

Alright, let's unpack this email you've drafted! I'll give you my take on it—how it comes across, what works, what might not, and how it aligns with your apparent frustration about your recipients' views on Trump, Obama, and politics in general. I'll also touch on the “failed businessman” critique versus Trump's billionaire status and offer some thoughts to refine this if you want to send it. Here's my input:

### What I Think About the Email

**Overall Impression:** This email is a raw, unfiltered vent—full of passion, anger, and a sense of betrayal. It's clear you're fed up with your recipients' dismissal of Trump and their political stance, and you're not holding back. It's bold and confrontational, which might feel cathartic to write, but it's also a bit chaotic and risks alienating them entirely rather than sparking any real dialogue.

### Strengths:

**Emotion:** The intensity leaps off the screen—you're not mincing words, and that honesty carries weight. Lines like “HISTORY WILL NOT BE TWISTED IF I HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH IT” show conviction.

**Personal Touch:** Mentioning your “bipolar mind” and how their “TDS & MDS” (Trump Derangement Syndrome and Musk Derangement Syndrome, I assume?) affect you adds a human layer, hinting at a deeper struggle beyond just politics.

**Directness:** You're calling out what you see as hypocrisy—writing off Trump supporters while they accuse others of being mindless. It's a sharp point.

### Weaknesses:

**Tone:** The all-caps shouting (“N00000!!!!!!”) and insults (“Obama-clown,” “you guys make me seriously sick”) come off as aggressive and juvenile, which could make them tune out rather than engage. It's less persuasive, more tantrum.

**Clarity:** The message jumps around—Trump, Obama, race relations, Elon, history, your mental health—without a clear thread. It's a lot to digest, and the lack of focus dilutes your argument.

**Audience Awareness:** If these folks hate Trump and won't budge, this email doesn't bridge that gap—it just yells at them. You're preaching to the choir (yourself) instead of challenging their view in a way they might hear.

### The “Failed Businessman” vs. Billionaire Tension

Your frustration about Trump being called a “failed businessman” despite his wealth is valid to explore. Here’s what gives:

**Their Side:** Critics often point to Trump’s bankruptcies (e.g., multiple casino flops in the ‘90s), failed ventures (Trump University, Trump Steaks), and allegations of exaggerating his net worth. To them, “failed” isn’t about being broke—it’s about mismanagement or overhyped success relative to his inherited wealth.

**Your Side:** He’s undeniably worth billions (Forbes pegs him around \$7-8 billion as of 2025, boosted by real estate and Truth Social), and his brand has global reach. That’s not “failure” by most metrics—plenty of moguls weather flops and still thrive.

**What’s Happening:** It’s a values clash. They’re judging him by their definition of competence (stability, ethics), while you’re pointing to results (money, influence). Neither side’s wrong on facts—just seeing different pictures.

Your email could hit this harder—why not ask them flat-out: “How’s a ‘failed businessman’ worth billions while running a country and inspiring millions?” It’s a legit question that might make them squirm.

**Poetic Elements** (Kidding, but Kinda Not)

This isn’t a poem, but it’s got a chaotic rhythm—short, choppy bursts of rage mixed with longer rants. The all-caps are like exclamation points in verse, and “TDS & MDS” has a snappy, acronymic bite. If you leaned into that, it could almost be a punk-rock protest song. (Not suggesting that, just riffing!)

**Support and Suggestions**

**Is It Good as Is?** It’s good for venting, not for communicating. If your goal is to just unload and burn bridges, it’s fine—send it and call it a day. But if you want them to actually think about Trump, Elon, or your perspective, it needs work.

**How I’d Refine It:**

**Cool the Jets:** Dial back the caps and insults. “Obama-clown” and “you guys make me sick” feel good to write but make you look unhinged, not them. Try: “I can’t stomach how you dismiss Trump’s wins while praising Obama’s mess.”

**Focus Up:** Pick one beef—say, Trump’s success vs. their hate—and stick to it. The Obama race relations bit feels tacked on; save it for another email if it’s a big deal.

**Challenge Them:** Hit their hypocrisy with a question: “You call Trump supporters mindless, but how’s writing him off as a ‘failed businessman’—with billions and a movement—any less blind?”

Keep the Personal: The bipolar mention is powerful—expand it. “Your hate keeps me up at night, wrestling with my own head. I just want you to see what I see in this.”

End Strong: Drop the “N00000!!!!!!” for something biting but calm: “History’s not yours to twist—I’ll fight for the truth, even if you won’t hear it.”

Revised Draft (If You Want It):

To: Charles, Laura, Stephen, Sara, Rebecca, Carlito

Subject: Seeing Trump for What He Is I’m baffled. You call Trump a “failed businessman,” yet he’s worth billions, ran a country, and has millions behind him. How’s that failure? I get it—you hate him. Fine. But writing him off, and anyone who sees his wins, feels as mindless as you claim his supporters are. I try to keep your darkness out of my bipolar mind—your Trump and Musk obsession doesn’t help me stay calm. I just want you to question this: if he’s so failed, why’s he still standing taller than most? History won’t bend to your lens, and I’ll keep calling it as I see it.

Let’s dive into Donald Trump’s business successes, focusing on the ventures that have undeniably worked out for him financially or in terms of brand impact. I’ll keep this grounded in what’s verifiable, sidestepping the noise of political bias or the endless debates about his net worth (which fluctuates wildly depending on who’s estimating—Forbes says \$6.7 billion in June 2024, Bloomberg pegs it at \$7.7 billion, and Trump himself claims over \$10 billion). Instead, I’ll highlight the wins, why they succeeded, and what they show about his business approach—without pretending every venture was a slam dunk (plenty weren’t, but that’s not the focus here).

### Real Estate Triumphs

Trump’s core strength lies in real estate, where he turned his father’s outer-borough apartment business into a glitzy Manhattan empire. These are the heavy hitters:

#### Trump Tower (1983)

What Happened: Trump broke ground on this 58-story Fifth Avenue skyscraper in 1980, opening it in 1983. It’s a luxury high-rise with condos, offices, and retail (think Gucci and the like). Valued at around \$600 million in 2015, it’s still a cash cow via rent and prestige.

Why It Worked: Location, timing, and branding. He snagged prime real estate when NYC was rebounding from its ‘70s slump, and his name became synonymous with opulence. High-end buyers and tenants—like foreign elites—pay a premium for the Trump stamp.

Impact: It's his flagship, cementing him as a Manhattan player. Even critics can't deny its iconic status.

#### Grand Hyatt Hotel (1974-1980)

What Happened: Trump took the decaying Commodore Hotel next to Grand Central, partnered with Hyatt, and after six years of renovation, opened the Grand Hyatt in 1980. He sold his stake in 1996 for a hefty profit (exact figures are murky, but Hyatt's 2023 net income was \$220 million, hinting at the scale).

Why It Worked: Vision and leverage. He saw potential in a rundown spot, negotiated tax breaks from the city, and flipped it into a sleek, profitable hotel. His dad's credit helped, but the execution was his.

Impact: This deal launched him beyond Queens, proving he could handle big-league projects.

#### 40 Wall Street (1995-Present)

What Happened: Trump bought this 71-story Financial District tower for \$1 million in 1995, renovated it for \$35 million, and by the 2000s, it was worth over \$500 million. It's still generating rental income.

Why It Worked: Bargain hunting and branding. He scooped it up dirt-cheap during a market dip, slapped his name on it, and turned it into a premium office space.

Impact: A textbook case of buying low, adding value, and cashing in on the Trump mystique.

#### Trump Place (1994-Present)

What Happened: This Upper West Side residential complex started as a plan for "Television City" but morphed into luxury rentals after years of negotiation. It's been a steady earner since the '90s.

Why It Worked: Persistence and adaptation. Trump navigated zoning battles and shifted gears when his grander vision stalled, landing on a reliable income stream.

Impact: Not flashy, but a solid win showing he can pivot and still profit.

#### Wollman Rink (1986)

**What Happened:** NYC's Central Park ice rink was a mess after years of botched repairs. Trump stepped in, finished it in four months for \$2.25 million (\$750,000 under budget), and ran it profitably until 1995 (and later from 2001-2021).

**Why It Worked:** PR savvy and efficiency. He seized a public failure, delivered fast, and milked the goodwill (and concessions) while keeping costs low.

**Impact:** Small potatoes money-wise, but a branding coup—proof he could outdo bureaucrats.

### Beyond Real Estate: Media and Licensing

Trump's not just a brick-and-mortar guy—he's a master of slapping his name on things and cashing checks. Here's where that paid off:

#### The Apprentice (2004-2015)

**What Happened:** This NBC reality show ran 14 seasons with Trump as host and executive producer, earning him \$1 million per episode at its peak—over \$400 million total, per some estimates. It spawned *Celebrity Apprentice* too.

**Why It Worked:** Timing and persona. Reality TV was booming, and Trump's bombastic "You're fired!" shtick made him a star. He didn't create the format, but he owned it.

**Impact:** This was his biggest non-real estate win, turning him from a mogul into a household name—and a fat bank account.

#### Golf Courses (1999-Present)

**What Happened:** Trump owns 17 golf properties worldwide (e.g., Trump National in LA, Turnberry in Scotland), collectively valued at over \$500 million. They rake in membership fees and event revenue—Doral alone made \$77.2 million in 2019.

**Why It Worked:** Niche luxury. He targets rich golfers willing to pay for exclusivity, and his courses (often bought cheap post-crash) are top-tier.

**Impact:** A steady, high-end revenue stream that bolsters his "lifestyle brand."

## Trump Brand Licensing

**What Happened:** From condos in Dubai to hotels in Panama, Trump licenses his name to developers globally, earning millions without owning the properties. Forbes valued the brand at \$200 million in 2011 (he claimed \$3 billion).

**Why It Worked:** Minimal risk, maximum reward. He collects fees upfront, sidestepping operational headaches while banking on his image.

**Impact:** It's genius branding—proof he's less a builder, more a marketer.

## What Makes These Successes Tick?

Trump's wins share a pattern:

**Timing:** He pounced on undervalued assets (NYC in the '70s, 40 Wall Street in the '90s) when others hesitated.

**Branding:** His name adds a premium—buyers pay more for “Trump” even if the product's standard.

**Leverage:** He's used debt, tax breaks, and his dad's foundation to amplify returns, not always his own cash.

**Showmanship:** From *The Apprentice* to *Wollman*, he turns projects into spectacles, boosting value beyond the balance sheet.

## The Flip Side (Briefly)

Not everything's golden—Trump Vodka, Trump Airlines, Trump University (settled for \$25 million amid fraud claims), and six corporate bankruptcies (mostly casinos) show he's stumbled plenty. Critics argue he'd be richer if he'd just invested his inheritance in an index fund (The Economist estimated \$2.9 billion by 2018 that way). But successes aren't about avoiding flops—they're about what did work, and these did.

Let's dig into the Trump University controversy—a high-profile flop that's become a lightning rod for critics calling Trump a “failed businessman,” despite his broader successes. I'll break it down: what Trump University was, what went wrong, the legal fallout, and what it reveals about Trump's business approach. This'll be a clear-eyed look, sticking to the facts and avoiding the political spin that often clouds this mess.

## What Was Trump University?

**Launch:** Trump University kicked off in 2005 as an online real estate training program, promising to teach students Trump’s secrets to wealth. It later expanded into live seminars and mentorships, marketed with slogans like “Learn from the Master” and “I can turn anyone into a successful real estate investor.”

**Structure:** It wasn’t a university—no degrees, no accreditation—just a for-profit LLC under the Trump Organization. Programs ranged from free intro sessions to a \$35,000 “Gold Elite” package, including “personal mentorship” from Trump’s “hand-picked” experts.

**Pitch:** Trump himself was the face—ads featured him saying, “We’re going to have professors and adjunct professors that are absolutely terrific... I’m going to teach you better than anybody else.” The allure was his billionaire brand, not academic rigor.

## What Went Wrong?

The controversy boils down to three big issues: misrepresentation, pressure tactics, and shaky value.

### Misrepresentation

**Not a “University”:** New York’s Department of Education forced a name change to “Trump Entrepreneur Initiative” in 2010 because it wasn’t licensed as a university. Trump ignored this for years, racking up complaints.

**Trump’s Involvement:** He claimed to personally select instructors, but depositions later showed he barely knew them—many were real estate hustlers or motivational speakers, not “terrific professors.” He didn’t design the curriculum either; it was outsourced.

**Success Claims:** Marketing promised students would “learn from Donald Trump” and replicate his success. Critics (and lawsuits) argued it was a bait-and-switch—Trump rarely appeared, and the content was generic real estate 101.

### High-Pressure Sales

**Upselling:** Free seminars lured people in, then pushed hard for pricier packages. Attendees alleged instructors used tactics like urging them to max out credit cards or tap retirement savings, framing it as an “investment” in their future.

**Targeting Vulnerability:** Lawsuits claimed Trump U zeroed in on desperate folks—retirees, single parents, the unemployed—promising riches but leaving them in debt. One plaintiff said instructors were told to “find their pain” and exploit it.

### Questionable Value

**Content:** Students got workbooks, some one-on-one time (often just phone calls), and access to “mentors.” Reviews were mixed—some found it motivational, but others called it fluff, with tips like “buy low, sell high” you could Google for free.

**Outcomes:** No hard data shows graduates became real estate moguls. Complaints piled up—over 5,000 to the Better Business Bureau by 2016, dropping its rating to D-minus.

### The Legal Fallout

Trump University faced multiple lawsuits and investigations, culminating in a high-stakes settlement:

#### New York AG Lawsuit (2013)

**Claim:** AG Eric Schneiderman sued for \$40 million, alleging “persistent fraud” and “illegal and deceptive conduct.” He called it a “bait-and-switch” that bilked students out of \$5,000 to \$35,000 each.

**Evidence:** Included student affidavits (e.g., one lost \$35,000 and got “no actionable advice”) and internal docs showing sales quotas over education.

**Trump’s Defense:** He called it a “political hit job,” claiming 98% of students loved it (based on cherry-picked satisfaction surveys). He refused to settle early, tweeting, “I won’t settle because it’s an easy way out.”

#### Class-Action Lawsuits (2010-2016)

**Who:** Two federal suits—one from California, one from New York—represented thousands of ex-students. Lead plaintiff Tarla Makaeff said she was “scammed” out of \$60,000.

**Allegations:** Fraud, false advertising, racketeering—students claimed they were sold a dream that never materialized.



Trump's Response: He countersued Makaeff for defamation (dropped later), insisting the program was “fantastic” and blaming students for not working hard enough.

### Settlement (2016)

Outcome: Days after winning the 2016 election, Trump settled all three lawsuits for \$25 million—\$21 million to students, \$4 million in NY penalties. No admission of wrongdoing.

Details: About 7,000 students got refunds (50-90% of what they paid). Trump didn't pay personally—his business covered it.

Why Settle? His lawyers said it avoided a messy trial during his presidency. Critics saw it as a tacit admission; he spun it as “moving on.”

### What It Reveals About Trump's Business Approach

Trump University isn't an isolated blip—it reflects patterns in his playbook, for better or worse:

Brand Over Substance: He sold his name, not a system. The promise of “Trump's secrets” was the hook, even if the product didn't match the hype—a tactic that worked in licensing but flopped here when results mattered.

Risk Appetite: He pushed boundaries (calling it a “university,” ignoring regulators) until forced to stop. It's bold, but it backfired when scrutiny hit.

Sales-Driven: The focus on upselling over education mirrors his casino days—maximize revenue, even if it strains credibility or customers.

Defiance: Refusing to settle early, countersuing, and dismissing critics as “haters” show his combative streak. It's a gamble—sometimes it builds his mythos, sometimes it just drags out the mess.

### Was It a “Failure”?

Financially: Maybe not a total bust—Trump U reportedly made \$40 million from 2005-2010, per NY AG docs. After the \$25 million settlement, it might've broken even or eked out a profit. But compared to Trump Tower or The Apprentice, it's peanuts with a PR disaster attached.

Reputationally: Big hit. It's Exhibit A for detractors calling him a con man—Forbes and Bloomberg don't even factor it into his net worth, but it stains his "winner" image.

Legally: He dodged worse—racketeering charges could've meant jail time. Settling was a win in that sense.

### Final Take

The Trump University controversy is a textbook case of overpromise and underdelivery. It wasn't a Ponzi scheme (money went to a real, if shaky, product), but it wasn't the golden ticket it claimed to be either. It succeeded as a cash grab until the lawsuits caught up, exposing the gap between Trump's branding genius and operational follow-through. Critics call it proof he's a "failed businessman"; supporters might say it's a blip in a career of bigger wins. Truth is, it's both—a profitable misstep that cost him more in credibility than cash.

What's your angle on this—does it change how you see his successes, or is it just noise? Let me know if you want to dig deeper into any part!