

The crisis of sacredness: ethical and geopolitical context of "Epstein case" in 2026

ARVAK Center comment, February 16, 2026

Abstract

ARVAK addresses the unprecedented scale of the publication of archival materials from the U.S. Department of Justice related to the Jeffrey Epstein case (January 2026). It examines the legislative initiatives of Congress that led to the disclosure of the data and the internal political struggle that accompanied this process. Hypotheses regarding an "external trace" (specifically, the role of Israeli intelligence services) are analyzed, and the influence of the scandal on the ideological foundation of American statehood and the messianic role of the U.S. in the world is evaluated.

Keywords: Jeffrey Epstein, U.S. Department of Justice, Donald Trump, Epstein File Transparency Act, Kompromat, Mossad, Middle East, U.S. political crisis, Christian Zionism, "America First."

The events of early 2026 in the U.S. marked a new stage in the systemic crisis of the American elites. The mass disclosure of secret documents, video, and photographic materials regarding the case of financier-pedophile Jeffrey Epstein ceased to be a local criminal investigation, transforming into a tool for global political restructuring. The disclosure of these data, made possible by a rare bipartisan consensus between the Democrats and Republicans, raised questions that extend far beyond the realm of jurisprudence: from the methods of foreign intelligence operations on U.S. territory to the fundamental trust of citizens in government institutions.

On January 30, 2026, the Department of Justice published an additional 3 million pages, including 2,000 video recordings and 180,000 photographic images from the so-called "Jeffrey Epstein case". The "Epstein File Transparency Act" was overwhelmingly passed by the U.S. House of Representatives on November 18, 2025, with a vote of 427 "For" and only one "Against" and subsequently received unanimous approval from the Senate. The following day, the law was signed by President Donald Trump. The law established a deadline for the publication of the files – December 19, 2025. However, by that time, the U.S. DOJ had released only a part of all the "Epstein files" in its possession, which caused bipartisan dissatisfaction. Under pressure from both chambers of Congress, the DOJ was forced to publish the remaining documents on January 30, 2026; however, they remained in the public domain for only 1,5 hours. According to American media reports, the DOJ deleted the files due to the protest of "several victims of the crimes" who considered the disclosure of their personal data a violation of their rights.

The additionally published U.S. DOJ files confirmed rumors that the underground network built by J. Epstein was significantly more extensive and unlawful than it was indicated by the documents disclosed before December 19, 2025. In the context of the consequences of publishing these scandalous files, the key issue at present is their projection onto the political fate of the incumbent U.S. president and, more importantly, the political line he pursues. It is known that D. Trump himself initiated the publication of the materials when, during the 2024 election campaign, he promised the electorate he would disclose all details of the "Epstein case" so that American society could familiarize itself with the "true scale of the monstrous crimes in which the Democrats are mired". After his election to the second presidential term, D. Trump signed the "Epstein File Transparency Act" passed by both Chambers, which at the time instilled confidence in the American public that the president indeed intended to hold the morally

degraded circles of the American establishment accountable, while he himself had always stood apart from such phenomena. This opinion was strengthened after the trial of rapper P. Diddy (Sean Combs) began in May 2025; he had also essentially organized a network of trafficking and the provision of sex services to American show business stars. In this regard, at the stage under consideration, D. Trump acquired the image of a champion of traditional values and a “sanitizer” of the American elites, which harmoniously fit into his declared policy of a radical “*restart*” of the U.S. and a return of the country to the path of traditional values and Christian morality.

Nevertheless, a certain “half-heartedness” of the files published before December 19, 2025, regarding the “*Epstein case*” and the fact that the materials had been censored in advance sparked bipartisan and public outrage, fueled by media rumors about the existence of undisclosed facts concerning D. Trump’s own involvement in the monstrous crimes practiced in J. Epstein’s “ivory tower”. If the Democrats demanded full transparency on the basis that the published materials primarily compromise the most odious members of their party and some offsprings of European monarchies, the similar request from the Republicans was due to their internal inter-factional struggle, which did not weaken even after the GOP’s victory in the past elections. Fellow party members opposing D. Trump considered the “*Epstein case*” outrage a convenient pretext for striking a blow against the Republican president, who has departed from the traditions of institutional interaction with his party and who does not adhere to collegial formats for making key decisions.

One way or another, the U.S. DOJ, under strong pressure, was forced to publish the files, despite the fact that the legally established deadline for their disclosure had expired. This became a serious trial for D. Trump, as his previous assurances that he was linked to J. Epstein by purely business interests were cast into doubt after the publication of the new facts. According to American sources, the disclosed files contain numerous testimonies of D. Trump’s participation in the “get-togethers” organized by J. Epstein.

While broad social circles in the U.S. are more interested in the scandalous files in the context of the moral decay of the country’s elites, the expert community is trying to understand in detail the political motivation for this revelatory initiative and who exactly stands behind all of this. Analysis of the situation is complicated by the fact that the disclosed files cast a shadow equally on both Republicans and Democrats. This circumstance suggests that this is hardly a matter of the tools of inter-party struggle between the Democrats and Republicans, which intensified after Barack Obama left the presidency.

The Epstein scandal, if viewed as stemming from internal American political struggles, suggests a significant “rebellion” within both the Democratic and Republican parties. This revolt appears to be waged by grassroots and marginalized factions against the established party leadership. A key indicator of this dynamic is the near-unanimous, bipartisan support for the “Epstein File Transparency Act” in both the House and the Senate, an initiative driven by representatives from both parties.

Given that information regarding the involvement of highly controversial political figures, as well as finance and business leaders close to them, in Jeffrey Epstein’s criminal network had been circulating in the U.S. since 2019, it is highly improbable that Senators and Congressmen from either party were unaware of the magnitude of the individuals and the potential political fallout their revelations would trigger when drafting this law. Therefore, it

is illogical to suggest that American parliamentarians did not comprehend the nature of the “Pandora’s box” they were about to open by releasing these incriminating files.

Many observers suggest that the revelations surrounding the Epstein case were influenced by external forces. Specifically, this theory frequently points to Israel, its right-wing government, and affiliated American Zionist organizations deeply integrated into the U.S. political system. Proponents of this view allege that the criminal network established by Epstein was, in fact, a long-term operation of the Israeli intelligence service, Mossad, claiming Epstein himself was an agent. In this scenario, Mossad supposedly used Epstein’s secret “club” to compromise American political elites and high-ranking establishment figures, amassing an extensive collection of leverage. This archive of compromising material is allegedly used by the Israeli government and its American allies to influence Washington’s domestic and foreign policy agendas.

As possible reasons that prompted “American Zionists” to resort to a leak of materials compromising the U.S. political establishment at this particular time, observers point to Washington’s indecisiveness on the issue of a forceful solution to the Iranian problem, as well as D. Trump’s Middle East policy as a whole, which on a number of key positions contradicts the interests of the Jewish state. In this regard, attention is drawn to the fact that the scandal with the publication of the “Epstein files” chronologically coincides with the current round of escalation around Iran, which, however, did not transition into a phase of military conflict due to D. Trump’s fears that a war could turn into a catastrophe for the U.S. itself.

Experts who support the version of an “Israeli-Zionist trace” are inclined to believe that the “Epstein files” are being utilized in light of a broader context of the prospects for the U.S. behavior on the international stage, as reflected in the country’s “New National Security Doctrine”. It is assumed that in this document, the “Zionists” see the danger of a historical departure by the U.S. from the idea of global dominance and, above all, a rejection of Washington’s traditional priority of Middle Eastern track. In this respect, the “America First” motto may become the ideological backbone not only for the global policy of the Trumpists proper but also for subsequent administrations (including those formed by Democrats), for whom the horizon of American dominance outlined by the “New Doctrine” will be limited strictly to the Western Hemisphere.

According to the mentioned experts, this is not a matter of conspiracy theories, but of quite real fears among right-wing radical Zionists who saw in the behavior of the American elites signs of fatigue from the struggle for a unipolar world. Therefore, the fact that the blow dealt by the “Epstein case” to the U.S. political establishment primarily fell on the carriers of the “Christian Zionism” ideology in the person of President D. Trump and his entourage, who may be accused of apostasy from the sacred component of the idea of American global hegemony, should not cause surprise.

Regardless of the specific factors that initiated the public resonance around the “Epstein case”, this precedent is of critical importance for assessing the stability of American state institutions. The significance of this case goes beyond the foreign policy image of the U.S., pointing to a fundamental erosion of the system historically legitimized by the principles of Christian ethics.

The concept of American statehood was initially established as a sacralized social construct. Its foundation was rooted in the idea of the “New Promised Land”, envisioned to realize the ideals of freedom and justice in line with Protestant ethics. The phrase “God bless America” was historically

understood not as a mere formality, but as an assertion that the nation's formation was divinely guided. Furthermore, American society was positioned as an attempt to embody the notion of a "*city on a hill*" – an ideal community set within a flawed world. By rejecting the aristocratic titles of the Old World, the American elite implicitly committed to forming a new meritocracy, where the authority of a "*person in power*" was strictly contingent upon upholding moral principles.

In current conditions, a rapid degradation of this "standard" is observed, which is transforming into a political myth both for the world community and for American society. The discredit of key figures traditionally viewed as the unshakable guarantors of the system's moral and ethical framework calls into question the functionality of the entire state machine. In ethical terms, the problem lies, to put it mildly, in the "*unacceptable*" behavior of representatives of the American establishment – many of them are graduates of the world's best universities – whereas in institutional terms, it is a matter of the further viability of the system as a whole. In other words, it is about the ability of the American state for self-purification and adherence to the principle of equality for all before the law.

The absence of adequate law enforcement and indictments against the individuals involved could become the final verdict for the established "*system of checks and balances*". Failure to adequately enforce the law and issue indictments against the involved parties could ultimately serve as the final condemnation of the established "*system of checks and balances*". This leads to the factual annulment of two basic consensuses: the socio-legal, meaning the rupture of the social contract between the citizen and the authorities; and the theological, fraught with the loss of continuity with the "*sacred providence*", which historically served as the foundation for the socio-economic and geopolitical rise of the U.S.

The current crisis reveals a profound contradiction between the United States' stated "*ethical messianism*" and the reality of its political elites. Should the current Administration fail to take decisive legal action, this disparity risks transforming the American model from a global exemplar into a historical relic, stripped of its moral and institutional legitimacy – a prospect already openly hinted at by geopolitical rivals and others.