From: Steve Bannon <steve@arc-ent.com>
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2019 10:34 PM
To: Wolff; J
Subject: Re:

Agree 100%
Sent via BlackBerry by AT&T

From: Michael Wolff [redacted]
Date: Mon, 8 Apr 2019 15:26:38 -0400
To: J<jeevacation@gmail.com>
Cc: [redacted]>
Subject: Re:

I think the tone should be shifted from umbrage to just the facts. Don't get into a debate. If the Herald's assertion is wrong deny in absolute but not hostile terms; if other facts contradict the assertions, just state them. Try to be succinct rather than expansive. For instance, on the issue of being a government informant, rather than quoting from another journalist, merely state, in categorical terms, that you have never knowing aided U.S. law enforcement or other agencies in any official or unofficial way. Again, don't attack the Herald or its reporting, let the strength of your denials and the list of inaccuracies do that. Instead of, "This is a basic error which even the most superficial research would have revealed..." say "HIs business and activities as a financial advisor neither resemble nor intersect with the functions of a hedge fund manager. A hedge fund manager is not an accurate catch-all for all financial professionals and significantly misrepresents Epstein's career." In the bullet "The MH's sensationalized portrayal..." better to be expressed... "The Herald's portrait careful selects and cherry picks details to create a picture at dramatic odds with the greater circumstance, ignoring a wealth of mitigating evidence relating to the age of the women involved, their statements, and their financial interest in the legal cases against Mr. Epstein. All extenuating or exculpatory evidence was ignored in the Herald's report." I might say: "The Herald paints a portrait of coercion, threats, and exploitation. But significant aspects of the sworn evidence presents a vastly different and more complicated picture, once again wholly ignored by the Herald." Then go into a point-by-point list showing both the agency and complicity of the girls. Also: "The central factor in the Herald's portrait of the case is the age of the women who Epstein paid for massages and, sometimes, sex. Here the Herald has succeeded in giving the impression that under-age girls were the focus of Epstein's interest and activities. And yet significant evidence, nowhere referenced in the Herald account, strongly suggests otherwise..." Then point by point. I would group unreliable and conflicted sources under one header.

In general, this is all strong stuff, but the tone takes away from the strength of the individual points, and the overall argument is scattershot rather than tightly organized.

On Mon, Apr 8, 2019 at 2:42 PM J <jeevacation@gmail.com <mailto:jeevacation@gmail.com> > wrote:

> please note
>
> The information contained in this communication is
> confidential, may be attorney-client privileged, may
> constitute inside information, and is intended only for
> the use of the addressee. It is the property of

JEE