From: jessica banks <█████████████████████████>
To: Al seckel <████████████████>
Cc: Jeffrey Epstein <jeevacation@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Help needed on Jeff's sites - Confidential
Date: Sun, 28 Nov 2010 18:20:46 +0000

Hi Al,

Thank you for this detailed email. I COMPLETELY understand the goals and the implications/motivations for all these things.
As of Friday and per Jeffrey's request, I was just going over jeffreyepsteinscience.com (it was actually the one I knew about) merely for grammatical errors. I am going through every single link to make sure I see every word. Admittedly, however, I couldn't help but notice other content-related things that called for remedy and started to redo Jeffrey's bio in an initial effort.   In fact, due to the nature of the errors that I was noticing, I had actually figured that speed had been a primary goal and that cut-and-paste was blatantly being avoided (e.g., interesting twists of vocabulary led me to cross-reference on other people's sites). I now see that was just the tip of the iceberg.

I am ready to dive into all of this and be of whatever help I can. This evening I will get more familiar with all the sites and just check for glaring grammatical felonies.

The most time-consuming part of this process is codifying these changes in a way that is easily communicable to whoever will be implementing them (tracking changes in a huge file doesn't seem to be a good option). Maybe we can figure out an efficient system for doing this. I am also happy to make the changes in situ (heh, in site) but I would obviously need all the info and permissions for that.

I would be glad to discuss these things on the phone if that is easier and will cc you on any content I send to JE.

Feel free to call my cell (below) any time. Regardless I will be sending another email later this eve.
J

Jessica Banks, Boss
RockPaperRobot
33 Flatbush Avenue, 7th floor
Brooklyn, NY 11217
C: ███████████

http://rockpaperrobot.com

On Sun, Nov 28, 2010 at 11:40 AM, Al seckel <████████████████████> wrote:
> Hi Jessica,
>
> Jeff wrote me this morning that you might be wiling to help on the "English" of the various web sites that we are working on. This will be very helpful to us. In the matter of efficiency and speed, we intially got things up and running, and paid less attention to the English, but have been going back and correcting things, especially, when we come across anything, such as a posted factoid, which his critics could jump on. We have google alerts on his name, so the second they say anything critical, we instantly remove it or put it in a way that is factually correct. We dont' want to give them any traction.

It is important to understand that we have two main goals:

1. Build a very positive humanitarian successful presence for Jeff that is pervasive on the web, but not intrusive in any way on his private life or that will give any fodder for negative articles or thoughts. We can't stop his determined critics from writing about him, but we can provide them with little to grab a hold of, and in a certain sense, would bore the hell out of any tabloid journalist. Therefore, we aim to keep the material pitched high, and at the same time diffuse a lot of the anger that is out there.

In this regard, we are building three sites that will build a real 21st web presence of Jeffrey, each will have a different function. These sites can't appear to be "forced," they have to appear real, and not standard "reputation management stuff" offered by very expensive pro-services. That stuff won't work and will be immediately seen through by his critics.

The first site is the JeffreyEpsteinscience.com site, which features profiles and interviews with leading scientists, thinkers, achievers, etc. The interviews must be robust and readible, and above all, original. They can't have been "cut and pasted" from another source. This site is already doing very well, and is well linked to edu sites, and other sites, and is actually well trafficked, and many people reading it, tweeting about it, and a few leaving some positive comments. This site will get far better with more interviews on it. Daniel Kraft, whose interview is much more technical than mine, is having a hard time trying to make his a bit more accessible. Communication and the flow of ideas is a skill.... One does need to communicate and put them forth logically.

The second site is his philanthrophy site: www.jeffreyepstein.org. This lists all the groups he suppports, and that he will be supporting more in the future, and lays out a rigorous and robust grant application approach, which will resonnate with the academic community, and does not look fake or lifted, but has original thought behind it. This deliberately stops short of anyone applying, or listing avenues of support, or providing contact information. We will leave with "to be continued" and move it along at Jeffrey's perceived rate of time.

We are building a third site for a pseudo Jeffrey Epstein, which will bury all the negative videos on Jeffrey that float all over the web. This has to be constructed differently. It has yet to go up yet, and we are working on it now, as it is an intensive site.

Concurrent with this we have been building up the the other significant Jeffrey Epsteins's that already have a web presence (medical doctor who does hair transplants and reconstruction surgery, Oracle CEO, etc), so that they too can be strong in google rankings. Additionally, we have been building for a while a pseudo Jeffrey Epstein site on Sports: Jeffreyepsteinsports.com, which is placing very wel on the google front page. No need to make any English changes there, as this needs to have a very different style and approach, so that no one would think he had anything to do with it. They do not appear and should not be connected at all. For the rest of the world, it is just another Jeffrey Epstein who mouths off about various issues in sports....

It is important that all content, wording, etc. be original, and that there are no "cut and pastes" and everything needs to be constantly rewritten endless times (actually hundreds of times, and placed on established links in the philipines that link back to the original site. We have whole teams working in the Phillipines who do just this, and it is laborious work, but that is how google ranks. The more links the higher our ranking. But they rate where the links come from, and google has very sophisisticated algorthyms, which they change daily to thwart what we are trying to do (that try to stop spam sites), sand so it isn't easy. A good portion of google's power is devoted to stoping what we are doing. They also rank based on many factors, such as length of time the site exists, the freshness of the site (how active is it?), how many established links does it have, and the quality of those links (gov and

edu links are the best back links), is it relevant? Is it fresh or is it "cutting and pasting" from other sites, etc. They look for keyword searches, and have sophisticated algorhythms that make sure that the sentences make sense. There has to be a minimum of the number of words in an article for it to be picked up, i.,e no less than 450 words. The relevancy of the "key word, i.e, Jeffrey Epstein" to the rest of the article, etc., etc. All this has to be designed in. This is why some of our wording seems a bit loquatious, we need to expand it out, and place the key words in there in very particular spots for the google bots to pick them up, and why in a certain sense this appears a little contrived. Trust me, this is a non-trivial and very time-consumming job, especially with what is out there.

2. Replace the negative articles with these positive articles.

So, obviously, one has to replace (or in truth move down and away) the negative articles with the positive articles. That's why we need to build the way we do, as the negative material is already very well established, has strong powerful links and placements, such as the Huffington Post, Forbes, and Daily Beast, and of course, Wikipedia. All of these have literally millions of links going to them. in a certain sense, it is a race of who has the best links as well as relevant content.

In terms of WIkipedia, which we knew that we would never be able to remove its first place ranking, we did manage to tone it down considerably, remove his mug shot and description of him as being "arrested by the Palm Beach Police Department" with his good photo with the caption: American financier and philanthropist. We did the same at the top of Wiki, even if you didn't open the article, the first thing you would read was "Jeffrey Epstein, American financier and convicted sex offender." That wasn't good. If you opened and read the Wiki entry it went down hill from there, as it was a very graphic account out of the daily beast articles, and there was plenty of details. There were external links, there was nothing positive, etc. We toned this down immensely, removed the Daily Beast links, inserted large sections on his philanthrophy, and the grants, and fixed wording, the stuff about the lawsuits, etc., etc. This was a very big job as they had 27 people watching this site, and at first every time we made a single edit, they would go back and switch it back within less than 15 minutes, usually to something worse. We had to actually hack their IP addresses to block them from interferring with Wiki, and now the site has been stable in our direction for weeks. In a week or two, the headline "solicitation of prostitution" should fall away from its top headline too, replaced with Epstein Foundation, once the google bots once again troll the web, and so, it will just get better and better. It will become basically invisible.

When moving things around, you want to make sure that you move the negative ones away, and not the good ones! We are pushing up the EDGE piece, etc. Keeping up MoneyMan of Mystery, etc. And, on subquent pages of google, these pages are also getting filled with material that is not our main material but our linking material, further pushing the negative stuff back to the far pages of google. It takes time for our links to get picked up, as first they continually have to be built, spun, and established, and then we have to wait for the google bots, who typically roam about once a month or so, checking what's news, verifying, to get new rankings. It is not helpful to look at the google site every day, as it is like doing a diet, where you check the scales every day, and one gets discourages, as things bounce, google changes their algorythms, we have to adjust.

We have also had people already try to hack our sites, so, obviously, there are forces we have to contend with.... It is not a pretty landscape out there, but we welcome your help on any corrections that you may have. Please let me know how you can help, and would be glad to have your services. Truly. Fixing factual errors and typos, etc. is the easiest for us, and pretty much can be done on an immediate basis. We do control this site.

I just needed to lay out the landscape first.

In the end, we hope to do something really positive and constructive, and not just window dressing, otherwise, the whole thing will just backfire again.

With kind regards,
Al