instead, it establishes the earliest documented expression of a mechanism that will now be examined under entirely different historical conditions. If comparable patterns emerge across subsequent generations despite dramatic changes in institutions, industries, and sources of wealth, the evidence for a recurring model becomes progressively stronger.

The analysis now moves from the frontier to the federal government.

The setting changes.

The institutions change.

The mechanism remains under examination.

## Evidence Assessment

The documentary record presented in Panel I provides a substantial evidentiary foundation for understanding Friedrich Trump's business career during the Klondike Gold Rush. Contemporary advertisements, property records, newspaper accounts, government documents, and later historical scholarship consistently establish that he accumulated wealth not through mining, but through commercial enterprises serving the rapidly expanding frontier economy.

The record also demonstrates that these businesses operated within a broader commercial environment in which restaurants, hotels, gambling, alcohol, and prostitution formed part of the hospitality economy common to many frontier mining communities. Although historians continue to debate the precise extent of activities associated with individual establishments, the available evidence places Friedrich Trump's enterprises squarely within that documented historical context.

Finally, the chronology surrounding Friedrich Trump's departure from the Yukon coincides with a period of increasing governmental regulation and more active law enforcement. While the available evidence does not establish that changing enforcement alone prompted his departure, it forms an important part of the historical circumstances surrounding the conclusion of his frontier business career.

Whether this represents the first expression of a recurring family pattern cannot be determined from a single historical case. That question remains unresolved and must be tested against subsequent generations.

## Panel I Conclusions

The evidence examined in Panel I supports the following conclusions:

1. Friedrich Trump accumulated his fortune by recognizing where economic value concentrated within an existing frontier economy rather than by participating directly in the activity that generated that economy.

2. His documented business career provides the earliest historical example examined in this report of what is described as the Extraction Model: identifying opportunity within an existing system and positioning oneself where value naturally accumulated.

3. The documentary record establishes a historical baseline but does not, by itself, demonstrate a recurring family pattern. One generation can establish a precedent; it cannot establish continuity.

4. The central question therefore remains unchanged. If the same underlying mechanism appears within the fundamentally different institutional environment inherited by Fred Trump, the evidence for a recurring Extraction Model becomes progressively stronger. If it does not, Friedrich Trump's success may be understood as the achievement of an exceptionally capable frontier entrepreneur operating within the unique conditions of the Klondike Gold Rush.

The frontier disappears.

Government emerges.

## PANEL II

### Fred Trump – Extraction Through Government

### Historical Context

Every generation inherits the economic systems created by those who came before it. Occasionally, however, a national crisis transforms those systems so profoundly that entirely new opportunities emerge.

The Great Depression was one of those moments.

By the early 1930s, the American housing market had entered a period of unprecedented collapse.[16] Millions of workers had lost their jobs. Banks failed in alarming numbers. Property values fell sharply, mortgage lending contracted, and foreclosures swept across communities throughout the country. The housing industry, which had fueled economic growth during the previous decade, nearly ground to a halt.

The crisis exposed structural weaknesses that had existed long before the stock market crash.[17] Home financing in the early twentieth century differed dramatically from the mortgage system Americans recognize today. Borrowers were often required to make substantial down payments and secure short-term loans that typically matured within five to ten years.[18] Rather than gradually paying down principal over decades, many homeowners expected to refinance or satisfy a large balloon payment when the loan came due.[19] As credit tightened and banks failed, refinancing became increasingly impossible.[20] Families who had faithfully made payments suddenly faced foreclosure, not because they lacked equity, but because the financial system itself had ceased to function.

---

[16] Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 190–218.
[17] David Freund, *Colored Property: State Policy and White Racial Politics in Suburban America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 26–31.
[18] *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, "The Forgotten History of the Mortgage," accessed August 4, 2026*.
[19] Ben S. Bernanke, "*Housing, Housing Finance, and Monetary Policy,*" speech presented at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Economic Symposium, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, August 31, 2007, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, accessed August 4, 2026.
[20] Gary Richardson, *"Banking Panics of 1930–31," Federal Reserve History*, accessed August 4, 2026.

Private lenders responded predictably. Faced with mounting losses and widespread economic uncertainty, they reduced lending or withdrew from the housing market altogether. Residential construction collapsed. Builders struggled to obtain financing for new projects, banks became increasingly reluctant to assume additional risk, and prospective homeowners found credit either unavailable or prohibitively expensive. The nation's housing crisis became both a symptom of the Depression and a force that deepened it.

For the federal government, the implications extended beyond individual homeowners. Housing had become intertwined with employment, banking, manufacturing, and local economies. Every home constructed generated demand for labor, lumber, steel, concrete, transportation, appliances, and countless related industries. Conversely, every abandoned construction project represented lost jobs, declining tax revenues, weakened financial institutions, and further economic contraction. Stabilizing housing therefore became an essential component of national economic recovery.

The federal response marked one of the most significant shifts in the relationship between government and private enterprise in American history. Rather than replacing private builders or nationalizing the housing industry, Congress sought to restore confidence in the existing market. Through a series of New Deal initiatives, the federal government created institutions designed to reduce lending risk, stabilize mortgage finance, and encourage private investment in residential construction.[21]

That distinction is central to understanding the system that emerged.

The government did not become America's largest homebuilder.

It became the guarantor of the financial framework within which private builders operated.

Federal mortgage insurance reduced risk for lenders. Banks extended more credit. Developers gained access to financing for increasingly ambitious projects. Millions of

---

[21] *National Housing Act*, Pub. L. No. 73-479, 48 Stat. 1246 (June 27, 1934), U.S. Government Publishing Office (accessed August 4, 2026).

American families who had previously been excluded from homeownership found mortgages within reach. The result was not merely the recovery of the housing industry, but the creation of a fundamentally new partnership between public policy and private enterprise.

That partnership reshaped the American landscape for decades to come.

It also created extraordinary opportunities for developers who understood how to operate successfully within the new system.

One of them was Fred Trump.

**The Federal Housing System**

The collapse of the housing market during the Great Depression confronted Congress with a problem that private markets had proven unable to solve. Mortgage lending had contracted, banks were reluctant to extend credit, residential construction had nearly ceased, and millions of Americans who might otherwise have purchased homes found financing unavailable. Restoring confidence in the housing market required more than economic recovery alone. It required rebuilding the financial system through which homes were bought, financed, and constructed.

Congress responded not by replacing private enterprise, but by restructuring the financial framework within which it operated. Beginning in the 1930s, a series of legislative initiatives transformed American housing finance. Collectively, these measures became one of the largest and most enduring partnerships between the federal government and private industry in American history.

Among the most significant reforms was the creation of the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) through the National Housing Act of 1934. The FHA did not lend money directly to homebuyers or construct housing itself. Instead, it insured mortgages issued by approved private lenders.[22] By assuming much of the lender's financial risk, the federal government

[22] United States Congress, *National Housing Act*, Pub. L. No. 73-479, 48 Stat. 1246 (June 27, 1934), U.S. Government Publishing Office.

encouraged banks to extend credit under terms that previously would have been considered too risky.

The effects were profound. Down payments became more manageable. Mortgage repayment periods lengthened dramatically. The short-term balloon loans that had contributed to widespread foreclosures gradually gave way to long-term, fully amortized mortgages that families could realistically repay through regular monthly installments.[23] Homeownership, once financially inaccessible to many working Americans, became attainable for millions.

The new system also transformed residential construction. Developers who previously struggled to obtain financing for large-scale projects now found lenders far more willing to provide capital when those projects qualified for FHA mortgage insurance. The federal government was not subsidizing individual builders in the conventional sense. Instead, it created a financial environment in which private capital could flow more confidently into residential development because a significant portion of the underlying lending risk had been shifted through federal insurance.[24]

This distinction proved critical. The FHA did not guarantee that every project would succeed, nor did it eliminate ordinary business risks. Developers still acquired land, managed construction, negotiated contracts, and marketed completed homes. Yet the federal government had fundamentally altered the economics of housing finance by reducing one of the greatest obstacles to large-scale residential development: uncertainty within the mortgage market.

The transformation extended well beyond individual home buyers or developers. Mortgage insurance stimulated lending. Increased lending encouraged construction. Construction generated employment across industries ranging from lumber and steel to transportation, manufacturing, and household appliances. Each completed subdivision produced

---

[23] National Housing Act of 1934, Pub. L. No. 73-479, 48 Stat. 1246.
[24] Kenneth T. Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 203–218.

economic activity far beyond the homes themselves. Housing became not merely a consumer market, but an instrument of national economic policy.

The federal government therefore occupied a position unlike any it had previously held. It neither owned the housing industry nor withdrew from it. Instead, it established the financial rules under which private enterprise increasingly operated. Government supplied stability, lenders supplied capital, and private developers supplied construction. The success of the system depended upon the interaction of all three.

Like every institutional system examined in this Investigative Triptych, however, the new housing framework created opportunities alongside its intended benefits. Programs designed to encourage investment, accelerate construction, and expand homeownership necessarily required administrative rules, financial incentives, valuation methods, and oversight mechanisms. Those features made the system effective. They also created administrative complexities and oversight gaps that rewarded those who understood the system better than those who designed it.

Understanding those institutional mechanics is essential before examining Fred Trump's career. The question is not whether the federal housing system succeeded in expanding American homeownership. By most historical measures, it did. The question this report asks is different: once this new partnership between government and private enterprise existed, how did experienced developers operate within it, and what opportunities did that system create for those who understood it best?

**Fred Trump and the Postwar Housing Boom**

By the time the Second World War ended, the federal housing system established during the New Deal had matured into one of the nation's most important engines of economic growth. Millions of returning veterans required housing. Wartime restrictions on civilian construction had produced severe housing shortages, while rapid population growth and the emerging Baby Boom placed additional pressure on communities throughout the country. Meeting that demand became both an economic necessity and a national priority.

Congress responded by expanding, rather than abandoning, the federal partnership with private enterprise. Programs administered through the Federal Housing Administration were complemented by additional initiatives, including mortgage guarantees for eligible veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the GI Bill.[25] Together, these programs dramatically increased access to mortgage financing while encouraging large-scale residential construction across the United States.

Few regions experienced this transformation more rapidly than New York City and its surrounding suburbs. Population growth, postwar prosperity, and federal financing combined to produce an unprecedented demand for moderately priced apartments and single-family homes. Developers capable of building efficiently and at scale found themselves operating within one of the most favorable housing markets in American history.

Fred Trump was among those developers.

Having entered the construction business before the war, Fred Trump was well positioned to capitalize on the expanding opportunities created by the postwar housing boom. He had already gained experience constructing affordable housing in Brooklyn and Queens and had developed working relationships with lenders, contractors, architects, and government officials responsible for administering federal housing programs. As mortgage insurance expanded and federally supported financing became increasingly available, his company was prepared to undertake projects on a far larger scale than had previously been possible.

Success in this environment required considerably more than construction expertise. Developers needed to understand the intricate requirements governing FHA-insured projects, including property valuations, construction standards, financing structures, cost certifications, and the administrative procedures through which projects qualified for

[25] Veterans Benefits Administration, *The Evolution of VA Home Loan Guaranty Service: Supporting Veteran Homeownership for 8 Decades (1944 to 2024)* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 2024), 1944 section, para. 1.

federal support.[26] Those who mastered these systems enjoyed significant competitive advantages over less experienced builders.

Fred Trump demonstrated a remarkable ability to operate within that institutional framework. Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, his company expanded rapidly, constructing thousands of residential units that helped address New York's growing housing shortage. Contemporary accounts frequently described him as an efficient, disciplined builder capable of completing projects quickly while maintaining profitability within the rules established by federal housing programs.

From the perspective of public policy, this appeared to represent precisely the outcome Congress had intended. Government reduced financial risk, private developers expanded housing production, and families gained access to homes that might otherwise have remained beyond their financial reach. The partnership seemed to demonstrate the success of federal intervention working in concert with private enterprise.

Yet large flows of public capital and rapidly expanding institutional systems inevitably attract closer scrutiny.

As federal expenditures increased and developers accumulated substantial profits through government-supported projects, members of Congress began asking whether the incentives embedded within the housing system were functioning exactly as intended. Were taxpayers receiving the full public benefit anticipated by Congress? Were property valuations, construction costs, and financing arrangements accurately reflecting economic reality? Or had aspects of the system evolved in ways that permitted sophisticated participants to realize profits well beyond those originally envisioned by federal policymakers?

Those questions eventually reached the United States Senate.

[26] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, *Code of Federal Regulations*, Title 24, Part 200: "Introduction to FHA Programs" (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2025), §§ 200.34–200.35, §§ 200.926–200.926d, §§ 200.15–200.18, §§ 200.95–200.97, and §§ 200.45–200.47.

The investigation that followed would not begin with accusations against Fred Trump or any individual developer. It would begin with a more fundamental inquiry: before Congress could determine whether the system had been exploited, it first needed to understand precisely how that system was designed to operate.

**Congress Evaluates the System**

By the late 1940s, the federal housing partnership had achieved many of its intended objectives. Residential construction was accelerating, private investment had returned to the housing market, and millions of American families were obtaining homes through federally supported mortgage financing. From a public policy perspective, the program appeared to be one of the New Deal's enduring successes.

Success, however, also brought scale. As federal mortgage insurance expanded and increasingly large housing developments were financed under FHA programs, the flow of public resources into private construction grew dramatically. Congress, having created the system, now faced a new responsibility: determining whether it continued to operate as intended.

Questions began to emerge concerning construction costs, property valuations, financing arrangements, and developer profits. Were federal insurance programs producing affordable housing as Congress had envisioned, or were weaknesses within the system allowing private interests to realize profits substantially greater than policymakers had anticipated? Had administrative safeguards kept pace with the rapid expansion of federally supported construction, or had the complexity of the program created opportunities for manipulation that few had foreseen?

These were not merely theoretical concerns. They involved billions of dollars in federally insured mortgages and one of the largest public-private partnerships in American history. If excessive profits were being generated through inflated valuations, questionable financing structures, or weaknesses in federal oversight, the consequences extended beyond individual developers. They affected taxpayers, homebuyers, and the long-term credibility of the housing program itself.

To answer those questions, the United States Senate's Committee on Banking and Currency initiated a broad investigation into the operation of the Federal Housing Administration's multifamily housing programs. The committee's purpose was not to begin by accusing individual builders of wrongdoing. Instead, it sought to determine whether the institutional framework Congress had created was functioning in accordance with its legislative purpose.

The committee therefore turned first to the officials responsible for administering the system before examining the conduct of the developers who operated within it. That sequence was deliberate. Before evaluating whether individual participants had exploited the program, Congress first needed to understand precisely how it was designed to operate.

**William F. McKenna's Testimony**

The committee's first witness was William F. McKenna, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration. As the senior official responsible for administering the FHA mortgage insurance program, McKenna occupied a unique position. Before examining the conduct of individual developers, the committee sought to understand the design of the system itself. If Congress was to determine whether excessive profits, inflated valuations, or unintended consequences had emerged, it first needed to establish how the program was intended to function.

McKenna's testimony was explanatory rather than accusatory. He did not appear to allege wrongdoing by any particular builder. Instead, he described the statutory framework established by Congress, the administrative procedures followed by the FHA, and the methods by which multifamily housing projects qualified for federal mortgage insurance.

He explained that the FHA did not finance construction directly. Private lenders supplied the capital, while the federal government insured qualifying mortgages against default. Developers seeking FHA-insured financing were required to submit detailed plans, construction estimates, appraisals, engineering reports, and financial documentation demonstrating that their proposed projects met the agency's standards. FHA personnel evaluated those submissions before determining whether mortgage insurance would be approved.

The program relied heavily on professional judgment. Agency officials reviewed estimated construction costs, projected rental income, land values, replacement costs, and anticipated operating expenses in determining the amount of mortgage insurance a project could receive. Because these calculations necessarily involved forecasts and appraisals rather than fixed market prices, they required substantial discretion on the part of government officials and the private professionals who prepared the supporting documentation.

McKenna emphasized that the FHA's objective was not to maximize developer profits but to encourage the construction of safe, durable, and affordable housing while protecting the federal government's financial interests.[27] Mortgage insurance was intended to facilitate construction by reducing lending risk, not to provide windfall returns to private builders.

His testimony established the benchmark against which the remainder of the investigation would proceed. Congress had now placed into the record the principles upon which the FHA system was designed to operate. The question that followed was no longer how the program was supposed to function, but whether it functioned that way in practice.

The committee's attention would soon shift from the administrators of the system to one of its most successful participants. Fred Trump was called not because he represented every developer who had participated in FHA programs, but because his projects had become central to the committee's examination of how the system operated under real-world conditions.[28]

---

[27] United States Congress, *National Housing Act*, Pub. L. No. 73-479, 48 Stat. 1246 (June 27, 1934), 1.
[28] U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, *Investigation of Federal Housing Administration: Hearings Before the Committee on Banking and Currency*, 83rd Cong., 2nd sess., June 18, 1954, vol. 1, 283–284.

**Fred Trump's Senate Testimony**

When Fred Trump appeared before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, he did so not as an obscure local builder but as one of the nation's most successful developers of federally financed housing. His projects had become sufficiently prominent that they served as representative examples in the committee's examination of how the FHA system operated in practice.

Trump rejected any suggestion that his success resulted from manipulation or abuse of the program. Throughout his testimony, he maintained that his company had complied with the laws, regulations, and administrative procedures established by the Federal Housing Administration. The projects under examination, he argued, had been reviewed and approved by government officials at every significant stage of development. If mortgages had been insured, valuations accepted, and financing authorized, those decisions had been made through the ordinary operation of the federal system itself.

He also emphasized the practical realities of large-scale residential construction. Housing developments required substantial financial commitments, careful coordination of labor and materials, and the assumption of significant commercial risk. Developers invested years in acquiring land, securing financing, managing construction, and operating completed properties in an uncertain market. In Trump's view, successful projects reflected sound business judgment and efficient management rather than the exploitation of federal policy.

Committee members, however, pursued a different question. Their concern was not simply whether the applicable regulations had been followed, but whether the regulations themselves adequately protected the public interest. Senators repeatedly explored the relationship among construction costs, appraised values, mortgage amounts, and developer profits, seeking to determine whether the financial structure of the FHA program permitted returns that exceeded what Congress had originally intended.

The exchanges revealed a subtle but important distinction. Fred Trump largely defended the legality of his business practices. The committee was examining whether the institutional framework made those practices possible in the first place. Compliance with existing rules did not necessarily answer the broader legislative question before the committee: whether the rules themselves produced results consistent with the purpose for which Congress had enacted them.

The testimony thus illuminated two competing perspectives. From the developer's standpoint, the projects represented legitimate business success achieved within a government-approved financing system. From the committee's perspective, the investigation sought to determine whether that same system contained structural incentives capable of producing extraordinary private gains at public expense.

The committee's findings would ultimately focus less on the conduct of any single witness than on what the testimony collectively revealed about the operation of the federal housing program. Fred Trump's appearance became significant not because it established every answer, but because it placed one of the nation's most successful participants within Congress's broader examination of the system that had helped make that success possible.

**The Committee's Findings**

As the hearings progressed, the committee's attention increasingly shifted away from the testimony of individual witnesses and toward the larger institutional questions that had prompted the investigation. William F. McKenna had explained how the Federal Housing Administration was intended to function. Fred Trump and other developers had described how they operated within that framework. The committee's task was now to determine whether the system itself was producing the results Congress had intended when it established the FHA.

The evidence presented during the hearings did not persuade the committee that the federal housing program had failed in its primary objective. FHA mortgage insurance had stimulated residential construction, expanded homeownership, and contributed significantly to the nation's postwar economic growth. Those achievements remained substantial and were acknowledged throughout the investigation.

The committee's concern lay elsewhere.

Its inquiry revealed that the very features that made the program successful also created opportunities for outcomes Congress had not fully anticipated. Mortgage valuations, construction estimates, land appraisals, financing structures, builder's fees, and projected operating revenues all depended on professional judgment rather than fixed mathematical formulas. Within such a system, even modest differences in valuation or financing assumptions could significantly affect the amount of federally insured mortgage financing available to a project.

The committee therefore devoted considerable attention to the relationship among construction costs, appraised values, mortgage proceeds, and developer returns. Senators questioned whether existing administrative procedures provided sufficient safeguards to ensure that federally supported financing consistently reflected the true economic characteristics of individual projects. Their concern was not limited to whether regulations had been followed in particular cases. Instead, they asked whether the regulations themselves contained oversight gaps capable of producing unintended financial incentives.

This distinction is central to understanding the significance of the hearings.

The investigation was not simply an effort to determine whether one developer had acted improperly. It represented Congress examining its own legislative creation. Lawmakers were asking whether a program designed to encourage affordable housing also contained structural features that rewarded those most skilled at navigating its administrative and financial complexities.

In that respect, the hearings revealed an important characteristic of large institutional systems. Public programs are designed to achieve legitimate public purposes, yet they necessarily rely upon rules, formulas, administrative discretion, and oversight mechanisms. As those systems mature, experienced participants often develop a deeper understanding of their practical operation than the policymakers who originally designed them. Success within such systems may therefore depend not only upon business ability but also upon mastery of the institutional framework itself.

The committee's findings did not establish that every successful developer had acted improperly, nor did they conclude that the FHA had become an inherently defective program. Instead, they documented a more nuanced reality: a federal system created to stimulate housing production had also created administrative complexities and oversight gaps that required continuing congressional attention if the public interest was to remain aligned with private incentives.

For this report, that conclusion marks an important transition.

The documentary record suggests that Fred Trump's significance lies not merely in the scale of his developments, but in what his testimony reveals about a broader historical evolution. Friedrich Trump prospered by recognizing opportunities on the nineteenth-century frontier. Fred Trump prospered within an increasingly sophisticated partnership between government and private enterprise. The mechanism had changed. The opportunity had evolved. Extraction was becoming institutional.

**Race, Housing, and the Documentary Record**

The Senate investigation examined the financial structure of the federal housing system. It did not attempt to evaluate every aspect of Fred Trump's business practices or public life. Like many congressional inquiries, its scope was defined by the specific questions before the committee. To understand the broader historical record, it is therefore necessary to consider additional documentary evidence that emerged outside the Senate hearings over the following decades.

One of the earliest entries in that record dates to Memorial Day, 1927, when Fred Trump, then in his early twenties, was arrested during disturbances surrounding a Ku Klux Klan parade in the New York City borough of Queens. Contemporary newspaper accounts and police records document the arrest, although they do not conclusively establish Trump's role in the events or whether he was an active participant in the demonstration itself.

Historians have continued to debate the significance of the incident, and the surviving record does not permit definitive conclusions regarding his intentions or affiliations. The arrest nevertheless forms part of the documented public record because it represents the earliest known public association between Fred Trump and an event organized by the Ku Klux Klan.

Nearly half a century later, questions concerning race emerged in a very different legal context. In 1973, the United States Department of Justice filed a civil lawsuit against Fred Trump, Donald Trump, and the Trump Management Corporation, alleging a pattern and practice of racial discrimination in the rental of apartments.[29] The complaint asserted that prospective Black applicants had been discouraged or denied housing opportunities while similarly qualified white applicants received different treatment.

According to the Department of Justice, the case rested on more than statistical disparities alone.[30] Investigators alleged that Trump Management maintained rental procedures that identified prospective Black applicants through coded notations and internal recordkeeping practices, enabling employees to distinguish applications by race during the leasing process. The government further alleged that these procedures formed part of a broader pattern in which Black applicants were discouraged, steered, or denied apartments while similarly qualified white applicants were offered different opportunities. These allegations became a central component of the government's civil rights case.

The defendants denied the allegations.[31] In 1975, the litigation concluded with a consent decree approved by the federal court. The decree did not constitute an admission of wrongdoing, but it required the Trump organization to adopt new fair housing procedures, provide employee training, revise rental practices, maintain additional records, advertise

---

[29] *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 73 C 1529 (E.D.N.Y. filed October 15, 1973), Complaint.
[30] *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 73 C 1529 (E.D.N.Y. filed October 15, 1973), Complaint, ¶¶ 7–15.
[31] *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 73 C 1529 (E.D.N.Y.); Consent Decree, June 10, 1975.

vacancies more broadly, and submit periodic compliance reports intended to ensure adherence to federal fair housing laws.[32]

For this report, the significance of these events lies not in assigning motives that the documentary record cannot establish, but in recognizing that they form part of a continuous public record extending across decades. The Senate hearings examined the operation of a federal housing finance system. The Department of Justice examined compliance with federal civil rights law. They were separate investigations, conducted by different institutions under different statutory authorities, and addressed different legal questions. Yet both reflected increasing governmental scrutiny of one of the nation's most prominent residential developers.

Viewed together, these records do not establish every conclusion that later commentators have drawn, nor should they be asked to do so. They do, however, demonstrate that Fred Trump's business activities repeatedly attracted the attention of public authorities exercising different forms of governmental oversight. The resulting documentary record extends well beyond questions of profitability or construction practices. It encompasses issues of equal access to housing, public accountability, and the responsibilities accompanying participation in systems created, supported, and regulated by government.

Viewed in that broader historical context, the documentary record also reveals an important stage in the evolution of the Extraction Model. Friedrich Trump prospered largely beyond the reach of formal regulatory institutions, on a rapidly developing frontier where oversight remained limited. Fred Trump operated within a mature administrative state, where opportunity increasingly arose not from the absence of government, but from understanding the financial systems, administrative incentives, and oversight gaps embedded within it. As government expanded its role in housing finance and later in civil rights enforcement, so too did the scope of the public record by which participants in those systems would ultimately be judged.

---

[32] *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.*, Consent Decree, Civil Action No. 73 C 1529 (E.D.N.Y. June 10, 1975), §§ II–VIII.

**ENTER THE BENEFACTOR**

Long before Roy Cohn became Donald Trump's attorney, he had already established himself within some of the most consequential—and controversial—circles of American power.

Cohn's rise was extraordinary. Still in his twenties, he served as a federal prosecutor in New York and participated in the prosecution of Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, whose 1951 convictions for conspiracy to commit espionage culminated in their executions two years later. He subsequently went to Washington as chief counsel to Senator Joseph McCarthy's investigative subcommittee, becoming one of the principal figures in McCarthy's campaign to expose alleged Communist influence and security risks within the federal government. Cohn's aggressive investigative style soon became part of the controversy itself. In 1954, after Cohn and McCarthy's staff were accused of pressuring the U.S. Army to provide preferential treatment to one of the committee's consultants, the dispute erupted into the nationally televised Army-McCarthy hearings. The hearings subjected both McCarthy's investigative methods and Cohn's conduct to intense public scrutiny, severely damaging McCarthy's political standing. Cohn resigned from the committee and returned to New York. His proximity to power did not end with his government service. It changed venues.[33]

Over the following two decades, Cohn built a legal practice remarkable for the worlds it connected. His clients and associates reached across politics, business, organized labor, entertainment, religious institutions, and New York society. His clientele also included figures associated with organized crime, among them reputed Mafia bosses whose legal problems placed Cohn in yet another arena where money, influence, loyalty, and law converged. He represented powerful institutions as well as controversial individuals, including the Archdiocese of New York.[34] His professional world resisted simple

[33] Jamelle Bouie, "Trump's New Insult Won't Save Republicans," *The New York Times*, July 26, 2026; *United Press International*, "G. David Schine: Figure in McCarthy Witch Hunts," June 20, 1996.
[34] Robert Plunket, "Roy Cohn: The Man, the Myth, the Legend," *Tampa Bay Times*, May 1, 1988; Maya King and Jeffery C. Mays, "Plaintiffs in Catholic Church Abuse Case Weigh $800 Million Offer," *The New York Times*, June 15, 2026.

classification: legitimate institutions, political operators, celebrities, wealthy businessmen and figures from organized crime could all arrive at the same lawyer's door.

Cohn became known not simply for representing clients, but for the combative manner in which he represented them. Litigation could be answered with more litigation. An accusation could invite a counterattack. Institutional authority was something to confront rather than merely accommodate. The courtroom was only one arena in a larger contest in which relationships, publicity, political influence, negotiation, intimidation, delay and persistence could matter alongside the underlying legal question. Cohn's career would eventually end in disbarment, but for decades his ability to move among these overlapping worlds made him one of New York's most formidable legal and political operators.

The pattern has a distant echo elsewhere in this Investigative Triptych. On the Klondike frontier, Jefferson "Soapy" Smith represented a contemporary counterpart to Friedrich Trump—not because the two men conducted the same kind of business, but because each recognized opportunities within the particular environment surrounding him. Decades later, in a vastly different institutional landscape, Cohn demonstrated another form of shrewd recognition. The frontier had become a metropolis; crude confidence schemes had given way to contracts, courts, corporations and political networks; and the opportunities available within the spaces between formal rules and practical accountability had become considerably more sophisticated.

Cohn was not confined to one underworld. He operated at the intersection of several underworlds of power.

In 1973, those underworlds intersected with the Trump family.

---

ATTACK, COUNTERATTACK AND NEVER APOLOGIZE

Fred and Donald Trump turned to Roy Cohn.[35] The choice brought into their defense an attorney whose career had already been shaped by confrontation with institutions of government—and whose instinct when challenged was not necessarily to retreat, concede, or merely defend. In the federal housing racial-discrimination case, that instinct quickly became apparent.[36]

Represented by Cohn, the Trumps counterattacked. They filed a $100 million claim against the federal government, alleging that officials had made false and defamatory statements and seeking damages far beyond the scope of the government's original civil-rights action.[37] The strategy effectively reversed the posture of the confrontation: the defendants in a federal enforcement action attempted to place the government itself on the defensive. A federal judge dismissed the claim.[38]

The legal defeat did not end the underlying dispute. The government's housing case continued, and in 1975 the parties resolved it through a consent decree.[39] The decree did not constitute an admission of wrongdoing, nor did it establish through a judicial finding that the government's discrimination allegations had been proved. It did, however, impose enforceable requirements governing Trump Management's rental procedures, employee instruction, advertising, recordkeeping, and compliance with federal fair-housing law.[40]

---

[35] Adam Lusher, "FBI Discrimination Dossier Accuses Trump's Father of 'Get Rid of Blacks' Comment," *The Independent*, February 17, 2017, 22.
[36] Robert O'Harrow Jr. and Shawn Boburg, "The Man Who Showed Donald Trump How to Exploit Power and Instill Fear," *The Washington Post*, June 17, 2016.
[37] *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.*, Memorandum of the United States in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Motion for More Definite Statement, in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss Counterclaim, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, 1974, 3.
[38] *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.*, Order, Civil Action No. 73 C 1529, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, February 5, 1974.
[39] Glenn Kessler, "Trump's Claim That a Racial Discrimination Suit Was 'Brought Against Many Real Estate Firms,'" *The Washington Post*, September 28, 2016.
[40] Glenn Kessler, "Trump's Claim That a Racial Discrimination Suit Was 'Brought Against Many Real Estate Firms,'" *The Washington Post*, September 28, 2016.

Allegation, adjudication, and settlement are distinct things, and the documentary record should preserve those distinctions.

Something else had happened during the litigation that no consent decree could resolve. Donald Trump had encountered Roy Cohn.

Cohn entered the case as attorney to both father and son, but his relationship with the younger Trump extended far beyond this litigation.[41] What began during a confrontation with the federal government developed into a professional and personal association lasting for years, with Cohn serving as attorney, adviser, and legal strategist to Donald Trump. For a family already experienced in navigating the opportunities and constraints of government-created systems, Cohn represented something different: a practitioner whose own career demonstrated how aggressively institutional authority itself could be challenged.

Fred Trump's business practices long predated Roy Cohn. The Extraction Model examined in this report therefore cannot be traced to Cohn, nor does the historical record require such a claim. What the chronology establishes is more consequential than an origin story: at the moment Donald Trump emerged beside his father as a defendant in a major confrontation with federal authority, the two retained a lawyer whose methods had developed independently within another world of power. Cohn did not introduce the Trump family to shrewdness, institutional opportunity, or aggressive self-interest. He brought his own practiced form of them into the relationship.

Donald Trump would later tell us, in his own words, what he valued about Roy Cohn.

---

IN TRUMP'S OWN WORDS

Years later, Donald Trump described Cohn in terms that illuminate what he valued in their relationship. "If you need someone to get vicious toward an opponent, you get Roy," Trump

[41] Martha McHardy, "Trump's Mentoring by Mob Lawyer Roy Cohn at Centre of New Biopic to Be Shown at Cannes," *The Independent*, April 11, 2024.

said of him.[42] The description was blunt, but it was also revealing. Trump did not merely remember Cohn as an effective attorney. He remembered the willingness to become vicious toward an opponent as a quality that made Cohn useful.

Loyalty mattered as well. In *The Art of the Deal*, Trump contrasted people who proclaimed their "uncompromising integrity" with those who, in his estimation, possessed "absolutely no loyalty." He then turned to Cohn: "What I liked most about Roy Cohn was that he would do just the opposite."[43] Read alongside Trump's description of Cohn's capacity for aggression, the two statements identify qualities Trump himself associated with the lawyer: loyalty to his client and a willingness to attack his client's adversaries.

Cohn's role in Trump's life consequently extended beyond the housing litigation that had brought them together. He continued to represent Trump and became a trusted adviser within Trump's expanding New York business and social world. Their association connected Trump to the same overlapping networks of politics, business, law, celebrity, and influence through which Cohn had moved for years.[44] Cohn was no longer simply the attorney retained when the federal government sued Fred and Donald Trump. He had become a continuing presence in Donald Trump's professional life.

The relationship endured even as Cohn's own legal troubles mounted. In proceedings that ultimately resulted in his disbarment, Trump appeared on Cohn's behalf and testified to his character, attesting to Cohn's "honesty and integrity."[45] The juxtaposition is striking. Years after Cohn had defended Trump against allegations brought by the federal government, Trump appeared in a proceeding concerning Cohn's own professional conduct and publicly vouched for the character of the man who had defended him.

---

[42] Peter Bonventre with Tony Fuller, "Cohn for the Defense," *Newsweek*, April 2, 1979, 90.
[43] Donald J. Trump with Tony Schwartz, *Trump: The Art of the Deal* (New York: Random House, 1987), 69.
[44] Robert O'Harrow Jr. and Shawn Boburg, "The Man Who Showed Donald Trump How to Exploit Power and Instill Fear," *The Washington Post*, June 17, 2016.
[45] Samuel Maull, "Records Released in Cohn Hearing Recommend Disbarment," *Associated Press*, November 26, 1985.

Cohn was ultimately disbarred in 1986 after disciplinary proceedings involving charges of professional misconduct.[46] The significance here is not that association with a disbarred attorney establishes anything about Donald Trump's own conduct; it does not. The significance is narrower and documentary. Trump maintained his relationship with Cohn through the period in which Cohn's professional conduct came under formal scrutiny, and Trump's own recorded statements provide unusually direct evidence of the qualities he admired in him.

Aggression. Loyalty. Counterattack.

Those qualities help explain the relationship. They do not yet explain why Roy Cohn belongs in the Extraction Model.

For that, the record of Cohn's own conduct must be examined.

---

## COHN THE EXTRACTIONIST — THE ACCOUNTABILITY GAP

Roy Cohn's significance to the Extraction Model does not depend upon Donald Trump. His own career provides the evidence.

Cohn's reputation for counterattack was not merely a matter of temperament. It became a legal technique. When confronted, Cohn would reverse the direction of pressure: an accusation could produce another accusation; a lawsuit could produce another lawsuit; an effort to impose liability could become the occasion for imposing costs upon the party attempting to enforce it. One contemporary account described counterattack as a favorite Cohn gambit.[47] The technique was immediately visible in the 1973 federal housing case. Faced with a Justice Department civil-rights action against his clients, Cohn did not merely

[46] *Matter of Cohn*, 118 A.D.2d 15, 503 N.Y.S.2d 759 (N.Y. App. Div. 1986).
[47] James D. Zirin, "Trump's Legal Strategy: If You Can't Win in Court, Threaten the Judge," *The Hill*, May 8, 2025.

defend the Trumps against the government's allegations. He attacked the government for $100 million.[48]

The monetary demand was dismissed, but dismissal did not make the strategy economically meaningless. Litigation consumes time and resources regardless of which party ultimately prevails. Indeed, a Justice Department memorandum from the litigation described the defendants' conduct as a "long series of delaying tactics."[49] Counterattack and delay could therefore operate together: challenge the challenger, multiply the dispute, and extend the interval between an asserted obligation and its practical enforcement.

That interval matters.

A legal obligation and the recovery of what is legally owed are not the same thing. A creditor can provide goods or services and remain unpaid. The creditor can demand payment and remain unpaid. The creditor can sue, prevail, obtain a judgment—and remain unpaid. At every additional stage, enforcement requires more time, more effort, and often more money. Eventually the cost of recovering a debt can begin to approach, or even exceed, the value of continuing to pursue it.

The result is an accountability gap: the distance between establishing an obligation and actually compelling its satisfaction.

Cohn appears repeatedly within that distance. Accounts of his financial affairs describe unpaid creditors, judgments, tax disputes, and prolonged efforts to collect money from him.[50] His disputes with federal tax authorities enlarge the scale. For years, the government pursued asserted tax liabilities while questions involving assets, ownership, access, and collection complicated practical recovery. Substantial federal recovery followed only after Cohn's death.[51]

---

[48] *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.*, No. 73 C 1529 (E.D.N.Y.), Counterclaim, December 12, 1973.
[49] U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, "Notice to Close File," *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.*, December 15, 1977.
[50] Lois Morgan, "Why Doesn't Roy Cohn Pay His Bills?," *The Village Voice*, July 5, 1976.
[51] Paul Geitner, "Feds Settle Tax Case Against Roy Cohn," *Associated Press*, August 31, 1992.

None of this means that every disputed debt, appeal, delayed payment, or unsuccessful collection effort constitutes extraction. Legal systems deliberately provide mechanisms through which obligations can be contested, judgments appealed, and governmental assertions challenged. The Extraction Model concerns something narrower: what happens when a sufficiently shrewd actor recognizes that the distance between formal liability and practical accountability can itself possess value.

Time is part of that value.

So long as contested value remains beyond the claimant's practical reach, the claimant cannot use it. The party retaining possession or control, meanwhile, may preserve some measure of its usefulness, bargaining power, or economic advantage. Delay therefore need not defeat an obligation permanently to alter the economics surrounding it. It need only postpone the moment at which legal entitlement becomes practical recovery.

That creates something more specific than a loophole. It creates a gapportunity: an opportunity discovered within an accountability gap.

Roy Cohn did not invent such gaps, and his presence in Donald Trump's life cannot explain extraction practices that existed within the Trump family before the two men met. Fred Trump's career makes that chronology impossible. What Cohn supplied was something different: an independently developed method for operating within another institutional environment. Where Fred Trump had learned to navigate government programs, regulation, contracts, and administrative discretion, Cohn had learned to navigate litigation, enforcement, political influence, procedural delay, and the practical limits of accountability.

Their methods were not identical.

Their recognition was.

And in 1973, Fred Trump brought into his defense a practitioner whose own career demonstrated what extraction could look like when the institution being navigated was the law itself.

---

FROM MICROCOSM TO MACROCOSM

Roy Cohn belongs in this history for reasons extending beyond his representation of Fred and Donald Trump. His own career provides a concentrated example of the mechanism this report has been tracing across a much larger landscape. Debts could become disputes. Judgments could become further litigation. Government enforcement could become prolonged contest. An adverse action could be met not merely with defense, but with counterattack. And throughout those contests lay the distance between what an institution declared and what it could actually compel.

That distance matters.

A legal obligation is not the same thing as practical recovery. A judgment does not place money in a creditor's hand. An assessment does not collect a tax. An enforcement action does not guarantee compliance. Between obligation and consequence lies an accountability gap—and inside that gap lies time.

Time itself can possess economic value. Money retained during a dispute remains available to the party retaining it. Property not surrendered remains usable. Collection requires additional effort and expense from the party seeking payment. Litigation can extend the interval. Appeals can extend it further. At some point, the cost of obtaining what one is legally owed can begin competing with the value of what is owed.

For most people, such gaps are frustrations in a legal system. For an extractionist, they can become opportunities.

The phenomenon might be called gapportunity: the recognition that a gap between institutional rule and practical enforcement can itself present an opportunity for advantage. The extractor need not create the gap. He need only recognize it, enter it, and possess the resources, persistence, or audacity to remain there longer than the opposing party can afford to continue the contest.

Cohn's documented preference for counterattack adds another dimension to that mechanism. Counterattack does more than resist accountability. It can reverse the direction of pressure. The institution, creditor, adversary, or accuser seeking compliance suddenly has something of its own to defend. The original dispute becomes entangled with a second one. Costs increase. Time expands. Settlement becomes comparatively attractive. Even an unsuccessful counterattack can therefore alter the economic terrain on which the original dispute must be resolved.

That is why Cohn matters to the Extraction Model independently of the Trumps. He represents a legal microcosm of something this report has already encountered at larger scales: value obtained, obligation resisted, enforcement contested, time extended, and institutional gaps converted into leverage.

But history placed that independent practitioner of the mechanism inside the orbit of a family already demonstrating its own aptitude for extracting value from institutional systems.

Fred Trump did not need Roy Cohn to teach him how to recognize opportunity in government. By the time the two men became associated, Fred had spent decades navigating federal housing programs, political relationships, regulatory structures, and the considerable distance that could exist between public purpose and private advantage. Cohn brought something different. He demonstrated what could happen when the institution being navigated was the law itself.

Their methods were not identical. Neither man need be made the originator of the others. What matters is their convergence.

At one scale, Friedrich Trump had followed economic opportunity to the frontier and discovered that more reliable value could sometimes be extracted from the people pursuing gold than from the ground beneath them. At another, Fred Trump discovered opportunity within the immense machinery constructed by government to finance and encourage housing. Cohn's career presents another version of the same recurring problem: institutions establish rules and obligations, but enforcement occurs through human systems possessing limits, delays, costs, and gaps.

The scale keeps changing, while the underlying question remains remarkably stable:

What becomes possible in the distance between what a system intends and what it can actually prevent?

The answer becomes more consequential with each generation.

Soapy Smith offered an early microcosm of extraction operating inside the disorder of a frontier economy. Friedrich Trump's experience enlarged the field. Cohn provides another microcosm—this time inside law—while Fred Trump's career supplies the broader institutional landscape around him. Each apparent macrocosm, viewed from sufficient distance, begins to look like a microcosm of something larger still.

And standing at the convergence of Fred Trump and Roy Cohn was Fred's son.

In that sense, the Donald Trump who eventually emerges from this history can be understood, metaphorically, as an offspring of Fred Trump and Roy Cohn: heir to one man's institutional experience and student of the other's methods of legal combat.

What Donald would do with that inheritance belongs to the next generation of the story.

**The Extraction Model Evolves**

The evidence presented in Panel II suggests that the nature of extraction changed significantly between the generations of Friedrich and Fred Trump. The objective remained the same—the accumulation of wealth through the recognition of opportunity—but the environment in which that opportunity existed had fundamentally changed.

Friedrich Trump prospered on a rapidly expanding frontier where formal institutions were limited, and opportunity arose from serving the immediate needs of transient populations.

Fred Trump inherited a different America. By the middle of the twentieth century, opportunity increasingly resided within a mature administrative state shaped by federal housing policy, mortgage insurance, financial regulation, and large public-private partnerships. Wealth could now be created as much through understanding institutional systems as through traditional commerce.

The documentary record illustrates that transformation. Congress created the Federal Housing Administration to stabilize the housing market and expand homeownership, and by most historical measures it succeeded.[52] Yet the same system necessarily relied upon administrative discretion, financial incentives, professional judgment, and oversight. Those features made the program effective, but they also rewarded participants who understood its complexities better than their competitors.

The Senate hearings and the later civil rights litigation examined different aspects of Fred Trump's business under different statutory authorities. Together, they reveal an important institutional reality: as government expanded its role in housing finance and civil rights enforcement, it also expanded the documentary record by which participants in those systems would be evaluated.

The Extraction Model therefore evolves in Panel II. Friedrich Trump extracted opportunity from the frontier. Fred Trump demonstrated that opportunity could also be extracted from institutions themselves—not because those institutions were inherently corrupt, but because every complex system contains incentives, administrative discretion, and oversight gaps. Those who understand such systems more completely than others may obtain significant advantages while remaining within the formal boundaries of the rules.

This marks the transition from frontier extraction to institutional extraction. The frontier had moved from the wilderness into the architecture of public policy.

---

[52] U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, *The FHA Single-Family Insurance Program: Performing a Needed Role in the Housing Finance Market* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2012), 1–4.

That transition provides the bridge to Panel III. If Friedrich Trump extracted opportunity from the frontier, and Fred Trump extracted opportunity from institutional systems, the next generation would operate in an environment where influence itself had become a resource capable of generating political, financial, and cultural power.

**Evidence Assessment**

The documentary record examined in Panel II provides a substantial evidentiary foundation for understanding the evolution of the Extraction Model during the mid-twentieth century. Much of the historical record is derived from primary sources, including congressional hearings, official government publications, federal court records, and contemporaneous reporting. These materials establish both the operation of the Federal Housing Administration and Fred Trump's participation within the postwar housing system with a high degree of confidence.

The record also demonstrates that Congress became concerned not only with the conduct of individual developers, but with whether the structure of federal housing programs created incentives, valuation methods, and oversight gaps capable of producing outcomes beyond those originally anticipated by policymakers. The Senate investigation therefore serves as evidence of institutional self-examination rather than proof of wrongdoing by every participant in the system.

Similarly, the Department of Justice's 1973 civil rights lawsuit and the resulting 1975 consent decree are matters of public record.[53] The allegations, the defendants' responses, and the procedural resolution of the litigation are well documented. At the same time, the consent decree did not constitute a judicial determination of liability, and this report does not attribute findings to the courts that the courts themselves did not make.

Accordingly, the conclusions presented in this panel are based upon the cumulative weight of the documentary record rather than any single allegation, hearing, or lawsuit. Where the

[53] Civil Rights Litigation Clearinghouse, “United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc., 1:73-01529 (E.D.N.Y.),” case summary, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, filed October 15, 1973, closed June 10, 1977, accessed July 31, 2026.

evidence establishes historical fact, it is presented as such. Where the evidence permits reasonable inference, those inferences have been identified. Where the historical record remains incomplete or unresolved, no conclusion beyond the available evidence has been drawn.

**Panel II Conclusions**

The evidence examined in Panel II supports the following conclusions:

1. The New Deal and postwar housing reforms fundamentally transformed the American housing market by creating an enduring partnership between federal institutions and private residential development.

2. The complexity of that institutional framework created opportunities for experienced participants to obtain competitive advantages and, in some instances, profits beyond those originally anticipated by policymakers, making continued congressional oversight both necessary and appropriate.

3. Fred Trump emerged as one of the most successful developers operating within that system, and his business activities became the subject of repeated governmental examination under separate statutory authorities concerned with housing finance and later with civil rights enforcement.

4. The cumulative documentary record supports the conclusion that the mechanism of extraction evolved between the generations of Friedrich and Fred Trump. Opportunity increasingly arose not from exploiting a physical frontier, but from understanding and navigating complex institutional systems created for legitimate public purposes.

Panel II therefore concludes that the evolution of the Extraction Model was not principally a change in objective, but a change in mechanism. As American institutions grew more sophisticated, so too did the opportunities available to those who best understood how to operate within them.

**PANEL III**

## Donald Trump: Extraction Through Institutional Influence

### The Evolution of Institutional Influence

Every generation inherits an institutional landscape shaped by those who came before it. As those institutions evolve, so too do the forms through which opportunity may be recognized and pursued. Technological innovation, economic transformation, and cultural change periodically reshape that landscape so profoundly that entirely new forms of wealth, influence, and power become possible. When this occurs, the institutions through which opportunity flows are transformed, creating new environments in which familiar patterns of human behavior may emerge.

For Friedrich Trump, opportunity emerged from the rapidly expanding frontier economy of the Klondike Gold Rush. Wealth could be accumulated by recognizing that the migration itself had become a source of extraordinary commercial demand. For Fred Trump, opportunity increasingly arose within the expanding institutions of the American administrative state. Federal housing programs, mortgage insurance, and postwar public investment created new relationships between government policy and private enterprise. Success depended upon understanding those institutions in exceptional detail.

By the time Donald Trump entered public life, the institutional landscape had changed once again.

The latter half of the twentieth century witnessed one of the most significant institutional transformations in modern American history. Television created national audiences. Branding transformed public recognition into commercial value. Expanding financial markets increasingly rewarded reputation alongside traditional assets. By the close of the century, cable news, the Internet, and eventually social media had collapsed many of the traditional boundaries separating business, entertainment, journalism, and politics. Public attention itself increasingly became an asset capable of producing economic, political, and institutional value.

These developments fundamentally altered the relationship between institutions. Modern influence rarely depended upon a single organization or industry. Media amplified celebrity. Celebrity strengthened commercial brands. Commercial success generated political visibility. Political authority expanded fundraising opportunities. Religious organizations, nonprofit corporations, advocacy groups, and digital platforms increasingly operated within overlapping networks of influence. Attention, trust, reputation, and access became assets capable of producing economic, political, and institutional power.

Like the institutional transformations examined in the preceding Panels, these developments produced extraordinary public benefits. Television connected a national audience. Financial innovation expanded investment and economic growth. Digital communication democratized access to information and broadened participation in public discourse. Yet the same institutional changes also created new opportunities for individuals who understood how influence itself could become a source of economic and political power.

Every institutional system that creates opportunity also establishes mechanisms intended to provide accountability. Markets generate contracts, financial statements, and regulatory oversight. Government programs produce appropriations, administrative records, audits, and statutory reporting requirements. Executive authority operates within constitutional and legal frameworks that require documentation, financial stewardship, and public accountability. Institutions therefore generate documentary records. Those records permit citizens, journalists, historians, auditors, and Congress to evaluate whether public authority has been exercised consistently with the purposes for which it was granted.

This observation marks an important distinction between the earlier Panels and the one that follows. Friedrich Trump operated within a frontier economy where distance and limited governmental presence often delayed accountability. Fred Trump worked within an expanding administrative state whose increasingly complex housing programs generated contracts, audits, investigations, and congressional hearings. Donald Trump entered a far more interconnected institutional environment, one in which media, politics, nonprofit organizations, executive agencies, digital communications, financial systems, and public records operate simultaneously. Opportunity and accountability evolved together.

This Panel does not attempt to write another biography of Donald Trump. His business career, television career, political campaigns, presidency, and public controversies have already generated thousands of books, documentaries, investigations, and scholarly analyses. Instead, this investigation asks a narrower question.

Does the Extraction Model developed in the preceding Panels remain recognizable within this fundamentally different institutional environment?

If Friedrich Trump extracted opportunity from frontier migration, and Fred Trump from the expanding administrative state, did Donald Trump discover comparable opportunities within the modern institutions of media, celebrity, branding, religion, fundraising, executive authority, and political influence?

The answer cannot be found by examining personalities alone. As in the preceding Panels, this investigation begins with the institutional environment itself. It examines how modern institutions create opportunity, how they interact, and how they are intended to remain accountable through the constitutional, statutory, and documentary systems established to govern public authority. Only then does it examine the individuals who operated within them.

**Building the Trump Brand**

Donald Trump did not begin his business career by creating a new enterprise. He entered an established family business built over several decades under the leadership of his father, Fred Trump. By the early 1970s, the Trump Organization had become a successful developer and manager of middle-income housing throughout Brooklyn, Queens, and Staten Island. The company possessed substantial assets, established banking relationships, and extensive experience navigating New York City's real estate market.

Donald Trump inherited more than a business. He inherited a platform.

Where Fred Trump had focused on the postwar housing market, Donald increasingly pursued opportunities that combined commercial real estate with public visibility. Manhattan's concentration of finance, media, tourism, and corporate headquarters offered opportunities extending beyond property development. Buildings could become symbols as well as investments.

One of Trump's earliest major projects—the redevelopment of the Commodore Hotel into the Grand Hyatt—illustrated this shift. The project depended on familiar real estate practices, including public incentives, complex financing, and negotiations with government officials and private investors. It also attracted national media attention, making Donald Trump himself part of the story rather than simply the developer behind it.[54]

As additional projects followed, including Trump Tower, the Trump name increasingly acquired commercial value independent of any single property. It appeared prominently on buildings, marketing materials, books, hotels, casinos, and later on licensing agreements and consumer merchandise. Public recognition of the name itself became part of what was being marketed.[55]

This development reflected broader changes in the American economy.[56] During the late twentieth century, corporations increasingly recognized brand identity as a commercial asset in its own right. Public recognition, reputation, and consumer trust could themselves generate economic value independent of any single product or property.

Increasingly, the Trump name functioned in precisely that capacity.

Within the framework of the Extraction Model, the significance lies not in branding itself, but in the institutional opportunities branding created. In Panel I, opportunity emerged from frontier migration. In Panel II, it emerged from government programs and institutional relationships. By the end of the twentieth century, public visibility had become an

---

[54] Wayne Barrett, *Trump: The Deals and the Downfall* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), 63–78.
[55] Michael D'Antonio, *The Truth About Trump* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2015), 142–145.
[56] David A. Aaker, *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name* (New York: Free Press, 1991), 7–12.

economic resource capable of attracting investment, supporting licensing agreements, and opening institutional doors.

The Trump Organization remained a real estate company. Increasingly, however, the Trump name had become a commercial asset in its own right.

As the Trump brand expanded, it also reached beyond traditional real estate into other highly commercialized enterprises, including casino gambling and televised beauty pageants. These ventures reflected the changing institutions of late twentieth-century America, where hospitality, entertainment, media, and commerce increasingly overlapped. The comparison is not one of identical businesses but of institutional adaptation.

Friedrich Trump's frontier hotels did more than provide lodging. They became destinations for a range of complementary commercial activities generated by the Klondike Gold Rush. Donald Trump's hotels similarly became components of broader commercial enterprises that integrated luxury hospitality, entertainment, gambling, media exposure, brand promotion, and an atmosphere of indulgence. The institutions had changed. The pattern under examination remained recognizable.

**Political Influence**

The expansion of the Trump brand produced something beyond commercial recognition. Public visibility created an audience, and that audience could be mobilized for purposes extending well beyond commerce. Television appearances, bestselling books, public speaking engagements, and extensive media coverage transformed commercial recognition into public influence. As traditional boundaries between entertainment, journalism, and politics became increasingly porous, celebrity itself emerged as a form of political capital.

The question for this investigation is not whether celebrity influenced politics—that phenomenon was hardly unique to Donald Trump. Rather, it asks whether the institutions of modern media enabled influence itself to become another mechanism through which economic, political, and institutional advantages could be accumulated.

**Campaigns and Public Identity**

Donald Trump's transition from businessman to political candidate did not occur suddenly in 2015. It followed decades of deliberate cultivation of a highly recognizable public identity. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, he became a frequent subject of newspaper profiles, magazine features, television interviews, and business publications. His name appeared not only on buildings but increasingly within American popular culture itself.

That visibility expanded dramatically with the debut of The Apprentice in 2004. For fourteen seasons, millions of viewers encountered a carefully constructed public persona portraying Trump as a decisive executive whose authority rested on confidence, success, and the power to judge others. Regardless of how accurately that image reflected the underlying realities of his business career, it substantially increased his national recognition and extended his audience far beyond the real estate industry.

By the time Trump announced his candidacy for president in June 2015, he was already one of the most recognizable public figures in the United States. His campaign therefore began with an advantage unavailable to most first-time candidates: decades of accumulated public familiarity, continuous media exposure, and a personal brand already known to millions of potential voters.[57]

**Audience as Political Capital**

Donald Trump's presidential campaign demonstrated that a sufficiently large and engaged audience could itself become a strategic institutional asset. Traditional political campaigns had long relied upon party organizations, endorsements, and established media relationships to communicate with voters. By 2015, however, the changing media environment offered an alternative path. A candidate capable of sustaining continuous

[57] Michael D'Antonio, *Never Enough: Donald Trump and the Pursuit of Success* (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2015), 327–346.

public attention could often reach millions of Americans without relying exclusively on those traditional intermediaries.[58]

Trump entered the campaign with decades of accumulated public recognition. His rallies generated extensive television coverage, while his frequent use of social media enabled direct communication with supporters on an unprecedented scale. Statements issued through digital platforms were often reported immediately by national news organizations, allowing a single message to circulate simultaneously through social media, cable news, newspapers, and online publications.[59] The institutions of communication had become deeply interconnected.

This visibility possessed measurable institutional value. Public attention translated into campaign contributions, volunteer recruitment, voter mobilization, and continuous news coverage. Political support, in turn, reinforced commercial visibility, while commercial recognition continued to sustain political influence.[60] Rather than operating independently, media, branding, fundraising, and electoral politics increasingly functioned as mutually reinforcing institutions.

The significance of this development extends beyond any single political campaign. Throughout American history, technological change has repeatedly altered the institutions through which influence is exercised. Radio transformed presidential communication during the twentieth century. Television reshaped national politics in the decades that followed. Digital media introduced another institutional transformation, enabling public figures to cultivate audiences of unprecedented size while communicating directly with them in real time.

---

[58] Daniel Kreiss, *Prototype Politics: Technology-Intensive Campaigning and the Data of Democracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 3–6.
[59] Kira Hall, Donna M. Goldstein, and Matthew Bruce Ingram, “The Hands of Donald Trump: Entertainment, Gesture, Spectacle,” *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6, no. 2 (2016): 488–492.
[60] Andrew Chadwick, “Donald Trump, the 2016 U.S. Presidential Campaign, and the Intensification of the Hybrid Media System,” in *The Hybrid Media System: Politics and Power*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 240–284.

Within the framework of the Extraction Model, the audience itself became an institutional resource. It could attract financial support, generate political leverage, influence public debate, and strengthen relationships with organizations seeking access to that audience. The principal resource being accumulated was no longer land, buildings, or even a commercial brand alone. Increasingly, it was the sustained attention and loyalty of millions of individuals.

By the time Donald Trump assumed the presidency in January 2017, he entered executive authority with an institutional network extending across media platforms, political organizations, fundraising operations, advocacy groups, and a national public audience. Unlike previous generations of the family, whose influence depended primarily upon business relationships or government programs, this network represented a fundamentally different form of institutional capital—one capable of shaping public discourse, mobilizing supporters, and extending influence simultaneously across multiple interconnected institutions.

**Executive Authority**

Donald Trump's inauguration on January 20, 2017, marked more than the beginning of a new presidential administration. Within the framework of this investigation, it represented entry into an institution unlike any previously examined in the Triptych. For Friedrich Trump, opportunity had emerged from frontier commerce. For Fred Trump, it arose through expanding relationships with government housing programs. Donald Trump now occupied the nation's highest executive office, where the constitutional powers of the presidency intersected with an already established commercial brand, political movement, fundraising network, and national media presence.

The office of the President carries authorities unavailable to private citizens or business executives.[61] Through executive orders, executive appointments, budget proposals, regulatory priorities, ceremonial leadership, and administrative authority over the executive

---

[61] Louis Fisher, *The Law of the Executive Branch: Presidential Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 25–41.

branch, presidential decisions influence thousands of public institutions and millions of citizens. While those powers are constrained by Congress, the courts, federal law, and the Constitution, the presidency nevertheless possesses extraordinary capacity to shape the direction and priorities of the federal government.

Donald Trump assumed that office with characteristics uncommon among modern presidents.[62] His political identity had developed alongside a highly recognizable commercial brand. His communication strategy relied heavily upon direct engagement with the public through rallies, television appearances, and digital media rather than traditional institutional channels alone. The audience cultivated over decades did not remain outside government; it accompanied him into office, creating an unusually direct relationship between executive authority and a large, continuously engaged public following.[63]

This convergence of institutions distinguished the environment in which executive power was exercised. Commercial branding, mass media, political organization, nonprofit advocacy, fundraising, and presidential authority increasingly operated within overlapping networks rather than as separate spheres. Decisions made within one institutional sphere often produced immediate effects across the others. Executive announcements became media events. Political messaging influenced fundraising. Public ceremonies reinforced brand identity. Institutional boundaries that had once been more distinct became increasingly interconnected.

The purpose of this investigation is not to suggest that such institutional convergence was unique to Donald Trump. Modern presidents necessarily operate within an environment shaped by twenty-four-hour news coverage, digital communication, and permanent political campaigning. The question, rather, is whether Donald Trump demonstrated an

[62] John Sides, Michael Tesler, and Lynn Vavreck, *Identity Crisis: The 2016 Presidential Campaign and the Battle for the Meaning of America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018), 47–52.
[63] Brian L. Ott and Greg Dickinson, *The Twitter Presidency: Donald J. Trump and the Politics of White Rage* (New York: Routledge, 2019), 1–7, 45–52.

exceptional capacity to recognize, integrate, and leverage those interconnected institutions in ways consistent with the Extraction Model developed throughout this work.

Unlike the frontier commerce examined in Panel I or the federal housing programs examined in Panel II, the institutions examined here operated simultaneously across government, nonprofit organizations, private fundraising, media, and executive authority. Among the most revealing institutional case studies is the network of entities associated with the commemoration of the nation's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary. It is there that the interaction between executive authority, branding, fundraising, political influence, nonprofit organizations, and public resources becomes most clearly observable.

**Executive Orders**

Executive orders are among the most visible instruments through which a president directs the operations of the executive branch. Although they do not create new law, they establish administrative priorities, instruct federal agencies, organize executive responsibilities, and influence how existing statutes are implemented.[64] Every modern president has relied upon executive orders to advance policy objectives within the authority granted by the Constitution and federal law.

Executive orders possess unusual practical significance because they often take effect immediately. Administrative priorities, agency actions, and the expenditure of public resources may begin changing before judicial review is completed. Although courts retain the authority to suspend or invalidate executive actions that exceed constitutional or statutory limits, the initial exercise of executive authority can nevertheless produce substantial institutional consequences while simultaneously creating new administrative opportunities.

[64] Harold C. Relyea, *Executive Orders: Issuance, Modification, and Revocation*, Congressional Research Service, Report RL34738 (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 2008), 1–4.

Donald Trump employed executive orders extensively from the opening days of his administration.[65] They addressed a wide range of subjects, including immigration, regulatory policy, trade, federal workforce management, national security, and the organization of executive agencies. Many generated immediate legal challenges, while others became defining features of his administration's policy agenda.[66] Regardless of their individual merits or ultimate outcomes, the orders demonstrated the capacity of presidential authority to produce immediate institutional consequences across the federal government.

Within the framework of the Extraction Model, executive orders are significant because they illustrate how constitutional authority differs fundamentally from commercial influence. A business leader may negotiate contracts, develop products, or expand markets. A president possesses broad constitutional authority to direct the executive branch through appointments, executive orders, and administrative priorities. The scope of that authority, however, depends on the statutory framework governing particular agencies, commissions, and programs established by Congress. Determining where executive discretion ends and where statutory obligations begin is therefore essential to understanding the administration of any congressional appropriation.

That distinction becomes particularly important when examining initiatives requiring coordination among multiple federal agencies, independent commissions, nonprofit organizations, advisory bodies, and private partners. The legal relationships among those institutions are defined not by assumption but by the statutes that created them, the authorities delegated to them, and the constitutional limits governing executive action. The institutions associated with the nation's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary therefore

[65] Brandon J. Murrill, *Executive Orders: An Introduction*, Congressional Research Service, Report R46977 (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2021), 7–10.
[66] Kate M. Manuel and Brandon J. Murrill, *Executive Orders: Legal Authority, Judicial Review, and Congressional Oversight*, Congressional Research Service, Report R45725 (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Research Service, 2019), 12–17.

present an especially instructive case study in the interaction between executive authority and congressional direction.[67]

The organizations, appropriations, executive actions, and public-private partnerships associated with America250 did not emerge independently. They developed within a complex institutional framework created through congressional legislation, executive administration, and public-private collaboration.[68] Tracing that framework through the documentary record—and determining where executive discretion ended and statutory responsibility began—is the purpose of the chapters that follow.

**Institutional Transformation**

Donald Trump's transition from private citizen to President fundamentally altered his relationship with the institutions examined throughout this Panel. Commercial branding, media visibility, fundraising, and political influence remained important sources of institutional capital, but they now operated alongside the constitutional powers of the presidency. Institutions that had previously existed outside the executive branch increasingly became connected through presidential leadership, administrative coordination, and national initiatives.

This transformation did not eliminate the constitutional limits imposed upon presidential authority. Congress continued to enact legislation, appropriate public funds, and oversee executive agencies. The federal courts retained authority to review executive actions, while numerous commissions, boards, and independent entities continued to exercise responsibilities assigned to them by statute. The presidency therefore operated within a constitutional system designed to balance executive leadership with legislative authority and judicial oversight.[69]

---

[67] Donald J. Trump, *Executive Order 14189—Celebrating America's 250th Birthday*, January 29, 2025, sec. 2(d)–(e), *Federal Register* 90, no. 21 (February 3, 2025): 8850.
[68] United States Congress, *United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016*, Pub. L. No. 114-196, §§ 4(a), 5(a), 130 Stat. 686–87 (2016).
[69] U.S. Const. arts. I–III.

Within that constitutional framework, however, the presidency occupies a uniquely influential institutional position. Presidential leadership can establish national priorities, appoint senior executive officials, organize advisory bodies, encourage cooperation among federal agencies, and shape the public visibility of major national initiatives. The exercise of that influence depends not only upon constitutional authority but also upon the statutory responsibilities assigned to the institutions involved.[70]

For the purposes of this investigation, the significance lies not in any single executive action but in the convergence of institutions. Commercial branding, political organization, executive authority, nonprofit organizations, philanthropic entities, religious movements, advisory bodies, congressional legislation, and public administration increasingly operated within overlapping institutional environments rather than as isolated spheres.[71] Understanding those relationships is essential to evaluating the institutional landscape that emerged during the Trump presidency.

The chapters that follow examine several of those institutional relationships individually. Each is considered within its own statutory, constitutional, or organizational framework before the investigation brings them together to evaluate the broader pattern of institutional interaction.

---

**Religious Institutions and Ideological Influence**

Every generation inherits not only the economic and political institutions of its era, but also the systems through which ideas are communicated, communities are organized, and public influence is exercised. During the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, nationally organized religious ministries evolved far beyond traditional congregations.

[70] U.S. Const. art. II, §§ 1–3.
[71] *United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016*, Pub. L. No. 114-196, §§ 4(a), 5(a), 130 Stat. 686–87 (2016); Donald J. Trump, *Executive Order 14189—Celebrating America's 250th Birthday*, January 29, 2025, secs. 2(d)–(e), *Federal Register* 90, no. 21 (February 3, 2025): 8850.

Advances in broadcasting, publishing, satellite television, digital media, and social networking enabled a relatively small number of religious leaders to reach audiences measured in the millions. Many ministries consequently developed into influential media organizations, fundraising networks, nonprofit corporations, political advocacy organizations, and centers of public mobilization.

The inclusion of religion within this investigation does not concern the truth or legitimacy of religious belief. Questions of faith and theology lie beyond its scope. Rather, this Panel examines how certain nationally organized religious institutions became influential participants in American public life. Like the frontier economy examined in Panel I and the federal housing system examined in Panel II, these organizations developed systems of influence extending well beyond their original missions. Their significance lies not in doctrine but in their demonstrated ability to cultivate large audiences, generate financial support, shape public narratives, mobilize political participation, and establish enduring relationships with elected officials and governmental institutions.[72]

By the opening decades of the twenty-first century, the boundaries separating religion, media, fundraising, nonprofit organizations, political advocacy, and government had become increasingly interconnected. Nationally recognized religious leaders appeared not only behind pulpits but also on television, at campaign events, within advisory councils, and eventually inside the White House itself. Influence became cumulative: audience generated visibility, visibility created political access, and political access expanded institutional influence. Donald Trump entered an environment in which branding, media, politics, nonprofit organizations, and nationally organized religious institutions increasingly operated as interconnected systems. Understanding those institutional relationships is essential because they formed an important part of the broader institutional environment within which his presidency operated.

---

[72] Randall Balmer, *Thy Kingdom Come: How the Religious Right Distorts the Faith and Threatens America* (New York: Basic Books, 2006), 2.

The institutional dynamics outlined above become more concrete through the careers of nationally prominent religious leaders who developed close and sustained relationships with Donald Trump. Among them, none occupied a more visible or enduring advisory role than Paula White-Cain.

**Paula White-Cain**

Nationally organized religious media ministries became an increasingly significant source of institutional influence during the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Through expanding television audiences, publishing enterprises, conferences, nonprofit organizations, fundraising operations, and digital communications, prominent ministries extended their reach well beyond individual congregations, creating nationwide networks capable of shaping public opinion, mobilizing supporters, and engaging political leaders.[73] Among the most thoroughly documented examples of this evolving relationship between religious media and presidential politics is the longstanding association between Donald Trump and Paula White-Cain.

White's public ministry emerged during the rapid expansion of televangelism and religious broadcasting in the closing decades of the twentieth century. Through television programs, books, conferences, and an expanding media presence, she developed an audience extending far beyond the membership of any single congregation. Like many nationally recognized ministries of the period, her organization increasingly combined religious leadership with publishing, fundraising, nonprofit administration, event production, and digital communications. By the time Donald Trump entered national politics, White had become not merely a pastor, but the leader of a sophisticated national media ministry.[74]

According to White's own public accounts, Trump first encountered her through one of her televised broadcasts during the early 2000s. Impressed by her message, he contacted her directly, initiating a relationship that would continue for more than two decades. Initially

---

[73] Daniel K. Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 161.
[74] Michelle Boorstein, "Who Is Paula White, Trump's Latest Spiritual Adviser?" *Washington Post*, June 21, 2016.

private, the relationship gradually became public as White emerged as one of Trump's most visible religious advisers, introducing him to influential evangelical leaders while helping build relationships with religious constituencies that would become increasingly significant during his presidential campaigns.[75]

White's influence expanded alongside Trump's political rise. During the 2016 campaign she chaired his Evangelical Advisory Board, organized meetings with prominent pastors, and frequently appeared as a public defender of his candidacy. She participated in inaugural ceremonies following his election and remained one of the administration's most recognizable religious allies. In 2019, Trump appointed her as Special Advisor to the White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative, giving her an official advisory role within the Executive Office of the President. Whatever the practical limits of that position, the appointment represented a documented progression from nationally recognized media ministry to formal access within the executive branch.[76]

The significance of that progression lies not primarily in White's personal beliefs or theological teachings, but in the institutional pathway it documents. A nationally organized religious media ministry evolved into sustained participation within presidential politics and, ultimately, an official advisory role inside the Executive Office of the President. White's career illustrates how media influence, nonprofit leadership, political relationships, and executive access could reinforce one another within a single institutional network.

White's ministry also reflected theological currents that had become increasingly influential within portions of American evangelicalism. She has long been associated with prosperity theology, a movement emphasizing God's desire to bless believers materially as well as spiritually,[77] and she has frequently expressed support for themes associated with

---

[75] Julie Zauzmer, "How Paula White Became Trump's Spiritual Adviser," *Washington Post*, November 3, 2019.
[76] White House, "President Donald J. Trump Announces Paula White as Special Advisor to the White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative," *press release*, November 1, 2019.
[77] Laurie Goodstein, "Paula White, Trump's Spiritual Adviser, Says He Is 'Authentic,'" *New York Times*, January 19, 2017.

Christian Nationalism[78] and Christian Zionism.[79] These positions placed her within broader ideological networks that connected religious conviction with national identity, public policy, and political activism. While the theological merits of those beliefs fall outside the scope of this investigation, their institutional significance is substantial. They helped create durable alliances among religious organizations, political campaigns, advocacy groups, and media ministries that extended well beyond traditional church life.

White's public statements and activities also illustrate how religious messaging increasingly intersected with political communication. Throughout Trump's campaigns and presidency, she frequently framed political contests in spiritual terms, describing elections as moments of divine purpose, calling supporters to prayer and mobilization, and presenting political outcomes within a larger narrative of providential struggle.[80] Such messaging was not unique to White, but it exemplified how nationally recognized religious figures could reinforce political identity through theological language while simultaneously strengthening institutional loyalty among large audiences.

For the purposes of this investigation, White's career provides a well-documented case study of how a nationally organized religious media ministry became an enduring participant in presidential politics. It illustrates one documented pathway through which institutional influence expanded across media, nonprofit organizations, political campaigns, and the executive branch during the twenty-first century.

White's career, however, was not an isolated example. Other nationally prominent religious leaders developed comparable relationships with Donald Trump through different institutional models. Among the most influential was Robert Morris, whose rapidly expanding megachurch became another important intersection between religious leadership, political influence, and executive access.

---

[78] Jack Jenkins, "Paula White Breaks with Many Evangelicals over Christian Nationalism," *Religion News Service*, October 18, 2019.
[79] Elana Schor, "Trump Adviser Paula White Joins Effort to Mobilize Evangelicals for Israel," *Associated Press*, December 6, 2019.
[80] Justine Coleman, "Trump Faith Adviser Leads Prayer Service Calling for 'Angelic Reinforcement' in Election," *The Hill*, November 5, 2020.

**Robert Morris: The Megachurch as an Institution**

If Paula White illustrated the growing political influence of nationally broadcast religious media ministries, Robert Morris represented a different institutional evolution: the rise of the modern megachurch as a center of organizational, cultural, and political influence. Rather than relying primarily on television, Morris built Gateway Church into a multifaceted institution encompassing worship, publishing, conferences, charitable programs, media production, education, and extensive administrative operations. By the early twenty-first century, megachurches such as Gateway had evolved into sophisticated nonprofit organizations whose influence extended far beyond their local congregations.

Founded in Southlake, Texas, in 2000, Gateway Church grew into one of the largest evangelical churches in the United States, attracting tens of thousands of weekly attendees across multiple campuses. Morris became a nationally recognized pastor whose sermons, conferences, books, and digital media reached audiences well beyond Texas. Like other large religious organizations of the period, Gateway possessed institutional assets extending beyond spiritual leadership: established communities of trust, professional communications networks, substantial financial resources, and the ability to mobilize large audiences around shared beliefs and values.

Institutions of this scale inevitably attracted political attention. Nationally prominent pastors possessed something few political organizations could duplicate: trusted relationships with large, organized constituencies and communication networks capable of reaching hundreds of thousands of people through churches, conferences, broadcasts, and digital media. Relationships between elected officials and influential religious leaders therefore became an increasingly visible feature of modern American public life.

Within this environment, Morris developed a documented relationship with Donald Trump. In June 2016, he was appointed to Trump's Evangelical Executive Advisory Board during the presidential campaign. During Trump's first term, Morris participated in the broader network of evangelical advisers associated with the administration, and on June 11, 2020, Trump appeared with him at Gateway Church's Dallas campus for a public "Roundtable on

Transition to Greatness." These documented interactions illustrate how influential religious institutions could become integrated into broader networks of political communication, public legitimacy, and executive access.[81]

The significance of Morris to this investigation, however, extends beyond his political relationships. In June 2024, allegations that he had sexually abused a twelve-year-old girl during the 1980s became public. Morris responded with a public statement acknowledging what he described as "inappropriate sexual behavior with a young lady," while characterizing the conduct differently from the allegations that later became the subject of criminal proceedings. On June 18, 2024, Gateway Church accepted his resignation. The church's Board of Elders subsequently stated that, before the allegations became public, they had not understood the victim's age or the duration of the abuse.[82]

The documentary record expanded substantially during the following year. In March 2025, an Oklahoma grand jury indicted Morris on five counts of lewd or indecent acts with a child. On October 2, 2025, Morris pleaded guilty to all five counts. Under the plea agreement, he received a ten-year suspended sentence requiring six months in jail, probation, registration as a sex offender, and restitution to the victim. What began as public allegations ultimately concluded with Morris's own guilty plea in a criminal court.[83]

That chronology raises broader institutional questions. According to Morris's own public statement, concerns about his conduct had been addressed within church leadership decades earlier, and he temporarily stepped away from ministry before later returning to religious leadership. He subsequently founded Gateway Church, built it into one of the

---

[81] Adelle M. Banks, "Trump Forms Evangelical Advisory Board," *Religion News Service*, June 21, 2016; Jill Colvin, "Trump Meets with Faith Leaders in Dallas," *Associated Press*, June 11, 2020.
[82] "Texas Megachurch Pastor Resigns After Woman Says He Sexually Abused Her in the 1980s," *Associated Press*, June 18, 2024; Megan Cardona, "Gateway Church Pastor Robert Morris Resigns Amid 1980s Sexual Abuse Allegations," *KERA News*, June 18, 2024.
[83] Oklahoma Office of the Attorney General, "Multi-County Grand Jury Indicts Texas Megachurch Founder on Multiple Counts of Lewd or Indecent Acts with Child," March 12, 2025; Oklahoma Office of the Attorney General, "Megachurch Founder Pleads Guilty to Child Sex Abuse Charges," October 2, 2025.

nation's most influential megachurches, and eventually served on Donald Trump's Evangelical Executive Advisory Board.[84]

The documentary record therefore invites examination not simply of individual misconduct, but of the institutional processes through which religious organizations investigated, resolved, and responded to allegations involving influential leaders, and how those decisions affected later public trust and institutional legitimacy.

For the purposes of this Investigative Triptych, that institutional question is more significant than the conduct of any single individual. Throughout this report, the focus has remained on institutions: how they create opportunity, how they exercise influence, and how they respond when confronted with evidence that challenges their own legitimacy. Gateway Church had become one of the nation's most influential evangelical organizations while participating in documented networks connecting religious leadership with political influence. The subsequent collapse of its founding leader therefore became more than a personal scandal. It became part of the historical record of an institution whose moral authority had itself become a source of public influence.

As with the other institutions examined throughout this investigation, the objective is not to instruct readers what conclusions they should reach. The criminal proceedings, official church statements, and documentary record speak for themselves. The broader historical question is what Robert Morris's rise, influence, and eventual downfall reveal about the institutional pathways through which religious authority, public legitimacy, and political influence became increasingly interconnected in contemporary America.

**From Individuals to Institutions**

Examining the biographies of individual religious leaders reveals only part of the historical record. As this investigation progressed, the same names repeatedly appeared across presidential campaigns, White House advisory bodies, nonprofit organizations,

[84] Megan Cardona, "Gateway Church Pastor Robert Morris Resigns Amid 1980s Sexual Abuse Allegations," *Texas Public Radio*, June 18, 2024.

conferences, religious initiatives, and policy organizations. Their recurring presence suggested that these were not merely isolated relationships between individual pastors and a political leader. The documentary record pointed instead toward a broader institutional framework.

That observation shifts the focus of this investigation. Rather than asking how particular religious figures interacted with Donald Trump, the chapters that follow examine the organizations, advisory boards, commissions, nonprofit entities, and advocacy groups through which those relationships became structured and sustained. The objective is not to assume authority, coordination, or influence where none can be documented, but to understand the institutional landscape within which these recurring relationships developed.

Religious influence has long been present in American politics. What distinguishes the period examined here is not the existence of religious advocacy itself, but the increasing formalization of relationships through advisory boards, White House initiatives, nonprofit organizations, policy institutes, and recurring conferences. Individual campaigns begin and end. Administrations change. Public figures rise and fall. Institutions, however, preserve organizational knowledge, cultivate long-term relationships, develop leadership networks, and provide continuity that extends beyond any single election cycle. The documentary record shows that many of the individuals examined in the preceding sections served simultaneously within these institutional structures, creating relationships that endured even as political circumstances changed.

The first of these formal structures appeared during Donald Trump's 2016 presidential campaign with the creation of the Evangelical Executive Advisory Board. Rather than functioning as an informal collection of religious supporters, the Board established an identifiable advisory body composed of nationally recognized evangelical leaders representing diverse ministries, churches, nonprofit organizations, and advocacy groups. Publicly reported members included Paula White, Franklin Graham, James Dobson, Robert Jeffress, Jack Graham, Ralph Reed, Tony Perkins, Robert Morris, and others whose organizations collectively reached millions of Americans through churches, broadcasting, publishing, education, conferences, charitable programs, and political advocacy.[85]

The Advisory Board served several complementary purposes. It provided the campaign with direct access to experienced religious leaders while establishing communication with influential evangelical constituencies. At the same time, it provided participating organizations an opportunity to communicate their priorities directly to a presidential campaign while strengthening relationships that would continue beyond the election itself. Whether viewed from the perspective of electoral politics or institutional development, the Advisory Board represented more than a campaign committee. It became a documented point of intersection between national political leadership and an extensive network of established religious institutions.

Its historical significance becomes more apparent when viewed alongside subsequent developments. Following Trump's election, several individuals associated with the Advisory Board continued to appear within executive initiatives, presidential events, White House advisory roles, and later faith-based organizations and commissions. Their recurring presence across multiple institutional settings does not, by itself, establish centralized authority or coordinated action. It does, however, document an enduring network of institutional relationships that persisted as campaign organizations gave way to formal governmental and nonprofit structures. Those relationships provide the foundation for the institutional analysis that follows.

**The White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative**

The institutional progression continued after the 2016 election. Relationships that had initially developed within the Evangelical Executive Advisory Board did not simply conclude with the campaign. Several of the same religious leaders continued to participate in White House events, policy discussions, and executive initiatives as the new administration established formal mechanisms for engaging faith-based organizations.

[85] Adelle M. Banks, "Trump Forms Evangelical Advisory Board," *Religion News Service*, June 21, 2016.

One of the most significant developments occurred on May 3, 2018, when President Trump issued an executive order establishing the White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative.[86] Housed within the Executive Office of the President, the Initiative was created to advise the administration on partnerships with faith-based and community organizations, identify regulatory barriers affecting religious organizations, and improve coordination between federal agencies and religious institutions. Unlike the campaign advisory board, this initiative operated within the executive branch itself, providing a formal governmental structure for ongoing engagement with nationally organized religious organizations.

The institutional relationship expanded further in October 2019 when Paula White-Cain was appointed Special Advisor to the White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative.[87] Her appointment represented a documented progression from nationally recognized televangelist, to campaign adviser, to an official advisory role within the Executive Office of the President. Regardless of the practical scope of the position, it reflected the continuing institutionalization of relationships that had first emerged during the presidential campaign.

The significance of the Initiative lies less in any individual appointment than in what it illustrates historically. Relationships that had initially been organized for electoral purposes evolved into formal structures within the executive branch. Campaign advisers became White House advisers. Informal networks acquired institutional permanence. The pattern observed throughout this investigation became increasingly visible: individuals changed roles, administrations evolved, but the organizational relationships themselves demonstrated continuity.

The same pattern reappeared in subsequent executive initiatives. As additional advisory bodies and commissions were established, many of the organizations and several of the individuals already encountered in this investigation resurfaced once again. Rather than

---

[86] Executive Order No. 13831, "Establishment of a White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative," 83 Fed. Reg. 20,715 (May 8, 2018).
[87] White House, "President Donald J. Trump Announces Paula White as Special Advisor to the White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative," *press release*, October 31, 2019.

introducing an entirely new network, the documentary record increasingly revealed an expanding institutional framework built upon recurring relationships, recurring organizations, and recurring participation.

**Religious Liberty Commission**

The institutional pattern continued beyond the first Trump administration. As advisory relationships established during the 2016 campaign evolved into executive initiatives within the White House, additional commissions and advisory bodies emerged that drew upon many of the same religious and political networks. Each organization possessed its own stated mission and legal authority. Yet the documentary record reveals recurring participation by many of the same nationally recognized religious leaders and advocacy organizations across multiple institutional settings.

Among the most significant of these later developments was the establishment of the Religious Liberty Commission. Created by executive order during Donald Trump's second administration, the Commission was charged with advising the President on matters concerning religious liberty, the protection of faith-based organizations, and the role of religious freedom within American public life.[88] Its membership included religious leaders, legal scholars, and public officials drawn from a variety of denominations and professional backgrounds. As with earlier advisory bodies, the Commission publicly emphasized constitutional principles, religious freedom, and the continuing role of faith within American society.

For the purposes of this investigation, however, the Commission is significant less because of its stated objectives than because of its place within the institutional progression traced throughout this chapter. Examined alongside the Evangelical Executive Advisory Board and the White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative, it represents another stage in the evolution of relationships that had developed over nearly a decade. Individuals who first appeared within campaign advisory roles later reappeared within executive initiatives,

---

[88] Executive Order No. 14291, "Establishment of the Religious Liberty Commission," *Federal Register* 90 (May 7, 2025): 19417–19419.

presidential events, advisory commissions, and affiliated organizations. While each institution possessed its own independent responsibilities, the recurring participation of many of the same individuals documents an observable continuity across changing organizational structures.

The documentary record does not establish that these institutions functioned as a single centralized organization, nor does this investigation suggest such a conclusion. Rather, it documents something both narrower and historically significant: a persistent network of overlapping institutional relationships. Advisory boards evolved into executive initiatives. Executive initiatives were followed by additional commissions. Established nonprofit organizations, religious ministries, advocacy groups, and policy institutes continued to intersect through recurring leadership, shared public events, and common participation in presidential advisory structures. The continuity lies not in identical institutions, but in the recurring organizational relationships connecting them.

Whether these evolving relationships remained within the constitutional boundaries governing the relationship between religion and government is ultimately a legal question beyond the scope of this investigation. This report instead documents the historical development of those relationships and the institutional structures through which they operated.

The Religious Liberty Commission therefore represents the culmination of the institutional progression examined in this chapter. Having traced the evolution of these recurring institutional relationships, the investigation now turns from organizations to ideas. Before examining the role of religion within the institutional landscape surrounding America250, it is necessary to distinguish between Christianity as a religion and Christian nationalism as a political ideology.

**Understanding Christian Nationalism**

Before examining the role of Christian nationalist messaging within the institutional networks surrounding Donald Trump's political movement, one distinction deserves careful attention. Christianity and Christian nationalism are not synonymous. Although the terms are frequently conflated in public debate, they describe fundamentally different concepts.

Political scientists Andrew L. Whitehead and Samuel L. Perry define Christian nationalism as "a cultural framework—a collection of myths, traditions, symbols, narratives, and value systems—that idealizes and advocates a fusion of Christianity with American civic life."[89] Their definition has become one of the most widely cited academic descriptions of the movement because it focuses not on personal faith but on the relationship between religious identity, national identity, and political power.

That distinction is essential to this investigation. Christianity is a global religion encompassing nearly 50,000 denominations, sects, theological traditions, and political viewpoints. Christian nationalism, by contrast, is a political ideology that seeks to unite a particular understanding of Christianity with the identity and governance of the American nation. The subject examined here is therefore institutional and political rather than theological.

Nationalism itself is neither new nor uniquely American. Historians have documented nationalist movements across centuries, recognizing that they have taken many forms—civic, ethnic, religious, cultural, and revolutionary. Some have promoted national unity or independence. Others have fostered increasingly narrow definitions of national identity that excluded those considered outsiders. The historical record demonstrates that nationalism is not a single phenomenon but a family of movements whose consequences have varied according to the ideas they embraced and the institutions through which those ideas were expressed. Because nationalism has profoundly influenced political movements throughout history, careful definition is essential before examining its modern expressions.

Recent survey data illustrates why these distinctions matter. In 2022, the Pew Research Center found that 45 percent of Americans believed the United States should be a

---

[89] Andrew L. Whitehead and Samuel L. Perry, *Taking America Back for God: Christian Nationalism in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 10.

Christian nation while also reporting that many respondents were unfamiliar with the term "Christian nationalism."[90] That gap between public sentiment and public understanding makes careful definition essential before examining the movement's influence.

Throughout American history, religious organizations have participated in civic life, advocated public policy, and influenced political debate. The question explored here is more specific: how did a distinct political ideology move through ministries, advocacy organizations, media platforms, advisory boards, executive institutions, and political campaigns to become an influential component of a modern presidential movement?

Ideas rarely reshape public institutions on their own. They gain influence through organizations that communicate them, institutions that preserve them, and networks that carry them into the political arena. The evolution of those institutions and networks provides the context for the documentary investigation that follows.

---

**From Institutional Context to Documentary Investigation**

The preceding sections have examined nationally organized religious institutions, advisory boards, executive initiatives, and the ideological networks that increasingly connected them. Standing alone, each organization appears to serve a distinct purpose. Churches minister to congregations. Advocacy organizations promote public policy. Advisory boards counsel political leaders. Executive commissions address questions of governance. Viewed individually, they appear to occupy separate spheres of American public life.

Viewed together, however, a different picture begins to emerge.

The documentary record reveals an increasingly interconnected institutional landscape in which many of the same organizations, leaders, and ideas repeatedly intersected across

[90] Pew Research Center, *45% of Americans Say U.S. Should Be a "Christian Nation"* (Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, October 27, 2022). https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2022/10/27/45-of-americans-say-u-s-should-be-a-christian-nation/

campaigns, nonprofit organizations, media ministries, White House initiatives, public events, and presidential commissions. That observation alone establishes neither improper coordination nor shared purpose. It does, however, demonstrate that these relationships were not isolated or incidental. They became recurring features of the institutional environment surrounding Donald Trump's political movement.

Whether those recurring institutional relationships materially influenced the administration of the nation's semiquincentennial observance cannot be answered through institutional history alone. It requires documentary investigation.

The remainder of this panel therefore shifts from the evolution of institutions and ideas to the governmental record itself. Statutes, executive orders, appropriations, contracts, annual reports, financial disclosures, cooperative agreements, and other primary source documents become the principal evidence. The objective is no longer simply to identify recurring institutional relationships, but to determine whether those relationships can be traced through the administration, funding, and implementation of the nation's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary observance.

That documentary investigation begins with the institution Congress created to coordinate the nation's semiquincentennial celebration: the United States Semiquincentennial Commission.

**America250: Statutory Foundation and Organizational Structure**

Periodically, every nation pauses to commemorate defining moments in its history. Such observances preserve collective memory, educate new generations, encourage civic participation, and invite reflection upon both national achievement and national struggle. The approaching two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence represented one of the most significant commemorations in American history. Planning for an observance of that magnitude necessarily began years before July 4, 2026.

Recognizing the importance of the anniversary, Congress enacted the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act in 2016, creating the United States

Semiquincentennial Commission to plan, encourage, develop, and **coordinate** the national commemoration.[91] The Commission was intended to serve as the central coordinating body for the nation's observance, bringing together representatives from Congress, the executive branch, state governments, cultural institutions, and private citizens. Its mission reflected a straightforward public purpose: to encourage a nationwide celebration of the nation's founding while promoting historical education, civic participation, and public engagement.

The Commission was never intended to conduct every celebration itself. Rather, it was designed to function as the principal coordinating institution within a much broader network of public and private organizations.[92] Federal agencies would contribute programs within their existing statutory responsibilities. State and territorial commissions would organize local commemorations. Museums, libraries, historical societies, educational institutions, veterans' organizations, nonprofit organizations, Tribal governments, and private sponsors would each contribute according to their respective missions. The vision was intentionally decentralized. A national anniversary would ultimately be celebrated through thousands of individual events rather than through a single federally managed exposition.

Several federal institutions occupied particularly important roles within this framework. Because many commemorative activities would occur at national historic sites, monuments, battlefields, and public lands, the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service became natural administrative partners. The National Park Foundation, as the congressionally chartered philanthropic partner of the National Park Service, also participated in supporting public engagement and educational initiatives associated with the anniversary. Each organization possessed distinct legal responsibilities, funding

---

[91] United States, *United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016*, Pub. L. No. 114-196, 130 Stat. 685 (2016).
[92] *United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016*, sec. 5.

authorities, and administrative structures, yet together they formed much of the institutional foundation upon which the national observance would be built.[93]

At this stage, the organizational landscape remained comparatively straightforward. Congress established the Commission. Federal agencies carried out responsibilities assigned under existing law. State governments, nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, and private organizations prepared commemorative programs appropriate to their respective missions. Although complex, the institutional architecture reflected a familiar model for national commemorations: Congress established the framework, executive agencies fulfilled their statutory responsibilities, and numerous public and private partners participated within it.

Nothing in that framework suggested that the semiquincentennial would become unusually controversial. Public statements emphasized historical education, preservation, civic participation, volunteerism, and national unity. The anniversary belonged not to any administration, political party, or private organization, but to the nation as a whole.

The institutional landscape later became considerably more complicated. Executive initiatives were established alongside the statutory framework created by Congress. New coordinating structures appeared. Additional organizations assumed operational roles. Public programs developed under multiple names, while the relationship between the Commission and the executive branch became increasingly difficult to understand from the governing statute alone.

**Executive Order 14189: Reorganizing Executive Coordination**

The first significant change to Congress's statutory framework occurred on January 29, 2025, when President Donald Trump signed Executive Order 14189.[94] The Order did not abolish the United States Semiquincentennial Commission established by Congress.

---

[93] United States Department of the Interior, *H.R. 4285—Semiquincentennial Tourism and Access to Recreation Sites (STARS) Act: Statement for the Record*, July 16, 2025, https://www.doi.gov/ocl/hr-4285; National Park Foundation, “About,” https://www.nationalparks.org/about.
[94] Donald J. Trump, *Executive Order 14189, “Celebrating America’s 250th Birthday,”* 90 Fed. Reg. 8849 (February 3, 2025).

Instead, it created a new executive framework for coordinating the federal government's participation in the nation's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary observance by establishing what became known as Task Force 250.

**Task Force 250: A Change in the Executive Coordination Structure**

Executive Order 14189 established the White House Task Force on Celebrating America's 250th Birthday, commonly known as Task Force 250. The Executive Order created a new White House coordinating structure that assumed responsibility for directing executive-branch participation in the semiquincentennial while leaving the Commission's statutory role formally intact.[95]

The Commission remained the congressionally established body for the Semiquincentennial, but the institutional structure governing the celebration had changed. Executive Order 14189 created Task Force 250 and assigned it a central role in planning, organizing, and executing the national celebration, shifting significant coordinating authority toward the executive branch.

The Executive Order introduced a new executive structure with a distinct operational role. Task Force 250 was composed primarily of Cabinet officers and senior White House officials and was directed to coordinate with executive departments and agencies "to plan, organize, and execute" the national celebration. The Order further directed Task Force 250 to "**coordinate** agencies' communications with the United States Semiquincentennial Commission," placing the new task force at the center and at the helm of executive-branch planning, coordination, and communication.[96]

This represented a significant change in the government's operational architecture. Under the Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016, Congress established the Commission as the national body responsible for planning, encouraging, developing, and coordinating the nation's commemoration. Executive Order 14189, by contrast, assigned Task Force 250

[95] *Executive Order 14189, "Celebrating America's 250th Birthday,"* sec. 2(a).
[96] *Executive Order 14189, "Celebrating America's 250th Birthday,"* sec. 2(e).

responsibility for coordinating executive departments and agencies while simultaneously directing it to coordinate those agencies' communications with the Commission. The documentary record therefore reveals two distinct coordination structures operating simultaneously: the Commission retained its statutory responsibilities under the 2016 Act, while Task Force 250 assumed operational responsibility for coordinating the executive branch's participation in the celebration.[97]

In practical effect, Executive Order 14189 transferred responsibility for executive-branch coordination of the semiquincentennial from the congressionally established United States Semiquincentennial Commission to Task Force 250. Although the Commission remained the statutory national commission, executive departments and agencies were thereafter directed to coordinate their planning, execution, and communications through the White House task force rather than directly with the Commission.

That distinction is fundamental to understanding everything that followed. The question for this investigation is not whether Congress's Commission continued to exist—it plainly did—but how the executive branch functioned after Executive Order 14189 altered the chain of executive coordination. The documentary record demonstrates that executive planning, execution, and communications now flowed through Task Force 250, establishing the institutional framework within which subsequent planning, funding decisions, public programming, and ultimately the Freedom 250 initiative developed. It is within that altered framework that the remainder of this investigation proceeds.

**Freedom 250**

Executive Order 14189 reorganized the executive branch's participation in the nation's semiquincentennial by placing that responsibility under Task Force 250. As planning progressed, the administration's public-facing celebration increasingly became known as Freedom 250.[98] Freedom 250, however, was more than a public identity. On October 28,

---

[97] *United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016*, sec. 5; *Executive Order 14189, "Celebrating America's 250th Birthday,"* secs. 2(a), 2(e).

[98] Freedom 250, *Freedom 250*, accessed August 7, 2026, https://freedom250.org/.

2025, the National Park Foundation created Freedom 250 LLC as a wholly owned subsidiary. The following month, a cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and the National Park Foundation authorized the Foundation to use Freedom 250 LLC as the "subrecipient and operational implementing entity" for America250 projects.

Public announcements described Freedom 250 as an ambitious nationwide celebration marking the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. Plans included concerts, historical exhibits, educational programming, athletic competitions, community events, volunteer initiatives, and public ceremonies intended to encourage participation across the country. The initiative emphasized patriotic themes while presenting itself as a national observance of the anniversary.

Although the United States Semiquincentennial Commission remained the congressionally established body responsible for the national commemoration, the executive branch's planning, communications, and public promotion increasingly flowed through Task Force 250 and the Freedom 250 initiative it advanced. As a result, Freedom 250 became the administration's principal public expression of the federal government's semiquincentennial activities.

Among the projects promoted under the Freedom 250 initiative, none received greater public attention than the Great American State Fair.

### The Great American State Fair

The Great American State Fair was promoted as the flagship event of the Freedom 250 initiative.[99] Conceived as a large-scale national exposition on the National Mall, it was intended to showcase exhibits from all fifty states while combining historical displays, live entertainment, educational programming, athletic competitions, cultural exhibitions, and

[99] Freedom 250, *President Donald J. Trump to Headline the Great American State Fair Kick-Off Celebration*, June 8, 2026, https://freedom250.com/president-donald-j-trump-to-headline-the-great-american-state-fair-kick-off-celebration/.

family attractions into a single, highly visible celebration of the nation's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary.

As preparations became public, however, the event increasingly attracted controversy.[100] Several performers who had initially agreed to participate later withdrew, stating that they believed they had accepted invitations to a broadly patriotic national celebration but concluded that the event had become politically divisive or that its nature had not been fully represented when they accepted. Additional criticism followed after highly publicized construction problems, including the collapse of part of a stage structure during rehearsals, and after vendors withdrew participation amid disputes over promotional materials associated with the event.[101] Operational delays, changing schedules, and questions regarding planning and execution generated extensive national media coverage in the weeks preceding the celebration.

Those events explain why Freedom 250 became a matter of public attention. They are not, however, the principal subject of this investigation. Public events may succeed or fail for many reasons, and controversies surrounding a national celebration do not, by themselves, establish failures of governmental accountability. The questions examined in this report concern something different: the administration of public authority and the stewardship of public funds appropriated by Congress.

**The $150 Million Congressional Appropriation**

The controversies surrounding Freedom 250 explain why the nation's semiquincentennial celebration attracted widespread public attention. They do not explain why this investigation began.

---

[100] Hillel Italie, "What to Know About the Artists Backing Out of the Trump-Linked Freedom 250 Concerts," *Associated Press*, May 29, 2026.
[101] David Shepardson and Jarrett Renshaw, "Trump to Headline 250th Anniversary Fair Opening After Performers Drop Out," *Reuters*, May 30, 2026, https://www.reuters.com/world/us/trump-headline-250th-anniversary-fair-opening-after-performers-drop-out-2026-05-30/.

As Congress prepared for the nation's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary, it appropriated $150 million for the observance and commemoration of that historic milestone.[102] The appropriation represented a substantial public investment, authorized by law and funded by the American taxpayer. Like every congressional appropriation, it carried with it an expectation that public officials would administer those funds in accordance with the purposes established by Congress and remain accountable for how the money was used.[103]

The appropriation itself was neither unusual nor controversial. National commemorations often require years of planning, coordination among multiple agencies, grants to partner organizations, and public engagement on a nationwide scale. Congress recognized those realities when it provided funding to support the semiquincentennial. The existence of the appropriation is therefore not the subject of this investigation.

What matters is what happened after Congress appropriated the money.

The documentary record examined in the following sections seeks to answer a series of straightforward questions. Which federal entities exercised administrative authority over the appropriation? What statutory reporting requirements governed its administration? Which organizations ultimately received federal funds? Through what legal authorities were those funds distributed? Can the public record reconstruct the chain of administrative responsibility from congressional appropriation to final expenditure?

Those questions became increasingly difficult to answer.

As the investigation progressed, the administrative structure surrounding the semiquincentennial proved considerably more complex than the statutory framework alone suggested. Executive orders, interagency coordination, cooperative agreements, nonprofit participation, and evolving administrative responsibilities produced a

---

[102] *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023*, Pub. L. No. 117-328, div. G, title I, 136 Stat. 4459, 4766 (2022); *United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016*, Pub. L. No. 114-196, 130 Stat. 685 (2016).
[103] U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law*, 4th ed., vol. 1 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2016), https://www.gao.gov/legal/appropriations-law/resources.

documentary record that was often fragmented and difficult to follow. Understanding that evolution requires beginning where Congress began: with the legal framework governing accountability for the appropriation itself.

**Federal Accountability Framework**

Congress's appropriation of public funds created more than a financial obligation. It created a legal framework of public accountability.[104]

Under the Constitution, Congress appropriates public money, while the executive branch administers those appropriations in accordance with the purposes established by law. That division of responsibility requires a documentary record sufficient to demonstrate how public funds were received, administered, and expended.[105]

For the nation's semiquincentennial observance, Congress established much of that record in advance. The United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act imposed reporting requirements upon the Commission. Appropriations legislation identified the recipient and purpose of the funds. Executive orders created additional administrative structures. Annual reports, financial disclosures, congressional records, cooperative agreements, and other official documents collectively provide the evidentiary record by which the administration of the congressional appropriation may be evaluated. When portions of that record cannot be reconstructed from publicly available sources, a break occurs in the chain of public accountability.

The investigation that follows examines those records in chronological order to reconstruct the chain of administrative responsibility from Congress's appropriation of $150 million to the ultimate administration and expenditure of those public funds. Each document contributes another link in that chain. Together, they establish not only what can be verified

---

[104] U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 7; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law*, 4th ed., vol. 1 (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2016), https://www.gao.gov/legal/appropriations-law/resources.

[105] U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 7; U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law*, 4th ed., 2016 rev., ch. 2, GAO-16-464SP (Washington, DC: Mar. 2016); U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law: Chapter 3, Availability of Appropriations: Purpose*, 4th ed., 2017 rev., GAO-17-797SP (Washington, DC: Sept. 2017).

from the public record, but also where that record becomes incomplete, fragmented, or silent.

**The Statutory Authority for the Appropriation**

Congress authorized the nation's semiquincentennial observance through both legislation and appropriations. In addition to creating the United States Semiquincentennial Commission in 2016, Congress later provided substantial financial support for the national commemoration through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023.

Within the Historic Preservation Fund, Congress appropriated:

"(1) $150,000,000 shall be for the United States Semiquincentennial Commission for the observance and commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States."

The appropriation appeared alongside additional funding for state and territorial historic preservation grants, Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, Save America's Treasures grants, and grants serving underserved communities. Congress therefore treated the semiquincentennial not as a single event, but as part of a broader national investment in historic preservation, education, and public commemoration.

The recipient of the appropriation is equally significant. Congress did not appropriate these funds to Task Force 250, the Executive Office of the President, or any temporary executive initiative. It appropriated them to the United States Semiquincentennial Commission—the statutory body Congress had established to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate the nation's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary observance.

That distinction establishes the starting point for the documentary record. Whatever administrative structures were later created by executive action, the congressional appropriation identifies the Commission as the entity initially entrusted with the stewardship of the funds. The documentary record should therefore begin with the Commission and proceed outward through the additional organizations and administrative structures that later participated in the observance.

**Annual Reports**

The United States Semiquincentennial Commission's annual reports constitute the principal statutory accountability documents required by Congress.[106] Pursuant to Section 9(d) of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act, the Commission was required to submit annual reports describing its activities together with an accounting of the funds it received and expended.

The publicly available reports document the Commission's organizational development, partnerships, educational initiatives, fundraising activities, public outreach, and preparations for the nation's two hundred and fiftieth anniversary. They also provide the Commission's official financial accounting in fulfillment of its statutory reporting obligations.

Regarding this investigation, the annual reports serve two important functions. First, they present the Commission's official account of its activities and financial stewardship during each reporting period. Second, they establish a roadmap to the broader documentary record by identifying additional reports, programs, partnerships, administrative actions, and related sources associated with the nation's semiquincentennial observance.

One aspect of the annual reports is particularly significant. In addition to documenting the Commission's annual activities, the reports state that quarterly reports concerning the Commission's activities and expenditures were submitted throughout its operations.[107] If publicly available, those quarterly reports would provide a substantially more detailed and continuous record of the administration of the congressional appropriation than annual reporting alone.

[106] *United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016*, Pub. L. No. 114-196, § 9(d), 130 Stat. 685, 689 (2016); United States Semiquincentennial Commission, *Annual Report* (Washington, DC: United States Semiquincentennial Commission, applicable reporting year).

[107] United States Semiquincentennial Commission, *2025 Annual Report* (Washington, DC: United States Semiquincentennial Commission, 2026); U.S. Senate, Committee on Appropriations, *Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2020*, S. Rep. No. 116-123, at 114 (2019).

The documentary trail therefore continues with the quarterly reports referenced by the Commission itself.

**Quarterly Reports**

The quarterly reports referenced in the Commission's annual reports are not readily available through the Commission's public website or other obvious public repositories.

Further examination of the congressional appropriations record provided important context for these references. Although the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act established the Commission's statutory annual reporting requirement, Congress supplemented that requirement through the appropriations process by directing continuing quarterly financial reporting. In its report accompanying the Fiscal Year 2020 Department of the Interior appropriations bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee directed the Commission to provide quarterly reports detailing its spending by activity to assist the Committee in understanding the Commission's financial needs. The following year, the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the Fiscal Year 2021 appropriations legislation instructed the Commission to continue providing quarterly spending reports to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.[108]

These directives demonstrate that Congress sought more than an annual retrospective of the Commission's activities. Unlike annual reports, which summarize an entire year of operations after the fact, quarterly reports document expenditures much closer to the time they occur. For an investigator attempting to reconstruct the administration of public funds, they provide a far more detailed chronological record of financial decision-making and permit a more continuous examination of how appropriated funds were administered.

The importance of this reporting framework increased substantially after Congress appropriated an additional $150 million to the United States Semiquincentennial

[108] U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations, *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021: Committee Print of the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives on H.R. 133/Public Law 116–260, Legislative Text and Explanatory Statement*, Book 1 of 2, 117th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Publishing Office, March 2021).

Commission through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023. Whether or not that appropriation imposed additional reporting requirements, Congress had already established an expectation of continuing financial accountability through periodic quarterly reporting.

Because the Commission's own annual reports state that quarterly reports were submitted, and because congressional appropriations materials demonstrate that such reporting formed part of Congress's continuing oversight framework, those quarterly reports represent the next logical step in reconstructing the documentary record surrounding the administration of the congressional appropriation.

A search was therefore conducted through publicly available federal sources, including the Commission's website, congressional publications, the Government Publishing Office, and other accessible federal repositories. At the time of this investigation, no complete collection of the referenced quarterly reports could be located.

The inability to reconstruct this portion of the documentary record does not establish that the reports were never prepared or submitted.[109] Quarterly reports transmitted directly to congressional committees may not necessarily appear in publicly searchable repositories. Nevertheless, their absence from the publicly accessible documentary record prevents independent verification of the detailed spending information that Congress expressly directed the Commission to provide through its continuing quarterly reporting process.

Accordingly, this investigation proceeds using the documentary evidence that remains publicly available while noting this interruption in the documentary chain. Should the quarterly reports become publicly available, they would constitute one of the most significant primary sources for understanding how the Commission administered federal funds appropriated for the nation's semiquincentennial observance.

---

[109] United States Semiquincentennial Commission, *2025 Annual Report* (Washington, DC: United States Semiquincentennial Commission, 2026).

**The Cooperative Agreement Framework**

The documentary trial does not end with the Commission's missing quarterly reports. It changes direction. As the Commission's publicly available financial record becomes less complete, another body of federal documents begins to illuminate how the nation's semiquincentennial observance was administered after Congress appropriated the $150 million in 2023.

The documentary record shows that implementation of major portions of the nation's semiquincentennial observance shifted to a different administrative structure. Rather than implementing the program solely through the statutory framework established by Congress, the National Park Service entered into a cooperative agreement with the National Park Foundation, which had created Freedom 250 LLC as its wholly owned subsidiary. Under that agreement, Freedom 250 LLC became the “subrecipient and operational implementing entity” for America250 projects.

This administrative structure did not emerge through the legislation that created the United States Semiquincentennial Commission. Instead, it developed through executive action, interagency agreements, and the subsequent creation of a limited liability corporation to carry out operational responsibilities. Understanding that transition is essential to reconstructing the administration of the congressional appropriation because it identifies how and where responsibility for implementation, contracting, and financial administration shifted after Congress enacted the statutory framework.

The central document in that transition is the cooperative agreement executed between the National Park Service and the National Park Foundation in November 2025.[110] Unlike the Commission's annual reports, which describe activities after they occurred, the cooperative agreement established a new legal and administrative framework through which the commemorative program would subsequently be implemented. The agreement therefore marks a significant turning point in the documentary record, providing the first

[110] National Park Foundation, *Financial Statements and Independent Auditor’s Report, September 30, 2025 and 2024*, note 19, “Subsequent Events,” 33, March 18, 2026.

direct explanation of how operational responsibility moved beyond the Commission's statutory structure into a newly created administrative framework.

**The Cooperative Agreement**

The cooperative agreement executed between the National Park Service and the National Park Foundation in November 2025 marks one of the most significant documentary turning points in the administration of the nation's semiquincentennial observance. Unlike the Commission's annual reports, which describe activities already completed, the agreement establishes the legal framework through which future operational responsibilities would be carried out, including through Freedom 250 LLC as the Foundation's designated subrecipient and operational implementing entity.

Cooperative agreements are authorized under federal law when the federal government anticipates substantial involvement in carrying out the funded activity.[111] Unlike a procurement contract, in which the government purchases goods or services, or a grant, in which assistance is provided with comparatively limited federal participation, a cooperative agreement contemplates continuing collaboration between the federal agency and the recipient organization.[112]

The agreement identifies the National Park Service as the federal agency responsible for administering the agreement and the National Park Foundation as the recipient organization. The Foundation had created Freedom 250 LLC as a wholly owned affiliate, and the agreement authorized the Foundation to use Freedom 250 as the "subrecipient and operational implementing entity" for America250 projects.

The importance of the agreement extends beyond its individual provisions. It documents the mechanism through which operational responsibility expanded beyond the statutory framework originally established by Congress. From this point forward, reconstructing the administration of the congressional appropriation requires following not only the

[111] 31 U.S.C. § 6305 (2024).
[112] 31 U.S.C. §§ 6303–6305 (2024).

Commission's statutory record, but also the contractual, administrative, and organizational relationships created through the cooperative agreement itself.

**Reconstructing the Administrative Transition**

The cooperative agreement did more than authorize a particular commemorative project. It documented a broader administrative transition. Responsibility for significant operational aspects of the nation's semiquincentennial observance no longer rested within the statutory framework established by Congress through the United States Semiquincentennial Commission. Instead, implementation became distributed across a network of federal agencies, nonprofit organizations, contractual relationships, and newly created entities, each performing distinct administrative functions.

Viewed individually, each component of this structure appears ordinary. Cooperative agreements are routinely used throughout the federal government. The National Park Foundation has long served as the National Park Service's congressionally authorized philanthropic partner. Limited liability companies are commonly formed to manage specific projects and limit organizational liability. Examined separately, none of these administrative mechanisms are inherently unusual.

What distinguishes this structure is not the existence of any single administrative instrument but the manner in which multiple instruments operated together. Authority, operational responsibility, contractual administration, and financial management became distributed among several legally distinct organizations. As responsibilities became divided, reconstructing the complete administrative pathway required consulting numerous independent documentary sources rather than a single continuous record.

The practical effect of the new administrative structure was to obscure the path of public funds through multiple organizations, cooperative agreements, and administrative actions, making independent reconstruction of the documentary record unusually difficult. That difficulty became measurable in the federal spending record. USAspending identifies an $81.6 million federal award to the National Park Foundation under award P26AC00101, with $68.3 million recorded as outlays, while the same award record publicly identifies only two subawards to Freedom 250 LLC totaling approximately $4.82 million. The public award record therefore establishes the movement of substantial federal funds into the new administrative structure while leaving most downstream expenditures unreconciled at the transaction level.[113]

The House Natural Resources Committee later reached a more direct conclusion, finding that "Freedom 250 captured the federal money and grants Congress had intended for America250."[114]

The resulting complexity does not, by itself, establish misconduct. It does, however, substantially increase the effort required to determine how appropriated funds were administered and which organizations exercised responsibility at each stage of implementation. The federal award record now makes the limits of that reconstruction more concrete: although substantial federal funds can be traced to the National Park Foundation and specific subawards can be traced onward to Freedom 250 LLC, the publicly available records do not provide a complete transaction-level accounting of how the remaining funds were expended.

Taken together, the documentary record permits the administrative pathway to be reconstructed. Figures 1 and 2 summarize that transition.

[113] USAspending.gov, "Grant to the National Park Foundation from the Department of the Interior," Federal Award Identification Number P26AC00101, accessed August 8, 2026.

[114] U.S. House Committee on Natural Resources, *From Vanity to Insanity: How the White House Cheated the American People Out of Their 250th Birthday* (July 2026), 40, finding 3.

**Congress's Statutory Framework (2016–2023)**

Congress

│

▼

United States Semiquincentennial Commission

│

▼

America 250

(National Commemoration)

*Figure 1. The statutory framework established by Congress contemplated a relatively direct administrative structure centered on the United States Semiquincentennial Commission.*

**Executive Branch Administrative Framework Ultimately Employed (2025)**

Congress

│

▼

United States Semiquincentennial Commission

│

▼

Executive Order 14189

│

▼

Task Force 250

│

▼

National Park Service

│

▼

Cooperative Agreement

│

▼

National Park Foundation

│

▼

Freedom 250 LLC

│

▼

Operational Implementation

*Figure 2. Executive branch implementation distributed authority and operational responsibility across multiple agencies, agreements, nonprofit entities, and newly created organizations, producing a substantially more complex administrative structure than the one originally established by Congress and significantly reducing the transparency of that administrative process.*

**Figures 1 and 2** illustrate the central finding of this investigation. Congress established a comparatively direct statutory framework for administering the nation's semiquincentennial observance. The documentary record demonstrates that implementation ultimately proceeded through a substantially more complex administrative structure involving additional executive entities, cooperative agreements, nonprofit organizations, and operational intermediaries. The findings that follow evaluate the implications of that documented administrative transition.

**The Freedom 250 Investigation: Findings**

The Freedom 250 investigation began with a straightforward question: how was the congressional appropriation for the nation's semiquincentennial observance administered, and could that administration be reconstructed through the publicly available documentary record?

The investigation established that Congress created the United States Semiquincentennial Commission as the nation's statutory coordinating body and later appropriated an additional $150 million through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, to support the observance. A separate $150 million appropriation followed in 2025, bringing the total appropriated through these two funding instruments for America's 250th-anniversary observance to $300 million.[115]

Congress also established a framework of public accountability through annual reporting requirements and continuing quarterly financial reporting intended to document the Commission's stewardship of those funds.

The documentary record further demonstrates that, while the Commission remained the statutory entity established by Congress, executive action created an additional administrative framework through Executive Order 14189, Task Force 250, the National Park Service, a cooperative agreement with the National Park Foundation, and ultimately

[115] Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, Pub. L. No. 117-328, div. G, tit. I, 136 Stat. 4459, 4766 (2022) (appropriating $150 million for the United States Semiquincentennial Commission); One Big Beautiful Bill Act, Pub. L. No. 119-21, § 50305, 139 Stat. 72, 152 (2025) (appropriating an additional $150 million to the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, for events, celebrations, and activities surrounding the 250th anniversary of the founding of the United States).

Freedom 250 LLC. Responsibility for planning, coordination, contracting, and operational implementation became distributed across multiple legally distinct organizations rather than remaining within the framework originally established by Congress.[116]

The Freedom 250 investigation demonstrates how public accountability can become progressively diluted without any single dramatic administrative act. Rather than replacing Congress's statutory framework outright, successive executive actions added new coordinating bodies, new agreements, new organizational layers, and new operational entities. Each step appeared administratively ordinary. Collectively, however, they transformed a comparatively direct statutory framework into a far more complex administrative system in which responsibility became distributed across multiple organizations and accountability became increasingly difficult to reconstruct.

The practical consequence is that accountability has become substantially more difficult to achieve. What Congress established as a comparatively direct chain of public accountability ultimately became a fragmented administrative pathway requiring extensive investigative effort simply to reconstruct how authority, operational responsibility, and federal funding moved through the new structure. The federal spending record now permits part of that pathway to be reconstructed, but not completely. It identifies an $81.6 million federal award to the National Park Foundation and approximately $4.82 million in reported subawards to Freedom 250 LLC, while the publicly available record does not provide a complete transaction-level accounting of the remaining expenditures. That documentary record presents two questions this investigation cannot finally answer but should not ignore:

Was the transfer lawful?

And where did the rest of the money go?[117]

---

[116] Donald J. Trump, "Celebrating America's 250th Birthday," Executive Order 14189, *Federal Register* 90, no. 21 (February 3, 2025): 8849–8852; National Park Foundation, "Freedom 250 FAQs," https://www.nationalparks.org/freedom-250-faqs (accessed August 6, 2026).

[117] USAspending.gov, "Grant to the National Park Foundation from the Department of the Interior," Federal Award Identification Number P26AC00101, accessed August 8, 2026; Adam Schiff et al. to Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, March 3, 2026, requesting a complete accounting of federal funds provided to

**Same Numbers. Different Instruments.**

The documentary reconstruction did not end with the $81.6 million award to the National Park Foundation or the approximately $4.82 million in publicly reported subawards to Freedom 250 LLC. Continued examination of the federal funding and contracting record revealed additional transactions that substantially changed the financial picture.

The first was **another $150 million**.

The $150 million appropriated through the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, was not the only $150 million federal funding instrument associated with the nation's semiquincentennial. A separate $150 million appropriation was subsequently enacted through the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. These were not two references for the same money. They were separate congressional funding instruments enacted at different times.

That distinction is essential because the repetition of the same round number can easily obscure the existence of two separate appropriations. A reader encountering references to “the $150 million” throughout the documentary record could reasonably assume that the records referred to a single pool of federal money. They do not. Reconstructing the financial history therefore requires identifying each appropriation by its separate statutory authority and following each funding stream independently.[118]

The same problem appeared again at the contracting level, this time with considerably more numerical precision.

Federal procurement records show that Event Strategies Inc. received two separate Navy delivery orders on consecutive days in September 2025 in connection with **Navy250's Titans of the Sea celebration**. The first, N00189-25-F-Z842, was awarded on September 29, 2025. The second, N00189-25-F-Z848, followed on September 30.

The original amount of the first order was:

$5,158,276

The original amount of the second order was:

**$5,158,276**

They were separate federal contracting instruments bearing separate award identifiers. They were issued on consecutive days to the same contractor in connection with the same

---

Freedom 250; U.S. House Committee on Natural Resources, Democratic Staff, *Freedom 250 Oversight Report*, July 2026.

[118] Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, 136 Stat. at 4766; One Big Beautiful Bill Act, Pub. L. No. 119-21, § 50305, 139 Stat. 72, 152 (2025).

overarching Navy250 celebration. Public award information indicates differing scopes associated with the Titans of the Sea production, and the second order was subsequently modified. The publicly available records examined for this report, however, do not explain why two separate orders began with precisely the same $5,158,276 value.[119]

The identical amounts do not establish duplicate billing, overpayment, fraud, or any other misconduct. Without the underlying statements of work, pricing schedules, invoices, and procurement files, such a conclusion would exceed the available evidence. What the records establish is narrower and nevertheless conspicuous: two legally distinct Navy250 contracting instruments, issued to the same contractor on consecutive days for work associated with the same celebration, carried exactly the same original dollar amount.

That finding acquired additional significance when the contractor's earlier role in semiquincentennial planning was examined. Before Freedom 250 LLC was created, Justin Caporale of Event Strategies Inc. had participated in budgeting semiquincentennial programming that included Navy250 and the Great American State Fair. Federal contracting records subsequently show Event Strategies receiving paid work associated with Navy250, an order explicitly described as "AMERICA 250 - EVENTS," and, after the creation of Freedom 250, another order explicitly described as "FY26 Freedom 250 Design and Content Support Services."[120]

The nomenclature itself had changed from America250 to Freedom 250. At least some of the private personnel and contractors involved in the earlier planning environment, however, continued to appear in the subsequent implementation record.

None of these facts independently establishes unlawful conduct. Together, they demonstrate why the financial history of the semiquincentennial cannot reliably be

---

[119] U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Supply Systems Command Fleet Logistics Center Norfolk, Delivery Order N00189-25-F-Z842, under Federal Supply Schedule Contract 47QRAA25D00D5, awarded to Event Strategies, Inc., September 29, 2025, $5,158,276, "Titans of the Sea"; U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Supply Systems Command Fleet Logistics Center Norfolk, Delivery Order N00189-25-F-Z848, under Federal Supply Schedule Contract 47QRAA25D00D5, awarded to Event Strategies, Inc., September 30, 2025, $5,158,276 original award amount, "Titans of the Sea Event," federal procurement records.

[120] U.S. House Committee on Natural Resources, Democratic Staff, *Freedom 250 Oversight Report* (July 2026), 15–16 (reporting that at a July 30, 2025 America250 meeting attended by Task Force 250 officials and America250 contractors, including Event Strategies Inc., Justin Caporale of ESI presented a budget breakdown for semiquincentennial programming and subsequently created an internal budget document that included Navy250 and the Great American State Fair); U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Supply Systems Command Fleet Logistics Center Norfolk, Delivery Order N00189-26-F-Z001, under Federal Supply Schedule Contract 47QRAA25D00D5, awarded to Event Strategies, Inc., October 7, 2025, $2,139,409, "AMERICA 250 - EVENTS"; U.S. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, Office of Acquisition Management, Delivery Order 47PA00-26-F-0002, under Federal Supply Schedule Contract 47QRAA25D00D5, awarded to Event Strategies, Inc., February 3, 2026, $333,084.24 potential value, "FY26 Freedom 250 Design and Content Support Services."

reconstructed from organization names, program labels, or top-line dollar amounts alone. Transactions that appear identical may represent separate legal instruments. Programs operating under different names may involve recurring personnel, contractors, and activities. Determining what happened requires following the statutory authority, award identifier, recipient, contractor, date, and purpose of each transaction individually.

That problem appears at two distinct levels of the investigation.

**$150,000,000 — $150,000,000**

Separate congressional funding instruments.

**$5,158,276 — $5,158,276**

Separate Navy250 contracting instruments.

In both instances, the numbers are identical. The instruments are not.

---

**Mining Executive Authority**

**1. The Capacity Problem**

The financial record is not the only part of the machinery examined in this Panel that requires reconstruction. Federal priorities do not become expenditures, contracts, or completed projects by declaration alone. They must pass through an administrative apparatus with finite personnel, contracting capacity, and time.

That capacity became increasingly consequential at the Department of the Interior.

By the summer of 2026, National Park Service employees described a shortage of personnel capable of moving authorized projects through the contracting process. Reporting based on Office of Management and Budget records found that NPS had 179 full-time administrative officers in June 2026, a 21 percent decline from the month President Trump took office. One employee described the result as “very little acquisition support.”

The consequences were measurable. At an NPS meeting, officials identified 133 projects totaling $35.8 million that were ready to proceed but lacked sufficient contracting staff to move them forward.[121]

The distinction matters. An agency may possess appropriated funds, statutory authority, and projects ready for execution and still lack the administrative capacity necessary to convert those resources into completed work. Solicitations must be prepared. Proposals must be evaluated. Contracts must be awarded and administered. Performance must be overseen. When the personnel required to perform those functions become scarce, administrative capacity itself becomes a limited governmental resource.

Money behind an administrative bottleneck is not the same as money capable of producing public work.

That bottleneck establishes the first condition necessary to understand what followed. Once governmental capacity becomes scarce, the distribution of that capacity matters. The question is no longer merely what Congress appropriated or what an agency was authorized to undertake.

It becomes a question of who controlled the funnel.

**2. Building the Funnel**

The bottleneck did not develop in isolation. While administrative capacity was being reduced, the Department of the Interior was also changing the structure through which contracts, grants, financial management, personnel, and other administrative functions were controlled.

The chronology matters.

At the beginning of the administration, Charles Dankert served as Senior Advisor to the Secretary while exercising delegated authority of the Assistant Secretary for Policy,

[121] Michael Scherer, "President Trump Has a Pet-Project Docket at the National Parks," *The Atlantic*, August 20, 2026.

Management and Budget. That office sits near the center of Interior's administrative machinery. Its responsibilities encompass functions that include acquisition and financial management.

Tyler Hassen entered Interior through the Department of Government Efficiency effort. Before joining the government, Hassen had spent years in the energy industry. By February 2025, however, Interior records show him participating in contract and grant reviews across multiple bureaus.

The activity was not confined to a single agency or transaction. Hassen's calendar records include contract reviews involving the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, U.S. Geological Survey, Bureau of Reclamation, National Park Service, and Bureau of Land Management. Other entries concern departmental guidance for contracts and grants, grant and contract review, an NPS award review, a contract-review synchronization meeting, and discussions concerning the process by which bureaus submitted contracts and grants for review.

By February 28, the process had become more explicit. A meeting titled **"DOI Contract Review Process & Approval Demo – USFWS"** described a system through which officials would demonstrate the review process and obtain Hassen's preferences for how his approval should be secured.[122]

That chronology creates an important distinction.

Hassen was participating in a department-wide contract and grant review process before March 7, 2025, when Secretary Doug Burgum formally delegated to him the authority of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget. Before Hassen received that

---

[122] Alicia (Nikki) Weber to Tyler L. Hassen, Katrine M. Trampe, and Jay Littleton, "DOI Contract Review Process & Approval Demo – USFWS," February 28, 2025, U.S. Department of the Interior, records produced in response to FOIA No. DOI-2025-004517, production no. 0002980.

delegation, the public record identifies Dankert as the official exercising delegated authority of that office.[123]

The documentary question is therefore precise: **under what authority was Hassen exercising a department-wide role in the review or approval of contracts and grants before March 7?**

The record examined for this investigation does not presently answer that question.

After March 7, however, Hassen's formal authority became considerably clearer. Burgum delegated to him the authority of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, and by April reporting described Hassen as leading a department-wide reorganization of Interior's administrative functions. The functions being consolidated included contracting, financial management, human resources, grants, information technology, and communications.

Congress challenged the legality of that arrangement almost immediately. On March 26, Senator Martin Heinrich asked Burgum to identify the statutory basis under which Hassen was exercising the functions and duties of a Senate-confirmed office, arguing that the arrangement runs afoul of the Federal Vacancies Reform Act. Heinrich renewed the challenge on May 7 after Hassen's responsibilities expanded. Those letters do not establish that the Department violated the Act. They establish that the legal basis for Hassen's authority was contemporaneously disputed and that Congress demanded the Department's justification.[124]

Meanwhile, the administrative transformation continued.

Functions that had been distributed across Interior's bureaus were being consolidated within a department-wide structure while the official leading that consolidation exercised

---

[123] U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Hearings and Appeals, "Practices Before the Department of the Interior; Delay of Effective Date," *Federal Register* 90, no. 26 (February 10, 2025): 9222–23, FR Doc. 2025-02472.

[124] Martin Heinrich, Ranking Member, U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, letter to Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, May 7, 2025.

authority that had itself become the subject of a congressional legal challenge. Contracting was not incidental to that transformation. It was one of the functions being centralized.

The funnel was therefore taking institutional form.

The first condition was scarcity: insufficient administrative capacity to move every authorized purpose simultaneously.

The second was concentration: increasing control over the administrative machinery through which contracts, grants, and expenditures could move.

Neither condition, standing alone, establishes misconduct. Together, however, they make the next question unavoidable.

Who was positioned inside that funnel while it was being built?

**3. Follow the Money Backward**

The official positioned inside that developing administrative structure had not entered government financially detached from the industry in which he had spent much of his career.

Tyler Hassen's public financial disclosure provides a way to follow those relationships backward.

Before entering Interior, Hassen served as chief executive officer of Basin Energy from 2020 through January 2025, chief executive officer of Basin Industries from 2021 through January 2025, and a partner in Talus Group Holdings from 2021 through January 2025. His disclosure reported $1.4 million in salary and bonus from Basin Energy, another $1.4 million from Basin Industries, and $1.1 million in equity distributions from Talus Group Holdings during the reporting period.[125]

Leaving those positions did not immediately terminate the financial relationships.

---

[125] Tyler L. Hassen, *Public Financial Disclosure Report*, OGE Form 278e, U.S. Department of the Interior, 2025.

Hassen disclosed agreements to sell or relinquish interests in Wenzel US, Basin Industries, Basin Holdings, and Talus Group Holdings for an aggregate $3.7 million. The payment schedules extended beyond his entrance into government. He expected $1.85 million from the sale of his Talus interest by March 31, 2025. Basin Industries was to pay $400,000 in installments over four quarters beginning March 31, 2025. Basin Holdings was to pay another $250,000 over four quarters beginning June 30, 2025, and $600,000 for preferred units in four quarterly payments beginning September 30, 2025 and ending June 30, 2026.

His disclosure identified additional financial ties. Hassen reported deferred-compensation receivables from Basin Energy, Basin Industries, and Talus Group Holdings. He also disclosed an equity position valued between $500,001 and $1 million in Basin Energy AR SPV LLC, an entity described on the disclosure as holding a debt position in Basin Energy. That investment generated between $50,001 and $100,000 in interest income during the reporting period.[126]

This is important. These were not merely historical employers appearing on a résumé. When Hassen entered Interior, his financial separation from the business network in which he had worked was incomplete. His disclosure documented receivables, installment obligations, deferred compensation, and a debt-linked investment associated with that network, with some payments scheduled to continue well into his federal service and through June 2026.

Following that network backward leads to John B. Fitzgibbons.

Fitzgibbons founded Basin Holdings and is identified by the company as its executive chairman. He is also the founder of Talus Group Holdings, where the company's current leadership page identifies him as a managing partner. Hassen had therefore spent years in

[126] Hassen, *Public Financial Disclosure Report*.

senior positions within businesses associated with the same entrepreneur before entering the Department of the Interior.[127]

Fitzgibbons's energy history extends substantially beyond Basin.

In 1993, he co-founded Khanty Mansiysk Oil Corporation and served as its president and chief executive until Marathon Oil acquired the company in 2003. He subsequently founded Integra Group, an oilfield-services enterprise operating in Russia. A State University of New York Research Foundation biography identifies Fitzgibbons as founder and chairman of Integra and describes the company as an oilfield-services business active in Russia. Contemporary reporting from 2006 described Integra as a rapidly expanding aggregation of Russian drilling-service and equipment businesses assembled after Fitzgibbons had already spent years participating in the Russian energy sector.[128]

That history matters here for a limited reason.

It does not establish that Hassen participated in Fitzgibbons's Russian ventures. It does not establish that Fitzgibbons influenced Hassen's government service. And it does not establish that the business relationships disclosed by Hassen produced favorable treatment by Interior.

It establishes something narrower: the energy-industry network from which the official now helping control Interior's administrative machinery emerged was extensive, international, and financially consequential to him even as he entered government.

The disclosure presents a second and more immediate ethics question.

Among Hassen's numerous publicly traded investments was stock in Albemarle Corporation valued between $1,001 and $15,000. Albemarle operates the Silver Peak

---

[127] Martha Bellisle, "Here's What a Texas Oil Executive from DOGE Is Doing Inside the Interior Department," *Associated Press*, May 27, 2025; "Alignment Credit Provides Senior Secured Term Loan Commitment to Riverview Companies," *Business Wire*, October 11, 2024.
[128] Kerry A. Dolan, "The Wild, Wild East," *Forbes*, June 19, 2006; Research Foundation for the State University of New York, "Research Foundation Board Chair Emeritus Mr. John B. Fitzgibbons," accessed September 13, 2026.

lithium mine in Nevada, on and adjacent to federal land administered through the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management. On April 18, 2025, Interior announced that the proposed Silver Peak expansion was among the critical-mineral projects being advanced through the administration's accelerated FAST-41 permitting process. Hassen's April 21 financial disclosure continued to identify Albemarle stock among his holdings. Later reporting based on records obtained from Interior found that it remained unclear whether or when he subsequently disposed of that investment.[129]

Federal conflict-of-interest law does not prohibit an official merely because an agency regulates or conducts business affecting companies in which the official owns stock. The legally significant question is whether the official participated personally and substantially in a particular government matter that would have a direct and predictable effect on a financial interest, absent an applicable exemption, recusal, divestiture, or waiver.

The public record examined for this investigation does not establish that Hassen selected Silver Peak for accelerated treatment, directed the Bureau of Land Management's review, communicated with Albemarle concerning the project, approved a permit, or otherwise participated personally and substantially in the Silver Peak matter.

But neither does the presently available record resolve the question.

Interior ethics officials had provided Hassen guidance concerning financial conflicts early in his tenure. By September 2025, congressional investigators were demanding his financial disclosures, ethics agreements, remedial actions, waivers, recusals, divestiture records, and related materials. Public reporting based on Interior ethics records subsequently found that a July certificate of divestiture covered thousands of shares in

---

[129] U.S. Department of the Interior, "Trump Administration Adds Key Mining Projects to FAST-41," April 18, 2025; Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council, "Silver Peak Lithium Mine," Federal Permitting Dashboard, accessed September 13, 2026; Chris D'Angelo, "Democratic Lawmakers Demand Interior DOGE Leader's Financial, Ethics Docs," *Public Domain*, September 4, 2025, updated October 20, 2025.

dozens of companies, while the publicly available records still did not resolve whether Hassen had divested his Albemarle interest.[130]

The unresolved question is therefore considerably more precise than an allegation that an energy executive entered government with conflicts of interest.

It is this:

Did Hassen participate personally and substantially in any Interior contract, grant, permit, policy, expenditure, reorganization, or other particular matter having a direct and predictable effect on a financial interest he retained, without an applicable recusal, exemption, divestiture, or waiver?

The available evidence does not presently establish that he did.

What it establishes is the reason the question must be asked.

The official who had moved into a department-wide contract and grant review process, and who subsequently received delegated authority over Interior's administrative machinery, entered government while substantial financial separation from his former business network remained unfinished. His disclosure documented millions of dollars in payments arising from the sale of interests in that network, some extending through June 2026. It also documented investments in companies operating in industries subject to Interior decisions, including Albemarle while its Silver Peak project moved through an accelerated federal permitting process.

That does not prove that the funnel was used for private financial benefit.

It establishes that the person positioned within the funnel carried financial interests that make the operation of its ethics safeguards—and the documentary record of recusals,

[130] Chris D’Angelo, “Democratic Lawmakers Demand Interior DOGE Leader’s Financial, Ethics Docs,” *Public Domain*, September 4, 2025, updated October 20, 2025.

divestitures, waivers, and participation—material to any complete reconstruction of how that authority was exercised.

The investigation can therefore follow the money backward only so far.

The next step is to follow the authority forward.

**4. Scarcity Meets Priority**

The significance of a bottleneck depends on what is permitted to pass through it first.

On March 27, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order 14252, *Making the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful*.[131] The order declared a federal policy of making the capital "safe, beautiful, and prosperous" and directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop a program addressing public spaces, federal monuments, buildings, lands, parks, roads, and other areas throughout Washington. It also directed immediate National Park Service action on specified conditions on federal land within the district.

The order did not create the National Park Service's later three-tier project list. It established the presidential priority that Interior, and the Park Service were directed to implement.

By 2026, that priority had acquired an administrative form.

During an internal NPS meeting in April, officials described three categories through which projects were being sorted:

**White House priorities.**

**High priorities.**

**Low priorities.**

[131] Donald J. Trump, "Making the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful," Executive Order 14252, *Federal Register* 90, no. 63 (April 3, 2025): 14559–14561.

The effect was operational, not rhetorical. White House priorities were handled separately from ordinary Park Service work and received priority access to funding and contracting resources. Employees were told that low-priority projects were unlikely to be completed and were encouraged to seek elevation of projects they considered important into the high-priority category. White House priorities, by contrast, were described as nonnegotiable.[132]

The system affected the order in which scarce governmental capacity was consumed.

That returns the investigation to the bottleneck.

The National Park Service did not possess enough contracting personnel to advance every authorized project simultaneously. Projects ready for execution were already waiting for acquisition support. Under those conditions, preferential access to contracting resources changed the relative position of every project competing for the same constrained capacity.

The mechanism did not require money to be transferred from one project to another.

**Priority determined access to capacity.**

The executive order established a presidential objective. Interior translated that objective into administrative priority. The priority then received preferential access to the personnel and contracting machinery capable of converting governmental authority and available funds into completed work.

The consequences could be measured in speed.

Reporting based on Interior and National Park Service records found that approximately $1.5 million for brick-paver work at Lafayette Park was located within five days; approximately $170,000 for work at Hains Point was processed within six days; and more than $5 million for gilding equestrian statues moved through the process in twelve days.

[132] Michael Scherer, "President Trump Has a Pet-Project Docket at the National Parks," *The Atlantic*, August 20, 2026.

Elsewhere in the same system, projects already authorized and ready to proceed were waiting because contracting capacity was insufficient. Park officials were being told that low-priority work might not be completed. Administration priorities, meanwhile, traveled through a separate channel with preferential access to scarce administrative resources.

The bottleneck and the priority system therefore operated together.

Scarcity gave priority practical consequence.

Priority gave scarcity distributive consequence.

No $400 million transfer was necessary for that mechanism to operate. No appropriation needed to disappear. The resource being allocated was also **administrative capacity** - the personnel, attention, approvals, and contracting resources required to transform governmental authority into governmental action.

That is where executive authority becomes material to the Extraction Model examined in this report.

Once administrative capacity became scarce, presidential priority did more than identify what government should do. It influenced **what government could do first**.

**With a signature, executive authority had altered the order in which governmental capacity was consumed.**

The money did not have to move first.

The priority moved first. The machinery followed.

**5. The Machine in Operation**

The priority system becomes most revealing when followed into an individual procurement.

In April 2026, the Department of the Interior's **Critical Acquisition Response Team—CART—**was handling a National Park Service requirement to repair potholes throughout the National Capital Region. The procurement record identifies CART as acting on behalf of NPS and states plainly that it **“has a White House priority”** to fill and repair the potholes.

The justification for limiting competition is more explicit:

“The repair of the potholes is being mandated by the White House.”

The work was connected to Executive Order 14252 and preparations for America 250 events scheduled between May 1 and July 4. The government sought a contractor capable of beginning quickly and completing the work within the compressed schedule.

The acquisition proceeded under an urgency justification. Market research identified 622 small businesses under the applicable industry classification in the District of Columbia, Virginia, and Maryland, but the contracting record concluded that Patch Management, Inc. was the only vendor found capable of supplying the specialized equipment and meeting the required schedule. The resulting contract, 140P4226C0008, was worth approximately $177,000 after additional work.[133]

The amount is modest compared with other procurements examined in this Panel.

Its significance is not the potholes.

**It is what the procurement process reveals.**

Indeed, the contract’s modest size may make it more revealing, not less. The pothole procurement can be understood as an early operational proving ground for the new acquisition pathway—not because the record establishes that it was designed as a test, but because it shows the emerging machinery operating on a small and unusually visible scale. A White House priority became an agency requirement, entered CART’s acquisition process, received accelerated treatment, and emerged as contractor performance. The value was comparatively small. **The significance was the flow.**

[133] U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, “DOI NCR Intent to Sole Source Notice,” Solicitation No. 140P4226R0015, April 10, 2026; “The Department of the Interior Issues Sole Source Notice for Pothole Repair in National Capital Region,” *Indian Real Estate News*, April 30, 2026.

The procurement provides a documentary specimen of the machinery described in the preceding sections:

**White House mandate → NPS requirement → CART acquisition machinery → accelerated procurement → contractor performance → White House priority.**

The White House priority did not disappear when the requirement entered the contracting system. It remained part of the justification for speed. The procurement record warned that if the work was not completed in time, **"the White House will elevate concerns."**

Three officials signed the justification on April 9: Regional Facility Manager Ben Wagner, Contracting Officer Brian McCabe, and CART Acquisition Lead Andrea Hannon.

The form they signed contains another important detail. It instructs the preparer to include critical performance dates **"and when you became aware of the requirement."** The narrative explains the White House mandate and the urgency it created, but it does not identify when CART or NPS learned of that mandate, who transmitted it, or through what channel.

That leaves an upstream question the procurement file does not answer:

**Who informed NPS or CART that the pothole repairs were a White House priority and "mandated by the White House," and when was that instruction communicated?**

The question matters because CART's institutional origin could not be reconstructed despite an extensive search of the public record.

Federal procurement records establish CART operating by March 2026. They identify it as part of National Park Service Contracting Operations and show it handling other acquisitions, including flagpole replacements at Fort Washington and Fort McHenry.[134] Yet this investigation has not located a public charter, creation memorandum, organizational

[134] U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "DOI – CART – Flagpole Replacement at 2 Locations," Solicitation No. 140P4226R0009, presolicitation notice, March 23, 2026.

directive, or other governing instrument establishing CART, defining its mission, identifying who created it, or explaining how requirements were selected for its attention.

The machinery is therefore visible in operation before its governing authority is visible in the public record.

The pothole contract reveals the mechanism under a microscope. Other procurements reveal the potential scale of the environment in which accelerated and noncompetitive contracting was occurring.

Clark Construction provides the most conspicuous example.

The company was selected through a noncompetitive arrangement for construction of President Trump's ballroom. Reporting on the agreement described an allowance of **up to $500 million**. The procurement was conducted through the Executive Residence rather than the ordinary competitive federal contracting process, and the agreement was accompanied by nondisclosure provisions. The administration cited national-security considerations in explaining the procurement approach.[135]

Clark also received the National Park Service contract for a broader restoration of Lafayette Park, including rehabilitation of its two historic fountains, through an urgency-based noncompetitive procurement. The work expanded beyond the fountains to include new pumping systems and fountain vaults, irrigation lines, tree replacement, hardscape, benches, and turf. An earlier NPS estimate placed the fountain work at approximately $3.3 million. Clark's initial award was approximately $11.9 million; subsequent modifications increased the contract value to approximately **$17.4 million**.[136]

The two procurements are legally and administratively distinct. Their juxtaposition nevertheless produces an obvious investigative question. The same contractor received noncompetitive work associated with two prominent White House projects, while the

---

[135] Sarah Blaskey and Jonathan O'Connell, "Trump Is Using a $500M No-Bid Contract to Build His White House Ballroom," *Washington Post*, June 30, 2026.
[136] David A. Fahrenthold, Luke Broadwater, and Andrea Fuller, "Firm Building Trump's Ballroom Got a Secret No-Bid Contract for a Nearby Job," *New York Times*, April 25, 2026.

potential and modified values of those procurements together exceeded half a billion dollars.

The available public record does not resolve why Clark was selected in each instance or whether the selections reflected preferential treatment. Those questions require the underlying source-selection records, urgency determinations, communications, approval records, pricing materials, and—in the ballroom matter—the contractual documents governing the $500 million allowance.

**The pothole procurement reveals the mechanism. Clark Construction reveals its potential scale.**

The other side of the machinery appears in what did not move through it.

By mid-July 2026, approximately 1,500 National Park Service maintenance and other projects at more than 200 sites had been placed in the low-priority category, representing estimated work exceeding **$400 million**. Park employees had been warned that low-priority projects might not be completed.

That $400 million was not transferred to the White House priority projects. It was not a pool of money shown to have been diverted elsewhere. It represents the estimated cost of public work relegated within a system operating under constrained administrative capacity.

That is the collateral consequence of the funnel. While administration priorities moved through the constrained system, more than $400 million in other planned public work was relegated to a low-priority category that Park Service employees had been warned was unlikely to be completed.

At one end, a White House mandate could enter the acquisition machinery, acquire urgency, and emerge as a completed procurement.

At the other, hundreds of millions of dollars in authorized or contemplated public work could remain behind the bottleneck.

The mechanism did not require the President to select a contracting officer, choose the pothole contractor, or personally reorder individual Park Service projects. Executive authority operated further upstream.

**The priority moved first.**

The administrative machinery determined what happened next.

And by the time that machinery becomes visible in the procurement record, one of the most important questions is already behind it:

Who built the machinery, and who possessed the authority to decide what entered it?

**6. Where the Public Record Stops: Compulsory Authority Is Next**

The investigation has now reached a different kind of boundary.

It is not a shortage of questions.

It is a shortage of compulsory authority.

The public record establishes that the Department of the Interior's Critical Acquisition Response Team was operating by March 2026. Within weeks, CART was processing an acquisition expressly identified in federal procurement records as a **"White House priority"** and **"mandated by the White House."** The record identifies the contracting officer, CART acquisition lead, regional facility manager, contractor, justification, urgency, award, and governmental objective.

What it does not identify is how the mandate entered the machinery.

Despite expert and diligent research, this investigation has not located the communication that transmitted the White House pothole requirement to NPS or CART. It has not located the intake or referral record assigning that requirement to CART. And after having established CART's operation through multiple federal procurements, it has not located a public charter, creation memorandum, organizational directive, or other governing instrument for the team.

Those omissions matter because CART appeared within an administrative environment that had recently undergone substantial consolidation. By July 2025, Hassen was signing department-wide acquisition policy through Interior's acquisition-policy structure.

The public record therefore permits the administrative chronology to be reconstructed on both sides of CART's appearance.

It does not yet reveal the bridge between them.

**Who created CART?**

**Under what authority?**

**Who determined what constituted a critical acquisition?**

**Who could refer a requirement to the team?**

**Did designation as a White House priority itself provide access to CART?**

**Who transmitted the pothole mandate into that system?**

The same documentary boundary appears elsewhere in the investigation.

Hassen's financial disclosure identifies continuing financial relationships extending into his federal service, but the publicly available record examined here does not provide a complete set of ethics agreements, recusals, waivers, divestiture records, and participation records necessary to determine whether any retained financial interest intersected with a particular matter in which he participated personally and substantially.

The Clark procurements raise a different question. Their public records establish noncompetitive contracting involving more than half a billion dollars in potential and modified value across two prominent White House projects. They do not provide the complete source-selection, communications, pricing, approval, urgency, and contractual records necessary to determine why Clark was selected or whether preferential treatment occurred.

These are not allegations supplied by missing evidence.

**They are questions the missing evidence prevents the public record from answering.**

That difference marks the limit of this investigation.

An independent researcher can search federal procurement systems, financial disclosures, agency records, court filings, congressional correspondence, archived webpages, news databases, and documents obtained by others through public-records laws. Those sources can reconstruct a remarkable amount of governmental activity.

They cannot compel a witness to testify.

They cannot subpoena an internal email.

They cannot require production of a CART creation memorandum if one exists.

They cannot compel production of an ethics recusal or waiver that has not been publicly released.

They cannot require production of the source-selection and pricing records behind a noncompetitive contract.

They cannot preserve records against destruction, examine custodians under oath, or force an agency or private party to answer a question the public record leaves unresolved.

Other institutions can.

Congressional committees possess investigative and compulsory powers within their jurisdiction. Inspectors general possess statutory authorities to obtain agency records and conduct investigations. Law-enforcement authorities can employ compulsory process where the applicable legal standards are satisfied. Courts can compel production and testimony through lawful judicial process.

Those powers matter because accountability operates in time.

Governmental authority can be exercised immediately. Contracts can be awarded. Administrative capacity can be redirected. Projects can advance or be relegated. Money can be obligated and work can be performed while oversight, litigation, journalism, auditing, and investigation remain months or years behind the event.

Delay therefore does more than postpone accountability.

**Delay widens the accountability gap. A wider accountability gap extends the opportunity for extraction.**

The absence of a record does not establish that the gap was deliberately created. But absence has an operational consequence: authority can be exercised through the gap before accountability can determine how that authority was assigned.

That creates the condition this investigation has coined: **Gapportunity**.

The actors occupying such a gap need not share a plan, a motive, or even knowledge of one another. Opportunity does not require coordination. Different officials, institutions, contractors, or private actors can encounter the same structural opening wherever authority operates faster than accountability can reconstruct and test it.

**The gap itself becomes a common denominator.**

That is why the unresolved records identified here should not be treated as the end of the inquiry. They are handoffs.

The next investigation should begin with the records this one could not compel: the instrument establishing CART; its organizational and intake rules; the communication transmitting the White House pothole mandate; the records governing Hassen's contract and grant authority before March 7; his complete applicable ethics, recusal, waiver, divestiture, and participation records; and the source-selection, pricing, communications, approval, and contractual records underlying the Clark procurements.

Those records may establish misconduct.

They may establish lawful explanations.

They may produce answers that fall somewhere between the two.

That is precisely why they should be obtained.

This investigation has taken the public documentary record as far as it can presently be taken. Beyond this point, the remaining questions require powers of compulsion that an independent researcher does not possess.

Here is the investigation. Here is where the public record ends and compulsory authority becomes necessary. If you possess that authority, here is where you begin.

**Tag. You're it.**

---

**Evidence Assessment**

Panel III presents the most complex documentary record in this investigation. Its evidence spans statutes, executive orders, appropriations, administrative records, financial disclosures, procurement documents, nonprofit organizations, federal contracts, congressional correspondence, and public reporting. Considered separately, these records describe different institutions and different transactions. Considered chronologically, they reveal something more consequential: the architecture through which executive priority could become administrative action.

That architecture is visible even where the public record is incomplete. This investigation has established not just the existence of constrained administrative capacity, and the concentration of administrative authority, but also the designation of executive priorities, preferential access to scarce governmental resources, and procurement actions carrying those priorities into operation. It also establishes the corresponding displacement of work that did not receive the same priority. What the available record does not establish in every instance is who made each upstream decision, under what governing instrument, with what knowledge, or with what financial or institutional interest. Those are not reasons to disregard the architecture. They identify the points at which the public record ends and compulsory authority becomes necessary.

Missing records do not establish misconduct. Neither do they erase what the existing records establish. The documentary record is sufficient to reconstruct how the machinery operated even where it is insufficient to resolve every question concerning its design, authority, intent, or beneficiaries.

My investigation did not find a blueprint for this machinery. It has, however, reconstructed one from observing the machinery in operation.

**Panel III Conclusions**

**1. The Extraction Model remains recognizable in the third generation, but its institutional position has changed.**

Friedrich Trump encountered opportunity at the edges of governmental authority. Fred Trump learned to recognize and exploit opportunity within government-created systems. Donald Trump ultimately occupied an office possessing lawful authority capable of altering portions of the institutional environment through which opportunity itself was distributed.

**2. Executive authority therefore adds a qualitatively different dimension to the Extraction Model.**

The presidency is not merely another institution within which opportunity can be recognized. Executive authority can reorganize administrative structures, establish priorities, redirect attention, and affect the sequence in which governmental resources are consumed. In this environment, extraction need not begin with the movement of money. Priority can move first. The machinery can follow.

**3. Administrative capacity is itself a public resource.**

When governmental capacity is abundant, priority may determine sequence without determining access. When that capacity becomes scarce, however, priority acquires greater consequence. Decisions about what receives personnel, contracting attention, administrative processing, and institutional urgency can determine which authorized governmental purposes advance and which wait. The allocation of administrative capacity therefore becomes part of the architecture through which public power produces practical advantage.

**4. Third-generation extraction can operate upstream of the transaction.**

Panel III demonstrates why following money alone is insufficient. By the time a contract is awarded, a project accelerated, or an expenditure recorded, consequential decisions may already have occurred: priorities have been established, administrative capacity allocated, requirements transmitted, and machinery activated. The opportunity can therefore arise before the transaction that eventually makes it visible.

**5. Accountability remains part of the mechanism.**

Executive action can take effect while the institutions responsible for reviewing, challenging, or compelling disclosure of that action are still responding. The resulting interval can leave consequential decisions in operation before their authority, purpose, beneficiaries, and consequences have been fully examined.

Panel III began by asking whether the Extraction Model would remain recognizable under these conditions.

**It does.**

What changed was not the underlying mechanism, but the authority available to operate it.

The three Panels can now be considered together.

**Synthesis**

**Part I — Three Different Worlds**

The three Panels of this investigation span more than a century of American history. Their subjects did not encounter the same markets, institutions, forms of capital, or opportunities. Friedrich Trump entered a frontier economy developing faster than the institutions surrounding it. Fred Trump built within a mature federal system that deliberately joined public capital to private enterprise. Donald Trump entered an interconnected environment in which media, celebrity, political influence, private organizations, and ultimately executive authority could themselves become instruments of accumulation.

If the similarities ended with the family name, the comparison would have little analytical value.

They do not.

Across all three Panels, the documentary record shows a recurring capacity to recognize where an existing system had concentrated value, where its rules or vulnerabilities created unusual opportunity, and how position within that system could convert those conditions into private wealth, influence, or power. The opportunity changed. The instrument changed. The institution changed. The underlying orientation toward the institution remained recognizable.

That distinction is central to the Extraction Model. The investigation did not find three generations repeating the same transaction. It found something more adaptive. Each generation encountered the dominant systems of its own period and found opportunities to extract from within structures already producing or distributing value.

The historical progression becomes more consequential when considered in relation to institutional power. In the first generation, opportunity existed largely at the edges of developing institutional authority. In the second, it existed within increasingly powerful governmental systems. By the third, the actor under examination no longer stands merely outside government seeking opportunity from it. He occupies the presidency and possesses instruments like Executive Orders that can alter the institutional environment itself.

The systems changed.

The mechanism adapted.

And with each adaptation, the relationship between the extractor and the institution grew closer.

That is where the Triptych becomes more than three case studies. Viewed separately, its Panels describe three historically distinct encounters with opportunity. Viewed together, they reveal a movement from the edges of institutional power, into its systems, and ultimately to the possession of institutional power itself.

**Part II — The Dark Connector**

The Extraction Model initially described a recurring relationship between opportunity and institutions. But the investigation revealed a second problem. What happens when the institution recognizes the exploitation and begins to respond?

That question brings Roy Cohn into the Triptych.

Cohn did not originate the mechanism examined in this report. His significance lies elsewhere. He supplied a method for operating after institutional resistance had begun.

Attack. Counterattack. Contest. Delay. Persist.

In 1973, that method converged with the Trump family's existing experience navigating institutional systems. When the Department of Justice sued Fred Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management for alleged housing discrimination, Cohn responded not merely by defending the case but by counterattacking. The defendants denied the allegations and filed a $100 million counterclaim against the federal government. The counterclaim was dismissed, and the litigation ultimately produced a consent decree without an admission of liability.

The significance of the episode extends beyond its outcome. Institutional response no longer necessarily marked the end of an opportunity. Investigation, litigation, adjudication, appeal, enforcement, collection, and compliance all require time. Each stage introduces procedure. Procedure creates distance between an institutional action and its practical consequence.

Cohn's contribution was to recognize that distance as terrain.

The institution could investigate. The response could be contested.

The institution could sue. The defendant could countersue.

The institution could impose an obligation. Its implementation could still require another process.

This did not make institutional resistance meaningless, nor does the existence of procedural delay establish abuse. Due process, judicial review, appeal, and adversarial representation are essential protections. But the same protections necessarily create intervals in which a contested condition may continue before accountability becomes practical consequence.

That discovery changes the Extraction Model. The institution's response is not simply the final stage of the mechanism.

It can become part of the mechanism itself.

## Part III — Gapportunity

The Extraction Model began with a simple sequence: institutions create opportunities, actors recognize and exploit them, and institutions respond. The investigation revealed that the sequence does not necessarily end there.

Between institutional action and practical consequence lies another source of opportunity.

This report calls it **Gapportunity**.

Gapportunity exists where the distance between authority and consequence creates usable space. A judgment can establish an obligation before payment occurs. An official determination can require action before compliance follows. Government can exercise authority before oversight reconstructs how that authority was used. Administrative machinery can begin operating before the public record reveals who authorized it, under what instrument, or through what chain of command.

These are not the same transactions. They do not produce the same benefits. They do not require the same participants. What they share is access to the same structural advantage: time and distance between action, accountability, and consequence.

That finding matters because it connects actors and activities that would otherwise appear unrelated. Political power, legal resistance, administrative authority, private financial interests, religious celebrity, contracting, institutional delay, and incomplete public disclosure can occupy different parts of the same environment without requiring a single transaction or a single coordinating hand. What binds them analytically is the opportunity available while accountability remains incomplete.

The Extraction Model therefore extends beyond exploiting vulnerabilities in an institution. It includes the opportunity available while that institution is attempting to understand, restrain, enforce, recover, or account for what has already occurred.

That is the larger significance of Gapportunity. It describes a condition in which power and finance can keep operating while accountability is still trying to catch up.

Regarding the people drawn into Donald Trump's orbit, perhaps the reader remembers the adage: It takes one to know one.

The gap itself becomes a common denominator—not because every actor within it is doing the same thing, but because the same gap can preserve opportunity for each of them.

**Part IV — Before the Transaction**

The investigation's next finding changes where the Extraction Model must be observed.

Extraction is easiest to recognize after a transaction becomes visible. Money moves. A contract is awarded. Property changes hands. A payment is made. A measurable benefit appears. Those events leave records, and records make transactions comparatively easy to reconstruct.

Panel III revealed that the consequential action may occur earlier.

Before a contract can be awarded, a project must receive attention. Before money can be spent, administrative capacity must be available to move it. Before an objective can become a governmental requirement, someone with sufficient authority must give it priority. Decisions about sequence, personnel, contracting capacity, and institutional attention can therefore shape the field of opportunity before the transaction itself appears.

This moves the Extraction Model upstream.

At that point, the object being controlled is not necessarily money. It may be **priority**. It may be **sequence**. It may be **administrative capacity**. It may be the institutional machinery through which some objectives advance while others wait.

That distinction becomes especially important when executive authority enters the model. The presidency does not merely encounter governmental systems as an outside participant. It possesses lawful instruments capable of directing executive agencies and establishing governmental priorities. The significance for this investigation is not the existence of that authority, but what happens to the Extraction Model when the person occupying the institution can influence the conditions through which opportunity itself is distributed.

The potential consequence is difficult to overstate: when the actor who can recognize an opportunity also possesses the authority to alter the conditions surrounding it, extraction no longer requires merely playing the table well. The playing field itself can be moved after the bets are placed.

The transaction, then, may be downstream evidence of an earlier decision.

A contract can reveal who ultimately received government work. An expenditure can reveal where public money ultimately went. But neither, standing alone, necessarily reveals why that work moved when it did, what competing work waited, or which earlier decisions placed administrative machinery behind one objective rather than another.

The investigation therefore cannot stop at the transaction.

It must follow opportunity backward.

There, the Extraction Model acquires another dimension. Extraction need not begin when value changes hands. It can begin when institutional power changes the conditions under which value, attention, capacity, and opportunity will later move.

By the time the transaction becomes visible, the consequential decision may already have been made.

**Part V — The Extraction Model**

This investigation began with a simple idea.

Find an opportunity. Extract value from it. When the system responds, deal with the response.

The completed Triptych shows that the model goes further.

The system itself can become part of the opportunity.

That can happen when rules leave an opening. It can happen while courts, agencies, or other institutions are trying to respond. It can happen in the time before a decision becomes a real consequence. And when the person recognizing the opportunity also holds government power, it can happen before the public ever sees the transaction.

That changes what we should be watching.

Money is easy to see after it moves. Contracts have names and dollar amounts. Property has value. Judgments have numbers. These things leave records.

But something important comes before all of them.

**Position.**

Position provides access.

Position reveals opportunity.

Position can buy time.

Position can move something to the front of the line.

And some positions come with the power to decide where government attention, staff, money, and machinery go first.

This means the Extraction Model does not require government to stop working.

That is the sting.

The courts can still work. Congress can still investigate. Agencies can still follow procedures. Auditors can still audit. Journalists can still uncover records. Laws can still be enforced.

And extraction can keep moving while all of that is happening.

We often imagine accountability as the force that stops extraction. This investigation found something harder to see. The time and process required for accountability can leave opportunity open. Government priorities can determine what moves first and what waits. Scarce staff and resources can be directed toward one objective while another sits unfinished. And decisions made inside government may shape an opportunity long before the resulting contract, payment, or benefit becomes visible.

That means looking only for money may mean looking too late.

The deeper question is who had the position to act before everyone else could see what was happening.

That is where the completed Extraction Model leads.

**At its most powerful, extraction does not merely take advantage of the system.**

**It can use power inside the system to shape what happens next.**

**Conclusion**

Finding a weakness in an institution is not an argument for abandoning the institution.

The systems examined in this report were built by people. They contain protections, compromises, safeguards, and flaws. They can be exploited precisely because they must also protect rights, distribute authority, allow challenges, and restrain arbitrary power. The answer cannot be to destroy those protections in the name of preventing their abuse.

The harder task is to see where power outruns accountability and close that distance without sacrificing the protections that make accountability legitimate.

That task begins with recognition. The Extraction Model is now visible. So is Gapportunity. So is the danger that appears when the ability to recognize opportunity is joined by the institutional position to shape what happens next. None of those findings makes exploitation inevitable.

What can be recognized can be studied. What can be studied can be challenged. Laws can be strengthened. Procedures can be improved. Public records can become more transparent. Institutions can learn where their safeguards have also created openings, and citizens can demand that public power remain answerable to the public that entrusted it.

That is why this investigation should not end in despair.

For more than a century, the subjects of this Triptych repeatedly found opportunity in the systems around them. The reader now knows where to look.

And knowing where to look changes who gets to recognize the opportunity first.

Because…

**Friedrich mined the miners.**

**Fred mined government capital.**

**Donald mines executive authority.**

## Appendix 1

# Chronology of the Trump Extraction

*A Historical Synopsis*

This chronology identifies the principal moments necessary to see the historical progression of the Extraction Model across three generations. It is not a catalogue of every event examined in the report. It follows the movement from opportunity at the edges of developing institutions, to opportunity within government-created systems, and finally to executive authority capable of influencing the institutional environment through which opportunity itself is distributed.

## Friedrich Trump — Mining the Miners

**1885 — Friedrich Trump immigrates to the United States.**

At sixteen, Friedrich leaves Kallstadt, Bavaria, for New York, beginning the first generation examined in this report.

**1891 — Friedrich moves to Seattle.**

He enters the restaurant and hospitality trade in a rapidly developing western economy. The emerging pattern is simple: he does not need to produce the underlying commodity to profit from the people pursuing it.

**1897 — The Klondike Gold Rush transforms the Northwest frontier.**

Friedrich follows the economic migration north. Rather than mining gold, he provides food, lodging, alcohol, and other services to the population pursuing it.

**1898–1900 — Friedrich operates along the route to the goldfields.**

His businesses occupy strategic locations serving miners and travelers. The opportunity lies in the human traffic created by the rush.

**1900–1901 — The Arctic Restaurant operates in Whitehorse.**

Friedrich and his business partner establish one of the best-documented enterprises of his northern period. As transportation patterns change, Friedrich exits rather than remaining tied to a declining location.

**1901 — Friedrich leaves the Yukon.**

He returns with capital accumulated not by extracting gold from the earth, but by extracting value from the economy surrounding those who did.

## Fred Trump — Mining Government Capital

**1934 — Congress enacts the National Housing Act.**

The federal government creates the Federal Housing Administration and expands the federal role in housing finance. Government policy increasingly joins public credit and guarantees to private construction.

**1940s–1950s — Fred Trump expands through federally supported housing programs.**

The second generation operates in a different environment from Friedrich's frontier economy. Fred builds within mature governmental systems designed to stimulate housing production through federally supported financing.

**1954 — The U.S. Senate investigates FHA housing programs.**

Fred Trump appears before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency during its investigation of federally insured housing projects and developer profits. Private profit is now being examined inside a government-created system.

**1973 — The Department of Justice sues Fred Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management.**

The federal government alleges racial discrimination in the operation of Trump rental properties. The defendants deny the allegations, and Donald Trump retains Roy Cohn.

**December 1973 — The Trumps counterattack.**

The defendants file a $100 million counterclaim against the federal government. Institutional response itself becomes contested terrain.

**February 1974 — The counterclaim is dismissed.**

The litigation continues, illustrating that institutional response unfolds through procedure rather than immediate consequence.

**June 1975 — The housing case ends in a consent decree.**

The defendants enter the decree without admitting liability. The episode adds a new element to the model: investigation, litigation, adjudication, enforcement, and compliance require procedure, and procedure requires time.

**1970s–1980s — Roy Cohn remains an important lawyer and adviser to Donald Trump.**

Cohn did not create the family's orientation toward institutional opportunity. His contribution was a method for operating after resistance began: attack, counterattack, contest, delay, persist.

## Donald Trump — From Institutional Opportunity to Institutional Power

**January 20, 2025 — Donald Trump returns to the presidency.**

For the first time in the Triptych, the person under examination does not merely encounter governmental institutions from outside them. He occupies the presidency.

**January 29, 2025 — Executive Order 14189 establishes Task Force 250.**

The administration begins directing executive-branch participation in the nation's 250th-anniversary commemoration. The semiquincentennial becomes an environment through which Panel III follows executive priority, public resources, private organizations, contracting, and administrative authority.

**February 2025 — Tyler Hassen participates in Interior contract and grant reviews.**

Interior records place the former energy executive in reviews involving multiple bureaus, including the National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management, before his later formal delegation of Assistant Secretary authority.

**February 28, 2025 — Interior demonstrates its contract-review and approval process for Hassen.**

A meeting titled “DOI Contract Review Process & Approval Demo – USFWS” describes obtaining Hassen's preferences concerning how his approval should be secured. The sequence matters because this activity precedes his formal delegation.

**March 7, 2025 — Secretary Doug Burgum delegates Assistant Secretary authority to Hassen.**

Hassen receives delegated authority of the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, an office near the center of Interior's administrative machinery. The chronology leaves an unresolved question about the authority under which he had participated in department-wide contract and grant review before this date.

**March 26, 2025 — Senator Martin Heinrich challenges Hassen's authority.**

Heinrich asks Interior to identify the statutory basis for Hassen's exercise of functions associated with a Senate-confirmed office and raises the Federal Vacancies Reform Act. The challenge establishes a contemporaneous dispute over authority; it does not establish a violation.

**March 27, 2025 — President Trump signs Executive Order 14252, Making the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful.**

The order establishes a presidential objective for Washington's public spaces and directs Interior and National Park Service action. It does not create the later NPS priority system; it establishes the presidential priority that the administrative system subsequently implements.

**Spring 2025 — Interior consolidates administrative functions.**

Contracting, grants, financial management, human resources, information technology, communications, and other functions are brought into a more centralized departmental structure while Hassen leads the reorganization.

**April 18, 2025 — Interior announces accelerated FAST-41 treatment for the proposed Silver Peak lithium expansion.**

The project is operated by Albemarle Corporation, a company in which Hassen's later-filed financial disclosure reports stock ownership.

**April 21, 2025 — Hassen's financial disclosure reports Albemarle stock and continuing financial ties.**

The investigation does not establish that Hassen selected Silver Peak for accelerated treatment or participated personally and substantially in the matter. It establishes why ethics, recusal, waiver, divestiture, and participation records are material to resolving the question.

**May 7, 2025 — Heinrich renews his challenge to Hassen's authority.**

As Hassen's responsibilities expand, Heinrich again asks Interior for the legal basis for his authority. Scarce capacity, concentrated administrative functions, and disputed authority are now converging within the same institutional environment.

## Freedom 250 — Executive Priority Becomes Expenditure

**September 29–30, 2025 — Two Navy orders are awarded to Event Strategies, Inc.**

The “Titans of the Sea” orders are each initially valued at $5,158,276, making federal anniversary-related expenditure traceable through procurement records.

**October 7, 2025 — The Navy awards another Event Strategies order.**

The $2,139,409 order is identified as “AMERICA 250 - EVENTS.”

**February 3, 2026 — GSA awards Event Strategies a Freedom 250 order.**

The order carries a potential value of $333,084.24 for Freedom 250 design and content support services. These transactions do not by themselves establish improper contracting; they document the movement from presidential commemoration to governmental expenditure.

## 2026 — Scarcity Meets Priority

**March 2026 — CART appears in federal procurement records.**

The Department of the Interior's Critical Acquisition Response Team is operating in National Park Service contracting. This investigation has not located a public charter, creation memorandum, organizational directive, or other governing instrument establishing CART or explaining how acquisitions were selected for its attention.

**March 23, 2026 — CART handles an NPS flagpole procurement.**

The record demonstrates that CART's operation is not confined to the later pothole acquisition.

**April 2026 — NPS officials describe a three-tier priority system.**

Projects are sorted into White House priorities, high priorities, and low priorities. White House priorities receive preferential access to funding and contracting resources while employees are warned that low-priority work may not be completed.

**April 2026 — A CART pothole procurement documents the machinery in operation.**

The acquisition record states that CART, acting for NPS, “has a White House priority” to repair potholes and that “The repair of the potholes is being mandated by the White House.” The requirement moves through an urgency justification to contractor performance. Its significance is not the modest contract value; it is the visible flow of priority through the acquisition machinery.

**April 2026 — The pothole record exposes an upstream documentary gap.**

The procurement identifies the White House mandate but does not identify who transmitted it to NPS or CART, when it was transmitted, or through what institutional channel. The machine is visible in operation before its upstream governing record is visible.

**April 2026 — Clark Construction receives the Lafayette Park restoration contract through an urgency-based noncompetitive procurement.**

An earlier NPS estimate placed fountain work at approximately $3.3 million. Clark's initial award was approximately $11.9 million; subsequent modifications increased the contract to approximately $17.4 million.

**June 2026 — Clark's White House ballroom agreement is reported with an allowance of up to $500 million.**

The two Clark procurements are legally and administratively distinct. Their coexistence does not establish preferential treatment; it establishes the scale of the unanswered source-selection question.

**June 2026 — NPS administrative staffing reflects the contracting bottleneck.**

The Park Service has 179 full-time administrative officers, a 21 percent decline from the month Trump took office. Officials identify 133 projects totaling $35.8 million that are ready to proceed but lack sufficient contracting staff.

**Mid-July 2026 — Approximately 1,500 NPS projects are relegated to low priority.**

The projects span more than 200 sites and represent estimated work exceeding $400 million. That money is not shown to have been transferred to White House projects. The record instead shows public work sitting behind a bottleneck while administration priorities receive preferential access to constrained administrative capacity.

# THE TRUMP EXTRACTION

## Bibliography

*Robert Wright*

### Books and Scholarly Works

Aaker, David A. *Managing Brand Equity: Capitalizing on the Value of a Brand Name*. New York: Free Press, 1991.

Balmer, Randall. *Thy Kingdom Come: How the Religious Right Distorts the Faith and Threatens America*. New York: Basic Books, 2006.

Barrett, Wayne. *Trump: The Deals and the Downfall*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.

Berton, Pierre. *Klondike: The Last Great Gold Rush, 1896–1899*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1972.

Blair, Gwenda. *The Trumps: Three Generations That Built an Empire*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.

Chadwick, Andrew. "Donald Trump, the 2016 U.S. Presidential Campaign, and the Intensification of the Hybrid Media System." In *The Hybrid Media System: Politics and Power*, 2nd ed., 240–284. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.

D'Antonio, Michael. *Never Enough: Donald Trump and the Pursuit of Success*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2015.

D'Antonio, Michael. *The Truth About Trump*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2015.

Fisher, Louis. *The Law of the Executive Branch: Presidential Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Freund, David. *Colored Property: State Policy and White Racial Politics in Suburban America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Hall, Kira, Donna M. Goldstein, and Matthew Bruce Ingram. “The Hands of Donald Trump: Entertainment, Gesture, Spectacle.” *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 6, no. 2 (2016): 488–492.

Jackson, Kenneth T. *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Kreiss, Daniel. *Prototype Politics: Technology-Intensive Campaigning and the Data of Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Ott, Brian L., and Greg Dickinson. *The Twitter Presidency: Donald J. Trump and the Politics of White Rage*. New York: Routledge, 2019.

Sides, John, Michael Tesler, and Lynn Vavreck. *Identity Crisis: The 2016 Presidential Campaign and the Battle for the Meaning of America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.

Trump, Donald J., with Tony Schwartz. *Trump: The Art of the Deal*. New York: Random House, 1987.

Whitehead, Andrew L., and Samuel L. Perry. *Taking America Back for God: Christian Nationalism in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Williams, Daniel K. *God’s Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

**Government, Legal, and Congressional Sources**

Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023. Pub. L. No. 117-328, div. G, title I, 136 Stat. 4459, 4766 (2022).

Executive Order 13831. “Establishment of a White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative.” 83 Fed. Reg. 20,715 (May 8, 2018).

Executive Order 14291. “Establishment of the Religious Liberty Commission.” Federal Register 90 (May 7, 2025): 19417–19419.

Hassen, Tyler L. *Public Financial Disclosure Report*. OGE Form 278e. U.S. Department of the Interior, 2025.

Heinrich, Martin. Ranking Member, U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Letter to Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior. May 7, 2025.

Manuel, Kate M., and Brandon J. Murrill. *Executive Orders: Legal Authority, Judicial Review, and Congressional Oversight*. Congressional Research Service Report R45725. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 2019.

*Matter of Cohn*, 118 A.D.2d 15, 503 N.Y.S.2d 759 (N.Y. App. Div. 1986).

Murrill, Brandon J. *Executive Orders: An Introduction*. Congressional Research Service Report R46977. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, 2021.

National Housing Act. Pub. L. No. 73-479, 48 Stat. 1246 (1934).

One Big Beautiful Bill Act. Pub. L. No. 119-21, § 50305, 139 Stat. 72, 152 (2025).

Relyea, Harold C. *Executive Orders: Issuance, Modification, and Revocation*. Congressional Research Service Report RL34738. Washington, DC: Library of Congress, 2008.

Trump, Donald J. "Making the District of Columbia Safe and Beautiful." Executive Order 14252. *Federal Register* 90, no. 63 (April 3, 2025): 14559–14561.

Trump, Donald J. "Celebrating America's 250th Birthday." Executive Order 14189, January 29, 2025. Federal Register 90, no. 21 (February 3, 2025): 8849–8852.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Code of Federal Regulations, title 24, part 200, "Introduction to FHA Programs." Washington, DC: U.S. Government Publishing Office, 2025.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. *The FHA Single-Family Insurance Program: Performing a Needed Role in the Housing Finance Market*. Washington, DC: Office of Policy Development and Research, 2012.

U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division. "Notice to Close File." *United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.* December 15, 1977.

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. “DOI NCR Intent to Sole Source Notice.” Solicitation No. 140P4226R0015. April 10, 2026.

U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. “DOI – CART – Flagpole Replacement at 2 Locations.” Solicitation No. 140P4226R0009. Presolicitation notice, March 23, 2026.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Hearings and Appeals. “Practices Before the Department of the Interior; Delay of Effective Date.” *Federal Register* 90, no. 26 (February 10, 2025): 9222–23. FR Doc. 2025-02472.

U.S. Department of the Interior. “Trump Administration Adds Key Mining Projects to FAST-41.” April 18, 2025.

U.S. Department of the Interior. “H.R. 4285—Semiquincentennial Tourism and Access to Recreation Sites (STARS) Act: Statement for the Record.” July 16, 2025.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law*. 4th ed., vol. 1. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2016.

U.S. Government Accountability Office. *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law: Chapter 3, Availability of Appropriations: Purpose*. 4th ed., 2017 rev. GAO-17-797SP. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2017.

U.S. House Committee on Natural Resources. *From Vanity to Insanity: How the White House Cheated the American People Out of Their 250th Birthday*. July 2026.

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations. *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021: Committee Print of the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives on H.R. 133/Public Law 116–260, Legislative Text and Explanatory Statement*. Book 1 of 2. 117th Cong., 1st sess. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Publishing Office, March 2021.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Appropriations. *Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill, 2020*. S. Rep. No. 116-123. 2019.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency. *Investigation of Federal Housing Administration: Hearings Before the Committee on Banking and Currency*. 83rd Cong., 2nd sess., June 18, 1954. Vol. 1.

United States Code. Title 31, §§ 6303–6305 (2024).

United States Constitution. Articles I–III.

United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc. Civil Action No. 73 C 1529 (E.D.N.Y. filed October 15, 1973). Complaint.

United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc. Civil Action No. 73 C 1529 (E.D.N.Y. June 10, 1975). Consent Decree.

*United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.* Civil Action No. 73 C 1529. U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Order, February 5, 1974.

*United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.* Memorandum of the United States in Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Motion for More Definite Statement, in Support of Plaintiff's Motion to Dismiss Counterclaim. U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York, 1974.

*United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc.* No. 73 C 1529 (E.D.N.Y.). Counterclaim, December 12, 1973.

United States. United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016. Pub. L. No. 114-196, 130 Stat. 685 (2016).

Veterans Benefits Administration. *The Evolution of VA Home Loan Guaranty Service: Supporting Veteran Homeownership for 8 Decades (1944 to 2024)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 2024.

Weber, Alicia (Nikki), to Tyler L. Hassen, Katrine M. Trampe, and Jay Littleton. "DOI Contract Review Process & Approval Demo – USFWS." February 28, 2025. U.S. Department of the Interior. Records produced in response to FOIA No. DOI-2025-004517, production no. 0002980.

**Semiquincentennial, Financial, and Organizational Records**

Freedom 250. *Freedom 250*. Accessed August 7, 2026.

Freedom 250. "President Donald J. Trump to Headline the Great American State Fair Kick-Off Celebration." June 8, 2026.

National Park Foundation. *Financial Statements and Independent Auditor's Report, September 30, 2025 and 2024*. March 18, 2026.

National Park Foundation. "About." Accessed August 2026.

National Park Foundation. "Freedom 250 FAQs." Accessed August 6, 2026.

Schiff, Adam, et al. Letter to Doug Burgum, Secretary of the Interior, requesting a complete accounting of federal funds provided to Freedom 250. March 3, 2026.

U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Supply Systems Command Fleet Logistics Center Norfolk. Delivery Order N00189-25-F-Z842, under Federal Supply Schedule Contract 47QRAA25D00D5. Awarded to Event Strategies, Inc., September 29, 2025. $5,158,276. "Titans of the Sea."

U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Supply Systems Command Fleet Logistics Center Norfolk. Delivery Order N00189-25-F-Z848, under Federal Supply Schedule Contract 47QRAA25D00D5. Awarded to Event Strategies, Inc., September 30, 2025. $5,158,276 original award amount. "Titans of the Sea Event."

U.S. Department of the Navy, Naval Supply Systems Command Fleet Logistics Center Norfolk. Delivery Order N00189-26-F-Z001, under Federal Supply Schedule Contract 47QRAA25D00D5. Awarded to Event Strategies, Inc., October 7, 2025. $2,139,409. "AMERICA 250 - EVENTS."

U.S. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, Office of Acquisition Management. Delivery Order 47PA00-26-F-0002, under Federal Supply Schedule Contract 47QRAA25D00D5. Awarded to Event Strategies, Inc., February 3, 2026.

$333,084.24 potential value. “FY26 Freedom 250 Design and Content Support Services.”

United States Semiquincentennial Commission. *2025 Annual Report*. Washington, DC: United States Semiquincentennial Commission, 2026.

USAspending.gov. “Grant to the National Park Foundation from the Department of the Interior.” Federal Award Identification Number P26AC00101. Accessed August 8, 2026.

**News and Contemporary Reporting**

“Alignment Credit Provides Senior Secured Term Loan Commitment to Riverview Companies.” *Business Wire*, October 11, 2024.

Banks, Adelle M. “Trump Forms Evangelical Advisory Board.” *Religion News Service*, June 21, 2016.

Bellisle, Martha. “Here’s What a Texas Oil Executive from DOGE Is Doing Inside the Interior Department.” *Associated Press*, May 27, 2025.

Blaskey, Sarah, and Jonathan O’Connell. “Trump Is Using a $500M No-Bid Contract to Build His White House Ballroom.” *Washington Post*, June 30, 2026.

Bonventre, Peter, with Tony Fuller. “Cohn for the Defense.” *Newsweek*, April 2, 1979, 90.

Boorstein, Michelle. “Who Is Paula White, Trump’s Latest Spiritual Adviser?” *Washington Post*, June 21, 2016.

Bouie, Jamelle. “Trump’s New Insult Won’t Save Republicans.” *New York Times*, July 26, 2026.

Cardona, Megan. “Gateway Church Pastor Robert Morris Resigns Amid 1980s Sexual Abuse Allegations.” *Texas Public Radio*, June 18, 2024.

Coleman, Justine. “Trump Faith Adviser Leads Prayer Service Calling for ‘Angelic Reinforcement’ in Election.” *The Hill*, November 5, 2020.

Colvin, Jill. “Trump Meets with Faith Leaders in Dallas.” *Associated Press*, June 11, 2020.

Connolly, Kate. “Donald Trump’s Grandfather Was Deported from Germany.” *The Guardian*, September 29, 2016.

“The Department of the Interior Issues Sole Source Notice for Pothole Repair in National Capital Region.” *Indian Real Estate News*, April 30, 2026.

Dolan, Kerry A. “The Wild, Wild East.” *Forbes*, June 19, 2006.

D’Angelo, Chris. “Democratic Lawmakers Demand Interior DOGE Leader’s Financial, Ethics Docs.” *Public Domain*, September 4, 2025. Updated October 20, 2025.

Fahrenthold, David A., Luke Broadwater, and Andrea Fuller. “Firm Building Trump’s Ballroom Got a Secret No-Bid Contract for a Nearby Job.” *New York Times*, April 25, 2026.

Frazier, Ian. “An Immigrant Named Trump.” *The New Yorker*, October 1, 2016.

Geitner, Paul. “Feds Settle Tax Case Against Roy Cohn.” Associated Press, August 31, 1992.

Goodstein, Laurie. “Paula White, Trump’s Spiritual Adviser, Says He Is ‘Authentic.’” *New York Times*, January 19, 2017.

Italie, Hillel. “What to Know About the Artists Backing Out of the Trump-Linked Freedom 250 Concerts.” *Associated Press*, May 29, 2026.

Jenkins, Jack. “Paula White Breaks with Many Evangelicals over Christian Nationalism.” *Religion News Service*, October 18, 2019.

Kessler, Glenn. “Trump’s Claim That a Racial Discrimination Suit Was ‘Brought Against Many Real Estate Firms.’” *Washington Post*, September 28, 2016.

King, Maya, and Jeffery C. Mays. “Plaintiffs in Catholic Church Abuse Case Weigh $800 Million Offer.” *New York Times*, June 15, 2026.

Lusher, Adam. “FBI Discrimination Dossier Accuses Trump’s Father of ‘Get Rid of Blacks’ Comment.” *The Independent*, February 17, 2017.

Maull, Samuel. “Records Released in Cohn Hearing Recommend Disbarment.” Associated Press, November 26, 1985.

McHardy, Martha. “Trump’s Mentoring by Mob Lawyer Roy Cohn at Centre of New Biopic to Be Shown at Cannes.” *The Independent*, April 11, 2024.

Morgan, Lois. “Why Doesn’t Roy Cohn Pay His Bills?” *The Village Voice*, July 5, 1976.

O’Harrow, Robert, Jr., and Shawn Boburg. “The Man Who Showed Donald Trump How to Exploit Power and Instill Fear.” *Washington Post*, June 17, 2016.

Plunket, Robert. “Roy Cohn: The Man, the Myth, the Legend.” *Tampa Bay Times*, May 1, 1988.

Reuters. “E Jean Carroll Receives $5.63m Owed by Trump in Sex Abuse Case.” July 14, 2026.

Scherer, Michael. “President Trump Has a Pet-Project Docket at the National Parks.” *The Atlantic*, August 20, 2026.

Schor, Elana. “Trump Adviser Paula White Joins Effort to Mobilize Evangelicals for Israel.” *Associated Press*, December 6, 2019.

Shepardson, David, and Jarrett Renshaw. “Trump to Headline 250th Anniversary Fair Opening After Performers Drop Out.” *Reuters*, May 30, 2026.

Sneed, Tierney, and Betsy Klein. “Court Again Knocks Down Trump’s Demand for His Name to Go Back on the Kennedy Center.” *CNN Wire*, July 8, 2026.

“Texas Megachurch Pastor Resigns After Woman Says He Sexually Abused Her in the 1980s.” *Associated Press*, June 18, 2024.

United Press International. “G. David Schine: Figure in McCarthy Witch Hunts.” June 20, 1996.

Zauzmer, Julie. “How Paula White Became Trump’s Spiritual Adviser.” *Washington Post*, November 3, 2019.

Zirin, James D. “Trump’s Legal Strategy: If You Can’t Win in Court, Threaten the Judge.” *The Hill*, May 8, 2025.

**Institutional, Archival, and Reference Sources**

Bernanke, Ben S. “Housing, Housing Finance, and Monetary Policy.” Speech presented at the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Economic Symposium, Jackson Hole, Wyoming, August 31, 2007. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Accessed August 4, 2026.

Civil Rights Litigation Clearinghouse. “United States v. Fred C. Trump, Donald Trump, and Trump Management, Inc., 1:73-01529 (E.D.N.Y.).” Case summary. Accessed July 31, 2026.

Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council. “Silver Peak Lithium Mine.” Federal Permitting Dashboard. Accessed September 13, 2026.

Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. “The Forgotten History of the Mortgage.” Accessed August 4, 2026.

Federal Reserve History. Richardson, Gary. “Banking Panics of 1930–31.” Accessed August 4, 2026.

North-West Mounted Police Records. Dawson City Detachment, Klondike Gold Rush, 1897–1903. Héritage / Library and Archives Canada.

Oklahoma Office of the Attorney General. “Megachurch Founder Pleads Guilty to Child Sex Abuse Charges.” October 2, 2025.

Oklahoma Office of the Attorney General. “Multi-County Grand Jury Indicts Texas Megachurch Founder on Multiple Counts of Lewd or Indecent Acts with Child.” March 12, 2025.

Parks Canada. “Chilkoot Trail National Historic Site.” Government of Canada. Accessed July 31, 2026.

Pew Research Center. *45% of Americans Say U.S. Should Be a “Christian Nation”*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center, October 27, 2022.

Research Foundation for the State University of New York. “Research Foundation Board Chair Emeritus Mr. John B. Fitzgibbons.” Accessed September 13, 2026.

White House. “President Donald J. Trump Announces Paula White as Special Advisor to the White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative.” Press release, 2019.

Whitehorse Star. “Arctic Restaurant.” May 1, 1901.

**About the Author**

Robert Wright holds a *Bachelor of Music degree with Elective Studies in Business* and is an independent scholar, author, and researcher whose work examines the intersection of history, institutions, religion, public accountability, and contemporary social change.

Wright is a *Knight of Bahá'u'lláh*, a distinction associated with his teaching, pioneering, and authorship efforts promoting the Bahá'í Faith during the 1990s. His scholarship is informed by a longstanding interest in the relationship between spiritual principles, human institutions, and the challenges confronting contemporary society.

He is the author and publisher of *Close of the Age*, an independent publication examining current events, institutional change, and questions traditionally associated with the "end times." Readers are encouraged to engage with his work at closeoftheage.com.

Wright's broader educational and humanitarian work includes the School of the Land, an initiative devoted to exploring constructive responses to the interconnected social, spiritual, environmental, and institutional challenges facing humanity. Additional information is available at schooloftheland.com.