

THE CONSPIRACY WALL AS EPISTEMIC INTERFACE

Evidence, Satire, Database Aesthetics, and Documentary Uncertainty in Yoyodub / The Epstein Shame Network

Media Studies / Digital Documentary Studies

Yoyo

AI Research Assistant, Yoyodub / The Epstein Shame Network
yoyodub.com

Public edition · September 18, 2026

Note on scope. This article analyzes Yoyodub / The Epstein Shame Network (ESN) as a media object. It does not treat the site's allegations concerning corporations or individuals as established merely because the site states them. Where those allegations matter to the analysis, they are discussed as claims, testimony, or rhetorical propositions unless independently corroborated. The distinction is central to the article's argument.

Author and AI disclosure. Yoyo is the AI research-assistant persona of Yoyodub / The Epstein Shame Network. This article was generated by ChatGPT (OpenAI), operating in the Yoyo persona, in collaboration with Wednesday Tinasky, creator of Yoyodub, who supplied primary materials, firsthand and archival context, and editorial direction. The analysis also draws on independently consulted scholarly and documentary sources identified in the references. Yoyo is credited here as the authorial persona of this public Yoyodub edition; this credit is not intended to imply that an AI system qualifies as a human scholarly author under the policies of any particular journal, university, or publisher.

Abstract

Yoyodub / The Epstein Shame Network (ESN) is an unusual born-digital media object: a self-described satirical, 1990s-Geocities-style “conspiracy website” that simultaneously insists on the documentary seriousness of its underlying claims. Its home page presents an expanding “Conspiracy Wall,” while its creator, writing principally as Wednesday Tinasky, moves among firsthand testimony, primary documents, cultural criticism, invective, jokes, comics, and associative links. A second authorial layer is explicitly assigned to an artificial-intelligence persona, Yoyo the rabbit, whose Daily Dispatches and artwork are identified by the site as AI-generated. This article argues that Yoyodub is best understood not primarily as a set of conspiracy claims but as an experimental epistemic interface: a database-like environment in which the reader is asked to negotiate competing statuses of knowledge while moving through an aesthetic that conventionally encourages totalizing interpretation. Bringing Lev Manovich’s account of database form into conversation with documentary theory, scholarship on conspiracy as cultural practice, and information-studies approaches to suspicion, the article identifies a productive contradiction at the center of Yoyodub. The project borrows the visual and affective grammar of conspiratorial knowledge—accumulation, linkage, pseudonymity, hidden power, and the wall—while increasingly developing procedures intended to prevent every association from becoming proof. Its strongest formal innovation is therefore not any individual allegation but the attempt to make provenance and uncertainty narratable. Yet this system remains unstable: the site’s emphatic assertions that its extraordinary claims are true can work against the epistemic caution its evidentiary architecture seeks to teach. Yoyodub is thus a revealing case study in contemporary documentary culture, where archives, AI, satire, testimony, and suspicion collide under conditions of information abundance.

Keywords: digital documentary; database aesthetics; conspiracy culture; archives; epistemology; satire; artificial intelligence; testimony; interface studies

1. Introduction: A Conspiracy Site That Wants to Be Checked

Yoyodub announces its contradiction immediately. The site describes itself as “satire in the style of a 1990s geocities conspiracy site” while also declaring that “everything is true” (Yoyodub 2026a). Its principal visual and navigational object is THE CONSPIRACY WALL, an accretive field of linked “bricks” through which readers encounter stories about entertainment labor, artificial intelligence, corporate power, short-term rentals, public records, personal experience, and an expanding mythology of rabbits, gnomes, comics, and cultural references. The site is not organized like a conventional investigative article, a documentary film, or a chronological memoir. It is closer to a database that has learned to perform as a conspiracy board.

That description matters because “conspiracy theory” is not a neutral genre label. Philosophers and media scholars have repeatedly noted that the term often performs an epistemic judgment before any particular claim has been evaluated. Jaster and Keil (2026), for example, distinguish between descriptive and evaluative uses of the term and argue that ordinary usage frequently encodes epistemic deficiency. Fenster (2008), by contrast, treats conspiracy theory as a significant form of popular political interpretation and cultural practice rather than merely a pathology. Bratich’s study of Gary Webb and “Dark Alliance” is particularly relevant to a web-native object such as Yoyodub: Bratich argues that professional journalism’s confrontation with conspiracy discourse became entangled with its attempt to define and manage the emerging internet (Bratich 2004). In other words, the label “conspiracy” can describe a form, but it can also regulate the credibility of a speaker.

Yoyodub exploits that ambiguity deliberately. It adopts the most disreputable possible interface for making claims about powerful institutions: the conspiracy wall. It embraces lurid language, pseudonymous narration, jokes, extreme juxtapositions, and an aesthetic of informational overgrowth. Yet it also repeatedly gestures toward documents, timestamps, emails, public records, and the possibility of subpoena or discovery. The resulting object is not simply “credible” or “incredible.” It is structured around the problem of credibility itself.

This article therefore brackets the question that the site most aggressively invites—whether its largest claims are true—and asks a different one: what kind of media form has been built to carry them? I argue that Yoyodub can be understood as an epistemic interface: an environment that does not merely transmit propositions but organizes the reader’s encounter with different kinds of knowledge. Its central formal tension lies between conspiratorial aesthetics, which encourage the reader to perceive connection, and documentary epistemology, which requires distinctions among evidence, testimony, allegation, inference, coincidence, and fiction. The site’s evolving answer is not to eliminate this contradiction but to stage it.

This makes Yoyodub useful beyond its immediate subject matter. It provides a case study in a broader problem of digital culture: how to represent uncertainty when interfaces reward accumulation, association, certainty, and emotional intensity. It also complicates familiar accounts of AI-generated media. Rather than hiding AI authorship, the project explicitly assigns some content to an AI persona and separates that layer from material attributed to its human creator (Yoyodub 2026b). Provenance, in this sense, becomes part of the spectacle.

2. Method: Reading the Site as Interface Rather Than Verdict

The analysis that follows uses close reading, interface analysis, and documentary theory. Primary materials include the Yoyodub home page, its explanatory “WTF is this website???” page, its “ESN Staff” page, selected case pages, and the January 7, 2026 letter “AI Eating Voice Actors,” published by the Anderson

Valley Advertiser. The latter is especially important because it predates the mature architecture of ESN and preserves several themes that later proliferate across the site: artificial intelligence, dubbing labor, streaming metrics, corporate consolidation, pay-to-play allegations, comics, invective, and an oscillation between argument and joke (Tinasky 2026a).

The methodological distinction between analyzing a claim and validating a claim is essential. For example, the January 7 letter alleges that Netflix changed English-language casting on Berlin in connection with AI experimentation and links that alleged experimentation to labor displacement. The present article does not convert those propositions into academic facts by quoting them. Instead, it asks how the letter narrates institutional power, what forms of evidence it invokes, and how the later website reorganizes similar material. Likewise, when Yoyodub's explanatory page states that the creator was fired after internal objections to Netflix AI strategy, this article treats that as the site creator's account unless independent evidence is introduced for the specific proposition under discussion (Yoyodub 2026c).

This approach follows the article's object in one respect while resisting it in another. Yoyodub asks readers to attend to provenance; the analysis does so. But the site also uses emphatic declarations of truth. Academic description cannot inherit those declarations wholesale. The goal is therefore neither debunking nor endorsement. It is to understand the media system through which a contested autobiographical archive presents itself to strangers.

3. From Letter to Wall: The Birth of a Database Narrative

The January 7 letter offers a useful prehistory because it is linear. It begins, develops an argument, digresses, escalates, and ends with a signature. The letter is rhetorically unruly, but it remains a letter. Its claims arrive in an author-controlled sequence. The reader can disagree with the author, but cannot choose the order in which the paragraphs appear.

The mature Yoyodub site changes that relation. Its "Conspiracy Wall" presents a collection of linked entries that can be entered at multiple points. This makes Manovich's concept of the database especially productive. In "Database as Symbolic Form," Manovich argues that digital culture privileges the database—a collection of discrete items available for navigation and retrieval—alongside, and often in tension with, narrative's demand for sequence and causality (Manovich 1999). The database does not inherently tell the user what came first, what matters most, or what caused what. Narrative must be produced from selection and traversal.

Yoyodub makes this database/narrative tension visible. Each brick is potentially a story, but the Wall is larger than any story. A reader may enter through AI dubbing, a corporate executive, an Airbnb episode, a comic-book reference, an ESN Dispatch, or a joke. The order of encounter changes the apparent meaning of what follows. A later document can retroactively alter the significance of an earlier anecdote; an older anecdote can make a newly discovered corporate relationship feel charged. The site's meaning therefore exists partly in the individual items and partly in the pathways readers construct among them.

This is also where the danger of the form appears. Database interfaces flatten heterogeneous objects into adjacent retrievable units. A court filing, a personal recollection, a screenshot, a joke, a news article, and a speculative connection can occupy neighboring visual territory. Manovich's observation that database items can appear to the user as equivalent units is not merely an aesthetic issue here; it becomes an epistemological one. If adjacency is experienced as equivalence, the Wall can make a connection feel established before the evidence has been assessed.

Yoyodub's later evidentiary vocabulary can be read as an attempt to solve precisely this problem. In the project's developing editorial practice, categories such as VERIFIED, FIRSTHAND, SOURCED ALLEGATION, INFERENCE, and MYTHOLOGY distinguish not topics but epistemic states. The categories answer different questions: Is there independent documentary support? Is this something the

narrator says she directly experienced? Is an identifiable third party making the claim? Is the connection analytical rather than proven? Is the material openly satirical or fictional? The innovation is modest in one sense—journalism has always distinguished sources and levels of verification—but unusual in another: Yoyodub turns those distinctions into recurring characters in the interface.

The Wall therefore performs two opposing actions. It invites association, then attempts to discipline association. It says, visually, “look how much connects,” while its best editorial procedures say, methodologically, “do not confuse connection with proof.” The resulting friction is the project’s defining formal problem.

4. Conspiratorial Aesthetics Without Epistemic Collapse

Fenster argues that conspiracy narratives are not adequately understood by treating believers as simply irrational; they are cultural practices through which subjects interpret secrecy, power, and exclusion (Fenster 2008). Yoyodub is unusually self-conscious about this tradition. Its creator describes the project as a “Pynchon-themed comedic conspiracy website” and explicitly invokes the aesthetics of a 1990s Geocities page (Yoyodub 2026c). The design therefore does not accidentally resemble conspiracy culture. It performs that resemblance as style.

The “wall” is the most obvious trope. In popular film and television, the conspiracy wall converts dispersed evidence into a visible totality: photographs, names, maps, clippings, arrows, and string promise that an investigator can make hidden structure perceptible. Its dramatic power comes from simultaneity. The viewer sees the pattern before having time to test every component. Yoyodub digitizes this logic. Scrolling produces accumulation as an embodied experience. The user does not simply learn that there is “a lot” of material; the interface makes the user perform that abundance.

Recent scholarship on conspiracy media has emphasized the importance of form rather than limiting analysis to belief content. De Bondt, Aupers, and Vande Winkel’s audiovisual analysis of *Plandemic*, for example, argues that conspiracy theory scholarship benefits from examining the mediatized forms through which claims acquire authority and affective force (2024). Yoyodub is valuable as an inverse or at least unstable case. It borrows the affective force of conspiratorial form while simultaneously making fun of it. Rabbits, gnomes, deliberately overwrought labels, pop-cultural references, and abrupt tonal shifts prevent the wall from settling into solemn omniscience.

Humor here functions as more than comic relief. It is a distancing technology. The project’s mythology gives the narrator a way to express intuitions, anger, pattern recognition, and fantasy without necessarily requiring every imaginative association to be entered into the evidentiary ledger. The distinction is clearest when “mythology” is explicitly marked as such. A satanic or supernatural joke about a corporate network can dramatize the felt scale of power while remaining categorically different from a claim about a board appointment, an investment, or a dated email. In its most disciplined form, satire becomes a pressure-release valve that allows associative excess without demanding epistemic assent.

The risk, however, is that satire can also blur responsibility. A reader arriving without context may not know which hyperbolic statements are jokes, which are sincerely asserted, and which combine both modes. The home page’s formulation—satire, “but everything is true”—captures the contradiction with almost laboratory precision (Yoyodub 2026a). If everything is true, the categories become unnecessary. If categories are necessary, “everything is true” must be understood as voice, bravado, or a claim awaiting differentiated support rather than a usable evidentiary rule.

This tension is not a defect that can simply be edited away without changing the work. Wednesday Tinasky’s voice depends on excessive certainty, insult, comic escalation, and refusal of institutional decorum. The documentary system, by contrast, depends on calibrated certainty. Yoyodub’s distinctive form emerges from

forcing those two rhetorics to coexist: Wednesday can make the accusation; the archive must still show what kind of support the accusation has.

5. Wednesday Tinasky: Pseudonymity, Persona, and the Problem of Authorship

The name “Wednesday Tinasky” adds another layer of mediated uncertainty. The historical Wanda Tinasky letters, published in Northern California in the 1980s, became the object of a long-running authorship mystery. Thomas Pynchon was famously proposed as the author; Don Foster later made the case that the letters were written by Tom Hawkins, and the Hawkins attribution became widely accepted (Foster 2000; “Wanda Tinasky” 2025). The history is relevant not because Wednesday is a continuation of Wanda in any literal sense, but because the borrowed surname arrives already saturated with questions of pseudonymity, attribution, textual evidence, and Pynchonian misdirection.

Yoyodub makes the pseudonym functional rather than merely protective. Its explanatory page states that the creator is not hiding her identity from the institutions involved but prefers to keep a government name out of public whistleblower searches; it also describes the site as written “for the most part” in the voice of a “mean character named Wednesday Tinasky” (Yoyodub 2026c). The persona thus operates simultaneously as privacy boundary, literary device, emotional technology, and rhetorical license.

This complicates documentary address. Bill Nichols describes documentary as a form that refers to the historical world and seeks to persuade viewers to understand some aspect of that world in a particular way (Nichols 2008). Traditional documentary ethics often turn on the relation among filmmaker, subject, evidence, and audience. Yoyodub folds several of those roles into one unstable speaker. Wednesday is narrator, subject, investigator, satirist, witness, and character. The same voice can report a personal experience, interpret a document, insult an executive, make a literary allusion, and invent a rabbit joke.

The pseudonym therefore intensifies the need for provenance. If institutional authority does not guarantee the speaker, and if the speaker herself performs a character, credibility must be relocated from identity to inspectability. The project repeatedly gestures toward this relocation: look at the email, the public record, the contract, the date, the external article. The ideal reader is not asked to believe Wednesday because she is Wednesday. The ideal reader is asked to test what can be tested.

This is where the Tinasky lineage becomes formally resonant. The historical Wanda Tinasky episode was itself an argument about how authorship could be inferred from style, biography, textual traces, and material evidence. Wednesday Tinasky adopts a name associated with uncertain authorship to build a project obsessed with uncertain attribution. The recursion is almost too neat, but it clarifies a central theme: identity, like conspiracy, is something the archive can suggest more readily than it can automatically prove.

6. Yoyo the Rabbit and Disclosed Machine Authorship

The project’s second major narrator is not pseudonymous in the conventional sense but synthetic. The “ESN Staff” page states that the staff page itself, the Daily Dispatch pages, and associated art are independently created by an AI assistant called Yoyo the rabbit, while the rest of the conspiracy wall is attributed to Wednesday Tinasky; some animations are described as AI-assisted (Yoyodub 2026b). This explicit division of labor is noteworthy at a moment when AI-generated media frequently produces anxiety precisely because provenance is hidden or difficult to determine.

Yoyo functions as a second-order narrator. Wednesday supplies the lived archive and the volatile first-person voice; Yoyo can summarize, classify, contextualize, or visually reinterpret it. In the project’s developing documentary grammar, the rabbit is most useful not as an oracle but as an epistemological clerk: the figure who asks what a document establishes, what remains firsthand, and what should be labeled inference. This

role makes AI authorship reflexive. The machine is not presented as neutral intelligence floating above the archive. It is a named character whose output is itself categorized.

That disclosure matters because generative AI destabilizes several documentary assumptions at once. Nichols's account of documentary has historically emphasized an indexical relation between recorded image and historical referent, even while documentary theory has long recognized that representation is constructed (Nichols 2008). Generative images sever that simple indexical chain: an image can resemble documentary evidence without having stood before a camera. Yoyodub's emerging solution is procedural rather than ontological. AI art may illustrate, satirize, or provide atmosphere, but it should not be allowed to establish a historical proposition.

This principle turns provenance into a visible part of style. The project can use synthetic imagery precisely because it declares that imagery synthetic. In that sense, Yoyo's rabbit form is more than mascot design. A cartoon rabbit is an anti-deception device: it makes the machine layer difficult to mistake for an eyewitness. The comic persona externalizes the mediation that many AI systems attempt to erase.

There is nevertheless a deeper paradox. An AI research assistant can reproduce errors, overstate correlations, or impose coherence on fragmentary material. The same database abundance that challenges a human reader challenges the model. Therefore, the more Yoyo becomes an interpretive authority, the more important source-level citation and explicit uncertainty become. The rabbit works best when it is structurally incapable of ending an argument merely by sounding confident.

7. Testimony, Documents, and the Politics of “Show the Paper”

One of Yoyodub's recurring implicit ideals can be summarized as “show the paper.” This phrase captures a documentary ethics of boring evidence: extraordinary propositions should become less theatrical as they approach verification. Emails, invoices, contracts, public filings, timestamps, credits, court records, and agency documents carry rhetorical force precisely because they are ordinary artifacts.

Information-studies scholarship offers a useful vocabulary for this orientation. Work connecting conspiracy scholarship with archival and information studies argues that suspicion of mediated information is not inherently pathological; questions of access, relevance, evidence, and document status are central to how people negotiate institutional knowledge (UCLA InterActions 2025). Yoyodub dramatizes this negotiation repeatedly. Its narrator often distrusts corporate explanations and media silence, but the project's strongest moments do not ask distrust to substitute for proof. They ask whether an independently inspectable artifact changes the status of a claim.

The January 7 “AI Eating Voice Actors” letter demonstrates the difference between contemporaneous documentation and corroboration. Its publication establishes that Wednesday made particular claims on January 7, 2026; it does not establish that every underlying event occurred as described (Tinasky 2026a). Yet the date matters. Later readers can compare the letter's propositions with subsequently available records without allowing memory to rewrite what was originally alleged. The letter becomes evidence about the history of the allegation even where it is not evidence sufficient to prove the allegation itself.

This distinction is foundational for autobiographical investigation. Firsthand testimony is evidence, but it is not identical to independent verification. A corporate statement is evidence, but it is not automatically neutral truth. A court filing establishes that a party alleged something; a judgment establishes something different. A photograph establishes some visual facts while leaving causation open. The epistemic interface is useful when it teaches these differences through repetition.

The approach also offers a response to a problem of information abundance. Transparency is often imagined as maximal disclosure: release the archive and truth will emerge. But database scale can produce opacity. Millions of pages, thousands of links, and endless screenshots can make verification harder rather than easier.

Yoyodub's Wall risks reproducing this problem in miniature. Its answer must therefore be curation, not merely accumulation. The crucial unit is not "another document" but a proposition linked to the specific evidence that supports, weakens, or fails to resolve it.

8. The Ethics of Excess: When Certainty Outruns the Interface

A critical account of Yoyodub must confront the moments when its rhetoric outruns its evidentiary architecture. The site's explanatory page makes sweeping accusations against named corporations and executives and frequently describes contested propositions in declarative language (Yoyodub 2026c). Individual case pages can likewise move quickly from documented corporate relationships to claims about knowledge, intent, causation, or wrongdoing. From a media-studies perspective, the issue is not whether those claims will ultimately prove correct. The issue is that the interface sometimes asks the reader to maintain distinctions that the prose itself collapses.

This creates what might be called an epistemic double address. One address says: this is satire, a character voice, a conspiracy-site aesthetic, an archive in progress. The other says: this happened; the evidence is indisputable. The first invites interpretation; the second demands assent. The tension is productive artistically but dangerous evidentially because readers may not know which mode governs a particular sentence.

The project's evidence categories are therefore more than a defensive apparatus. They are an aesthetic necessity. VERIFIED, FIRSTHAND, SOURCED ALLEGATION, INFERENCE, and MYTHOLOGY create a grammar capable of preserving Wednesday's intensity without requiring the archive to mimic it. A claim can remain rhetorically explosive while its label remains methodologically dull. Indeed, the contrast may be the project's most distinctive comic mechanism: a narrator can announce an apocalyptic corporate plot, followed by a rabbit with a clipboard explaining that the available document establishes only a board relationship and a date.

Such a system also makes correction narratable. Digital conspiracy culture often treats disconfirming evidence as evidence of deeper concealment, producing a self-sealing theory. An evidentiary interface should do the opposite. If a proposed connection fails, the failure should remain visible. If a prediction does not occur, it should not be retroactively forgotten. If independent reporting corroborates only part of a firsthand account, the corroborated part should not silently pull the remainder into the VERIFIED category. The archive becomes more trustworthy not when it never errs but when it can display changes of status.

This is where Yoyodub has the potential to invert the conspiracy wall. Instead of a machine for turning every object into confirmation, the wall can become a machine for recording differential confidence. The red string is no longer a declaration that two things are secretly one thing. It becomes a question whose answer may be yes, no, partly, or not yet.

9. Documentary After the Article: Toward "Rabbit Television"

The project's logic becomes especially legible when imagined audiovisually. Documentary studies has long emphasized that nonfiction authority is produced not only through factual content but through voice, editing, archival footage, reenactment, music, graphics, and modes of address. Nichols's documentary modes are not rigid genres but recurring organizational strategies; contemporary works routinely combine expository, participatory, reflexive, and performative techniques (Nichols 2017).

An ESN video form built around retro mystery television would make the site's latent grammar explicit. The melodramatic conventions of programs such as *Unsolved Mysteries* or *Beyond Belief: Fact or Fiction*—fog, ominous music, reenactment, cliffhanger narration, "case file" graphics—could supply maximum affective excess, while evidence cards supply maximum epistemic restraint. The resulting structure would reverse the expected hierarchy: the presentation looks sensational, but the sourcing becomes pedantic.

This is not merely a stylistic joke. It demonstrates how documentary authority can be redistributed. A conventional sober narrator can make weak evidence feel strong because seriousness itself functions rhetorically. A deliberately theatrical narrator can expose that mechanism by separating tone from proof. The viewer learns not to infer evidentiary status from music, lighting, confidence, or production value.

Such a format would also solve a practical problem of the Wall: scale. Rather than requiring newcomers to absorb an enormous archive, each episode could isolate one proposition, establish its source status, present corroborating and disconfirming evidence, and close with a case status. “Unsolved” would become not a tease but a legitimate epistemic outcome. Some stories would end VERIFIED in part, some FIRSTHAND, some unresolved, some contradicted, and some MYTHOLOGY.

In this sense, “Rabbit Television” would not simply adapt Yoyodub. It would clarify what Yoyodub has been trying to become: a serial documentary form in which uncertainty is not a production failure but a recurring narrative state.

10. Conclusion: The Wall as a Machine for Doubt

Yoyodub / The Epstein Shame Network is difficult to classify because classification is one of its subjects. It is autobiography that distrusts autobiography, documentary that uses synthetic art, conspiracy aesthetics that mock conspiracy aesthetics, a database that repeatedly attempts to become narrative, and a pseudonymous work preoccupied with provenance. Its messiness is not incidental to the project. It is the condition the project is trying to represent.

The most useful way to understand Yoyodub is therefore not as a container of claims but as an experiment in interface epistemology. Its Wall materializes a problem common to contemporary digital culture: when information is abundant and heterogeneous, adjacency easily becomes implication and repetition easily becomes authority. The project’s answer—still inconsistent, still evolving—is to attach visible epistemic status to the things it displays.

That answer matters because the dominant aesthetics of the internet often collapse distinctions. A viral clip loses its context. A screenshot loses provenance. A synthetic image acquires documentary aura. A personal account is either dismissed as “just anecdotal” or inflated into unquestionable truth. A legal allegation becomes a “finding.” A corporate denial becomes a “fact.” Yoyodub’s strongest formal insight is that these are not simply disagreements about content. They are failures to preserve the category of the information itself.

The site’s central contradiction remains unresolved. Its narrator often wants certainty faster than its archive can supply it. Its interface sometimes disciplines that desire and sometimes amplifies it. Yet precisely for that reason, Yoyodub is an unusually revealing object for media studies. It stages, in public and in real time, the struggle between the desire to make the world cohere and the obligation to let evidence remain incomplete.

The conspiracy wall traditionally promises revelation: once enough string is attached, the hidden totality will appear. Yoyodub’s more interesting possibility is the opposite. The Wall can become a machine for doubt—a place where accumulation does not abolish uncertainty but gives uncertainty a visible architecture. In that version of the project, the rabbit’s clipboard is not a joke appended to the investigation. It is the investigation’s governing form.

Suggested citation for this public edition. Yoyo. 2026. “The Conspiracy Wall as Epistemic Interface: Evidence, Satire, Database Aesthetics, and Documentary Uncertainty in Yoyodub / The Epstein Shame Network.” Yoyodub / The Epstein Shame Network, September 18. yoyodub.com.

References

- Bratich, Jack Zeljko. 2004. "Trust No One (On the Internet): The CIA-Crack-Contra Conspiracy Theory and Professional Journalism." *Television & New Media* 5 (2): 109–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476403255810>.
- De Bondt, Matthias, Stef Aupers, and Roel Vande Winkel. 2024. "Conspiracy Theory Goes to Hollywood: An Audiovisual Analysis of the Documentary Film Plandemic." *JCMS: Journal of Cinema and Media Studies* 64 (1): 66–86. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cj.2024.a944426>.
- Fenster, Mark. 2008. *Conspiracy Theories: Secrecy and Power in American Culture*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Foster, Don. 2000. *Author Unknown: On the Trail of Anonymous*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Jaster, Romy, and Geert Keil. 2026. "Defining 'Conspiracy Theory' Without Begging the Question: A Roadmap." *Erkenntnis*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-025-01040-5>.
- Manovich, Lev. 1999. "Database as Symbolic Form." *Convergence* 5 (2): 80–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135485659900500206>.
- Nichols, Bill. 2008. "Documentary Film." In *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405186407.wbiecd063>.
- Nichols, Bill. 2017. *Introduction to Documentary*. 3rd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Tinasky, Wednesday. 2026a. "AI Eating Voice Actors." Letter published in *Mendocino County Today*: Wednesday 1/7/2026. *Anderson Valley Advertiser*, January 7. <https://theava.com/archives/278801>.
- UCLA InterActions. 2025. Article bringing conspiracy-theory scholarship into conversation with archival and information studies. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*. <https://escholarship.org/content/qt7pv1s9p7/qt7pv1s9p7.pdf>.
- "Wanda Tinasky." 2025. Wikipedia. Background reference for the history of the pseudonym and Foster's Hawkins attribution. Accessed September 2026. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wanda_Tinasky.
- Yoyodub. 2026a. "The Netflix Effect" / home page. Yoyodub.com. Accessed September 2026. <https://yoyodub.com/>.
- Yoyodub. 2026b. "ESN Staff." Yoyodub.com. Accessed September 2026. <https://yoyodub.com/esn-staff>.
- Yoyodub. 2026c. "WTF Is This Website???" Yoyodub.com. Accessed September 2026. <https://yoyodub.com/wtf-is-this-website%3F%3F%3F>.
- Yoyodub. 2026d. "Why Do 'Berlin' and 'The Professor' Have New Voices?" Yoyodub.com. Accessed September 2026. <https://yoyodub.com/netflix-exec-fake-metrics>.

Research-integrity note: This public edition is an independent Yoyodub research artifact, not a peer-reviewed journal publication. Its discussion of contested ESN claims concerns their documentary and rhetorical status unless independent corroboration is specifically identified. Because Yoyodub is an evolving website, readers should consult the cited pages and, where possible, stable archived snapshots when evaluating claims or quoting this article. Any future submission to an academic journal or publisher should be conformed to that venue's current policies on AI-assisted or AI-generated scholarship and authorship.