

“IT’S JUST ME”

THE ULTIMATE \$KYLIE THESIS

THE AFFIRMATIVE CASE THAT KYLIE JENNER HERSELF — OR SOMEONE ACTING WITH HER AUTHORIZATION — WAS BEHIND THE AUGUST 24, 2026 \$KYLIE LAUNCH

CONTRACT

6b7KQsXqb6JR5Nmeer5zGRmo51dwDfttM5b5Nu2rpump

CREATOR / PUMP.FUN PROFILE WALLET

AFqtycYGgGv4HdXwbEApTEirKxnHNS7giPTNWpNz4Rk1 | profile identity: cutekjenner

Updated through September 2, 2026

IMPORTANT EVIDENTIARY NOTE

This report deliberately argues the strongest evidence-based case for Kylie Jenner's personal authorization or direct participation. It is an advocacy thesis, not a finding of fact. The public record still does not prove that Kylie personally created AFqty, personally typed the two crypto posts, personally moved SOL, or personally received the proceeds. The purpose is to test whether the dominant 'hack' narrative is actually required by the evidence — and to assemble the facts that make an authorized-launch explanation increasingly coherent.

1. Executive Thesis

The public story hardened almost immediately: Kylie Jenner's verified X account promoted a new Solana memecoin, the posts disappeared, and observers called it a hack. The stronger affirmative thesis is different. The blockchain operation was prepared before the promotion; Kylie's verified account then executed a deliberate two-step launch sequence; the account showed apparent public continuity immediately before and after the event; Kylie remained socially active on other platforms; and two days later she publicly described her social-media operation as personally controlled: "It's just me."

None of those facts alone proves authorship. Taken together, however, they make a narrower proposition legitimate and increasingly important to test: Kylie herself — or a person acting with her authorization — may have supplied the social promotion while a professional crypto operator supplied the wallets, deployment, routing and market mechanics.

THE THESIS IN ONE LINE

The blockchain does not look improvised after a hack. It looks staged before an audience arrived. The X account did not merely paste a contract; it first established a Kylie-branded Pump.fun identity, then introduced the token. The account's public state remained continuous, and Kylie's own later description of her social-media control makes the authorized-launch hypothesis harder to dismiss.

- The last directly recovered normal Kylie post before the incident was at 21:13:27 UTC, authored by Kylie user ID 236699098 through Twitter Web App.
- The first crypto post appeared at 21:43:42.393 UTC — roughly 30 minutes later — and directed followers to 'cutekjenner'.
- The second crypto post followed 161 seconds later at 21:46:23.352 UTC and published \$KYLIE plus the exact contract address.
- X's current backend classifies the first deleted post as deleted by the Post author, not removed by policy or enforcement.
- Publicly recovered Kylie User objects show no visible account-ID change, profile lock, security interstitial, verification-state reset, delegated-account marker or public recovery transition.
- The token operation was funded, created and inventory-positioned before the first Kylie crypto post.
- A secondary wallet reconstruction places automated inventory rotations at 21:43:08, :24, :40 and :56; the first Kylie crypto post lands at 21:43:42.393, between the third and fourth rotation.
- That same reconstruction says no direct market-sale SOL was retained by the core operation before the post minute; the first retained SOL appears at 21:44:00, roughly 17.6 seconds after the first post.
- Kylie was active in the surrounding period on TikTok, Instagram, Threads/YouTube promotion and then resumed ordinary Instagram posting immediately afterward.
- Two days later, on Better Half, Kylie said she personally runs her social media: 'It's just me.'

2. Evidence Standard

This edition intentionally advances the affirmative case, but it does not erase contrary possibilities. Evidence is separated into four levels.

Level	Meaning
Direct fact	Raw X objects, exact status IDs, on-chain transactions, timestamps, account/user IDs, direct public statements.
Strong inference	Timing or transaction patterns that are difficult to explain as independent coincidence but do not identify a human controller.
Context	Social behavior, historical Jenner crypto precedent, image/profile choices and silence after the incident.
Unproven	Kylie personally typed the posts; Kylie controlled AFqty; Kylie received proceeds; a specific professional operator acted for her.

GUARDRAIL

The thesis can argue that the authorized-launch explanation fits the record better than the initial social-media

reaction acknowledged. It should not claim that the public evidence already proves Kylie personally launched or profited from \$KYLIE.

3. The Minute-by-Minute Timeline

UTC	Event
21:13:27	Last directly recovered normal Kylie X post before the incident. User ID 236699098. Source: Twitter Web App.
21:32:45	Secondary reconstruction: a pre-launch treasury that had existed since early July receives exactly 200 SOL.
21:36:53-57	Recursive funding tree culminates in synchronized final-layer funding into AFqty.
21:37:46	Secondary reconstruction: 60 terminal transfers into three future bundle signers are complete.
21:39:57	AFqty creates \$KYLIE and makes the developer purchase; three large buys immediately follow in the same slot.
21:39:58 onward	Secondary reconstruction: router/vault begins rotating capital and token inventory across addresses.
21:42:13	Indexed market record places PumpSwap pool creation roughly 89 seconds before the first X promotion.
21:43:08	Automated inventory rotation identified in secondary reconstruction.
21:43:24	Automated inventory rotation identified in secondary reconstruction.
21:43:40	Automated inventory rotation identified in secondary reconstruction.
21:43:42.393	Verified @KylieJenner posts: 'we'll lets try this trading thing out... follow me on pumpfun cutekjenner.'
21:43:56	Next automated inventory rotation identified in secondary reconstruction.
21:44:00	Secondary reconstruction: first retained operator SOL appears.
21:46:23.352	Verified @KylieJenner posts '\$kylie' and the exact contract address.
21:51:17	Secondary reconstruction places reported all-time-high market cap around this time.
21:54:06	AFqty completes final creator-position exit.
~21:54:48	A public X reply recognizes that the Kylie post has been deleted.

THE CORE TIMING POINT

The operation is not merely ready before the promotion. On the secondary reconstruction, the market machine is actively rotating inventory 2.4 seconds before Kylie's first crypto post, then begins retaining SOL seconds after the audience arrives. That is evidence of anticipation and synchronization. It still does not identify who supplied the X access or authorization.

4. Apparent X Account Continuity

The strongest new X-side evidence is not a recovered client for the deleted crypto posts — that remains unresolved. It is the continuity surrounding them.

4.1 The last normal post before the incident

Raw X JSON for status 2091997340169331000 identifies Kylie user ID 236699098, created at 21:13:27 UTC on Aug. 24, and explicitly reports the source as Twitter Web App. The object retains ordinary edit-control metadata and the same Kylie account identity later observed in other recovered objects.

4.2 Thirty minutes later

The first crypto post appears at 21:43:42.393. Three minutes later, the second post publishes the exact \$KYLIE contract. We have not recovered a literal `source` field for either deleted Kylie object, so this report does not claim they came from Web App, iPhone or any other specific client.

4.3 What the public JSON does not show

- No account-ID change.
- No visible login/logout object.
- No delegated-account marker.
- No public profile lock or protected-state transition.
- No profile interstitial or visible enforcement-state change.
- No visible recovery object.
- No avatar/banner reset.
- No follower/following discontinuity suggesting a profile replacement.
- No public evidence of a client transition because the deleted crypto-post `source` fields remain unrecovered.

HOW TO READ THIS

This is evidence of apparent public account continuity, not proof of same-human continuity. X can perform session invalidation, password resets, security review and account recovery entirely in private systems that do not appear in public GraphQL objects.

5. The Deleted Posts Still Exist Inside X's Conversation Graph

The association between the deleted first crypto post and Kylie's account does not depend only on screenshots. Replies preserved in X's own conversation data point directly to status 2092004950351954006 and user ID 236699098.

One immediate reply at 21:46:05 says '@KylieJenner OMG ITS REAL!!!' and records `in\_reply\_to\_status\_id\_str = 2092004950351954006` and `in\_reply\_to\_user\_id\_str = 236699098`. Another at 21:46:07 says '@KylieJenner Don't do that' and preserves the same parent status and user ID. These independent reply objects permanently tie the deleted root post to Kylie's numeric account identity inside X's conversation graph.

WHY THIS MATTERS

The public bridge is not merely a screenshot claim. X's own surviving conversation objects still identify the deleted root as a post under Kylie user ID 236699098.

6. The First Crypto Post Was Deleted at Author Level

Current X GraphQL responses for status 2092004950351954006 return a TweetTombstone whose text is: 'This Post was deleted by the Post author. Learn more.'

That is materially different from a policy-removal or legal-removal tombstone. It establishes that X classifies the disappearance as an author-side deletion.

This fact is compatible with two narratives: Kylie or an authorized user removed a post after deciding to abandon the launch; or Kylie regained control after an intrusion and deleted an unauthorized post. The tombstone therefore does not prove authorship — but it does prove that whoever removed it possessed author-level control.

THE PROXIMITY PROBLEM

AFQty's final creator exit occurs at 21:54:06. A public X user recognizes the deleted Kylie post by approximately 21:54:48. The roughly 42-second proximity between final creator exit and public recognition of deletion is one of the strongest coordination signals in the incident, even though the exact deletion second remains unresolved.

7. The Two-Post Sequence Looks Like a Launch, Not a Paste

The first post is more important than the contract post.

POST 1 — IDENTITY FIRST

"we'll let's try this trading thing out... follow me on pumpfun cutekjenner."

161 SECONDS LATER — ASSET SECOND

"\$kylie 6b7KQsXqb6JR5Nmeer5zGRmo51dwDfttM5b5Nu2rpump"

The first message does not need a contract address. Its function is to establish that a separate Pump.fun identity — `cutekjenner` — should be understood by Kylie's audience as 'me.' Only after that identity bridge is created does the second message introduce the tradable asset.

Under a simple compromise-and-paste model, the fastest path to monetization is to paste the CA immediately. The observed sequence instead resembles a social launch funnel: establish the claimed creator identity, allow the audience to orient to it, then introduce the coin.

An attacker could still deliberately stage exactly that sequence. The point is not that the structure proves Kylie authored it. The point is that the structure is entirely coherent with an authorized promotional launch and is more deliberate than an accidental or one-off post.

8. The Pump.fun Identity Was the Social Center of the Launch

The Pump.fun profile `cutekjenner` resolves to AFQty, the creator/deployer wallet. Searches have not established that the username existed days or weeks before Aug. 24, nor have they recovered a profile-created timestamp. The available pattern is therefore consistent with a fresh public-facing identity created for this campaign.

Indexed token metadata is notable for what it lacks: no token Twitter, Telegram, website or description was recorded in the preserved record. The social identity was supplied separately through the Pump profile and Kylie's X account.

ARCHITECTURE

@KylieJenner → 'follow me on Pump.fun cutekjenner' → cutekjenner / AFQty → \$KYLIE contract

That separation is significant. The developer did not need a conventional token social stack if a 39.5-million-follower celebrity account was going to serve as the social layer.

9. The `cutekjenner` Persona Used a Real Kylie Identity Cue

The profile imagery uses Kylie's old pink-hair / black-beanie / diamond-grill look associated with her 'King Kylie' era. The image is publicly old — so it is not proof of private access — but it is not an arbitrary celebrity photograph.

The modern detail is stronger: Page Six reported in April 2026 that Kylie's current Instagram profile itself used a 2016 throwback image with diamond grills and pink hair. In other words, the Pump identity copied a visual that Kylie herself had recently chosen to represent her current Instagram identity.

That can be read two ways. An impersonator could copy the current Instagram avatar precisely because it is recognizable. Or an authorized launch could naturally mirror Kylie's existing cross-platform branding. It is therefore identity-context evidence, not attribution proof.

10. Kylie Was Not Socially 'Offline' Around the Incident

The Aug. 24 incident did not occur during a visible period when Kylie disappeared from social media.

10.1 TikTok activity on Aug. 24

Contemporaneous Reddit discussion titled 'New tiktok from kylie' was posted Monday, Aug. 24 and discusses a fresh Kylie/Stassie TikTok in real time. Commenters debated whether it had been deleted; others stated it remained available. A separate Reddit thread about the same clip also says it was still up.

Social Blade records Kylie's TikTok at 604 videos through Aug. 24 and then 605 on Aug. 25 and 606 on Aug. 26. The daily counter does not establish the exact posting second, but it corroborates active TikTok publishing across the incident window.

10.2 Instagram immediately before and after

An Instagram archive records a Kylie feed post on Aug. 23 at 06:05 promoting her return to YouTube. The next identifiable feed post appears Aug. 25 at 08:37 with the caption 'it's time to clear the air.' Her ordinary Instagram activity therefore brackets the X incident.

INTERPRETATION

Cross-platform activity does not prove Kylie was personally holding the X device at 21:43. It does make the incident part of an otherwise active social-media period rather than a broader disappearance, lockdown or obvious public recovery phase.

11. "It's Just Me" — Kylie's Own Description of Social Control

Two days after the Aug. 24 event, Kylie appeared on Better Half with Stas & Vic. In the segment 'Who Runs Your Social Media?' she answered: "It's just me." She explained that she generally does not have a team telling her what to do, generally does not run posts by anyone, and also manages Kylie Cosmetics and Khy social accounts herself.

Page Six independently reported those remarks on Aug. 27.

WHAT THIS ACTUALLY CHANGES

It weakens the casual explanation that an unnamed social-media employee could have posted a crypto campaign without Kylie's knowledge. It does not rule out account compromise, stolen sessions or support-channel abuse. But by Kylie's own description, normal account control is unusually personal.

12. The Missing Public Recovery Narrative

If a 39-million-follower account had been hijacked to execute a coordinated crypto operation, one might expect some combination of password/security recovery, public warning, representative statement, account inactivity, unusual client changes, a direct 'I was hacked' statement, or a later explanation.

The reviewed public record has not produced such a Kylie statement or a detailed public X explanation of an access mechanism. Contemporary reporting explicitly noted that neither Kylie nor her representatives had confirmed a hack at publication.

Silence is not evidence of participation. Kylie has also publicly described a general tendency not to address every rumor about herself. But the silence matters as an unresolved evidentiary gap because the dominant 'hack' narrative is still stronger in public repetition than in publicly disclosed technical attribution.

THE CAREFUL POSITION

The absence of a public recovery footprint does not prove there was no private recovery. It means the external-compromise hypothesis remains publicly unattributed.

13. The Launch Was Prepared Before the Audience Arrived

The original thesis already established synchronized funding before creation. The newer reconstruction goes much further.

13.1 Funding before the token existed

A secondary forensic reconstruction identifies a treasury wallet receiving exactly 200 SOL at 21:32:45 UTC. It then traces multi-layer wallet provisioning into the future creator and bundle signers. Sixty terminal transfers into three future bundle signers were complete by 21:37:46 — more than two minutes before token creation.

13.2 Nearly half the supply acquired in the launch slot

At 21:39:57, AFqtY created \$KYLIE and bought 23.849 million tokens. Three very large buys followed immediately with no successful transaction interposed and the same recent blockhash across all four. The reconstruction calculates 473,848,999 tokens acquired in those four launch buys — 47.3849% of total supply — using 24.054 SOL of actual capital.

WHAT THIS MEANS

Whatever the identity of the human controller, the launch was not spontaneous retail behavior. The operation was technically and economically staged before Kylie's audience saw anything.

14. The Visible Bundle May Have Been a Disguise, Not an Exit

The same secondary reconstruction reports that the three large buyers sold all 450 million tokens within seconds — but the sale proceeds did not leave as ordinary profits. Instead, the transactions used a common custom router, sending roughly 55.13 SOL into a vault that repeatedly recycled sale proceeds into the next buy while crediting tokens to new owners.

The analyst identifies the vault in 194 \$KYLIE transactions from 21:39:58 through 21:52:44 and says it finished at zero. The economic interpretation is that the capital repeatedly changed wallets, manufacturing volume and a more distributed-looking holder base.

The router itself was shared infrastructure and therefore is not identity evidence. The significance lies in the reconstructed closed-loop behavior, not merely in touching the same service.

15. The Most Important New Timing Discovery: 21:43:40 → 21:43:42.393 → 21:44:00

The secondary reconstruction originally treated the X post only as a 21:43 minute window and therefore could not classify four rotations at 21:43:08, :24, :40 and :56 as before or after the post.

We now have the first X post's exact snowflake timestamp: 21:43:42.393 UTC. That resolves the ambiguity.

Event	Relation to first Kylie crypto post
21:43:08 rotation	34.393 seconds before
21:43:24 rotation	18.393 seconds before
21:43:40 rotation	2.393 seconds before
21:43:42.393 Kylie post	Audience arrives
21:43:56 rotation	13.607 seconds after
21:44:00 first retained SOL (secondary reconstruction)	17.607 seconds after

Immediately before 21:43:00, the reconstruction says 40 wallets later attributed to one economic backend held 409,343,810 tokens — just under 41% of supply. Its conservative estimate for the unknown posting second had been

39.62%-40.93%. With the exact X second, the three rotations at :08, :24 and :40 can now definitively be placed before the post and the :56 rotation after it.

THE SEQUENCING INFERENCE

Inventory first. Audience second. Revenue third. The market side appears staged before the reach arrives and begins monetizing essentially when the audience does. That is strong evidence the operator expected publicity. It does not, by itself, explain how the operator knew.

16. Monetization Intensified Only After the X Promotion

The secondary forensic account says that across core wallets, direct market-sale SOL retained before 21:43 was effectively zero because proceeds were recycled into subsequent buys. The first retained SOL appears at 21:44:00.

Between 21:44:00 and AFQty's final dev sale at 21:54:06, the reconstruction attributes 735 sells to 55 wallets, with a median transaction around 527,000 tokens and peak density of seven sells inside one second. It describes inventory being fed steadily into incoming buy pressure rather than one giant single-wallet dump.

It further places the reported all-time-high market cap at approximately 21:51:17, inside that extraction sequence.

WHY THIS MATTERS FOR THE AFFIRMATIVE THESIS

If a professional operator had an authorized celebrity promotion scheduled, this is exactly the kind of sequence one would expect: build inventory and liquidity first, wait for audience arrival, then monetize the attention. The same behavior is also possible for a professional attacker who knew a stolen post was imminent. Coordination is proven more strongly than authorization.

17. X Itself Parsed the Contract as a Solana Crypto Asset

Recovered X conversation JSON shows the contract normalized in `cashtag\_attachments` as `solana:6b7KQsXqb6JR5Nmeer5zGRmo51dwDfttM5b5Nu2rpump`. Other recovered objects likewise show X smart-tagging the address with the token name and ticker.

That matters because the second post was not merely arbitrary text from a screenshot. X's own backend recognized the contract as a crypto asset inside the conversation ecosystem.

18. Exit and Deletion Were Almost Simultaneous

AFQty's final creator-position sale occurs at 21:54:06. A public X reply under the surrounding discussion recognizes 'Deleted tweet' by approximately 21:54:48. Telegram observers likewise pivoted from circulating the Kylie promotion to calling it a hack/over within minutes.

This does not establish which happened first at the second level. It does establish that the economic exit and disappearance of the social promotion occurred in an extraordinarily tight window.

AFFIRMATIVE READING

An authorized experiment that was abandoned after the reaction became chaotic explains the tight exit/deletion window naturally: remove the endorsement as the operator finishes unwinding. The external-compromise reading also fits: the legitimate owner recovers the account while the attacker exits. The unresolved ordering remains crucial.

19. A Larger Coordinated Economic Backend

The newer secondary reconstruction substantially enlarges the known operation beyond AFQty.

- 59 router-session wallets allegedly swept balances into 59 one-use relay wallets.
- Those relays allegedly converged on one consolidator in a synchronized wave around 22:16:17.
- Residual SOL from the original bundle signers allegedly reached the same consolidator through separate relays.
- The consolidator later allegedly sent exactly 60 SOL back to the pre-launch treasury that had funded the operation.

- The reconstruction classifies 63 high-confidence core operator keys, 52 materially profitable, with an estimated class net of 2,425.21 SOL.
- It finds no provable privileged beneficiary outside the operator structure.

These figures should be treated as a secondary analyst's reconstruction until independently re-run transaction by transaction. They are nevertheless important because they support the broader conclusion that the visible creator wallet was only the public tip of a coordinated economic system.

20. The Absence of a Public Kylie Wallet Does Not Defeat the Thesis

The current chain record does not show a clean payment to a wallet publicly attributable to Kylie, her management or a known contractor. The secondary reconstruction likewise says it found no privileged friends-and-family beneficiary outside the operator structure.

That is a genuine weakness in a personal-profit theory. But the affirmative thesis does not require Kylie to have taken a visible Solana payout. An authorized promotion could involve off-chain compensation, an operator relationship, non-Solana settlement, a promotional experiment, or no completed payment at all if the launch was abandoned.

DO NOT OVERCLAIM

The blockchain currently proves coordination and extraction by the operator structure. It does not prove that Kylie received any of those proceeds.

21. A Professional Operator Is Compatible With Celebrity Authorization

Sophisticated wallets do not require a sophisticated celebrity. A professional crypto operator can prepare funding trees, routers, bundles, liquidity and exit mechanics while a celebrity supplies brand, audience and authenticated social promotion.

The Caitlyn Jenner \$JENNER launch in 2024 remains the closest family precedent: observers initially suspected a hack, yet Caitlyn ultimately participated in the launch and an outside crypto promoter handled much of the technical and promotional machinery.

The precedent does not prove the Kylie case. It demonstrates that 'the wallets are too sophisticated for Kylie' is not a serious rebuttal to an authorization theory.

22. Kardashian/Jenner Crypto Context

- Kim Kardashian previously promoted EthereumMax; the SEC later announced a settlement concerning undisclosed compensation.
- Caitlyn Jenner publicly participated in a 2024 memecoin launch after initial hack speculation.
- The broader family environment is therefore not culturally or commercially alien to crypto promotion.
- This context only addresses plausibility. It does not attribute the \$KYLIE wallets or posts to Kylie.

23. AFqty Looks Like a Campaign Wallet, Not Kylie's Personal Wallet

AFqty's first known launch is \$KYLIE. It is provisioned only minutes before creation, then later deploys Kendall-, Kim- and Travis-themed tokens. That behavior argues against AFqty being Kylie's longstanding personal crypto wallet.

For the affirmative thesis, that is not a fatal problem. It is actually consistent with a campaign architecture in which a disposable public-facing developer account is created for a celebrity launch while older professional infrastructure sits behind it.

THE BETTER ATTRIBUTION QUESTION

Not 'Was AFQty Kylie's personal wallet?' The stronger question is: was the professional operator behind AFQty acting independently after obtaining unauthorized X access, or acting for a client/authorized promoter?

24. Older Infrastructure Predates the Incident

The earlier thesis found persistent June/July Pump.fun and PumpSwap infrastructure, including the EVuFhk intersection. The important takeaway remains that the operation touched experienced Solana infrastructure that existed before Aug. 24.

Shared services such as Jito and Astralane are not identity fingerprints. EVuFhk is more interesting because it is a persistent address encountered repeatedly in both the older network and a later Kylie-linked route. Even so, it may still represent shared private infrastructure rather than one human.

For the affirmative thesis, the older network supports an operator model: if Kylie authorized a token experiment, she would not need to build this machinery herself. A professional operator already had it.

25. The Public Narrative Outran the Public Attribution

The internet rapidly called the incident a hack. Public reporting repeated that framing. But the reviewed record still lacks a publicly identified attacker, a publicly disclosed X access mechanism for this specific event, a Kylie statement identifying unauthorized access, or a direct technical explanation tying the posts to an external compromise.

That does not make the hack theory false. It makes 'hacked' a hypothesis that became conventional before the underlying access mechanism was publicly established.

THE THESIS POSITION

The correct burden is not to prove that hacks are impossible. It is to ask whether the available evidence eliminates authorization. It does not.

26. The Strongest Affirmative Reconstruction

1. A professional crypto operator with pre-existing Solana infrastructure prepares a celebrity-token campaign.
2. A pre-launch treasury and recursive wallet tree fund AFQty and future bundle buyers before the token exists.
3. AFQty creates \$KYLIE; coordinated launch buys acquire nearly half the supply.
4. The visible bundle is rapidly rotated through router/vault infrastructure into a more distributed-looking market.
5. Immediately before the X post, the coordinated backend still controls a large fraction of supply.
6. Kylie's verified account first establishes the Pump.fun identity `cutekjennner` as 'me'.
7. 161 seconds later, Kylie's verified account publishes the exact \$KYLIE contract.
8. The operation begins retaining SOL essentially as the audience arrives and sells steadily into the resulting demand.
9. As hack accusations and scrutiny intensify, AFQty completes its final creator exit.
10. Within the same minute, the Kylie promotion is recognized as deleted by outside observers.
11. Kylie's account continues publicly without an obvious recovery narrative; Kylie remains active on other social platforms.
12. Two days later, Kylie publicly says her social-media operation is 'just me.'

WHY THIS MODEL FITS

It explains the professional blockchain side without requiring Kylie to understand Solana mechanics. It explains the deliberate identity-first / contract-second social sequence. It is consistent with the exact timing between inventory positioning, audience arrival and monetization. It also fits Kylie's own description of personal social control.

27. The Strongest Arguments Against This Thesis

- A sophisticated attacker could deliberately stage the same two-post sequence and cross-platform identity bridge.
- Public X JSON does not expose private login, session, recovery or security-event data; apparent continuity cannot prove same-human continuity.
- Author-side deletion is fully compatible with a legitimate owner deleting unauthorized posts after regaining access.
- AFQty's serial celebrity-token deployments are also consistent with a professional scammer or compromised-account operator.
- No public wallet, contract, payment, message or agency record currently ties Kylie or her team to AFQty.
- The profile image was publicly available and therefore does not prove private material was supplied to the operator.
- The large coordinated backend and profit estimates rely partly on a secondary forensic reconstruction that should be independently re-executed.

WHY THE THESIS SURVIVES THOSE OBJECTIONS

Every objection preserves external compromise as a technically possible explanation. None of them eliminates the authorized-launch model. The decisive dispute is still who controlled or authorized Kylie's X account at 21:43-21:46.

28. What Would Move This From Thesis to Attribution

Evidence	Effect
X session/access logs for the two exact status IDs	Would show session, device/application, login/recovery and possibly support/OAuth context around creation and deletion.
Direct message / contract / agency communication	Could establish authorization between celebrity side and operator side.
Exchange/KYC attribution for operator funding or proceeds	Could identify a real-world controller or contractor.
Independent re-execution of the 699-wallet reconstruction	Would confirm or reject the 40% backend, router rotations, 63-key core and 2,425 SOL estimate.
Pump.fun profile creation / username-change metadata	Could establish when `cutekjenner` was created and whether it was prepared before the public incident.
Unique non-public image provenance	Could demonstrate insider access if the launch operator possessed imagery before public release.
A direct Kylie statement describing the Aug. 24 event	Could resolve whether the account activity was authorized, unauthorized, or something in between.

29. Public-Facing Thesis

WHAT IF THERE WAS NO HACK?

Everyone saw Kylie Jenner's X account promote a memecoin and immediately decided she had been compromised. Maybe. But the blockchain was already prepared.

Minutes before Kylie's verified account said anything, a scripted funding system was assembling the launch. The creator and bundle buyers were ready before the token existed. The launch slot acquired nearly half the supply. The visible inventory was then rotated through a coordinated backend. Seconds before Kylie's first crypto post, that machinery was still moving.

Then the verified account did something more deliberate than paste a contract. It told nearly 40 million followers: 'follow me on pumpfun cutekjenner.' Only 161 seconds later did it publish \$KYLIE and the exact CA.

The first retained operator SOL appears seconds after that audience arrived. The developer's final exit and deletion of the promotion occur in the same minute. Kylie's public account identity shows no visible discontinuity in the JSON we

have recovered. Her ordinary social activity continues around the incident. And two days later, when asked who runs her social media, Kylie says: 'It's just me.'

None of that proves Kylie personally typed the posts. But it does make the simplest authorized-launch model coherent: a professional operator prepared the crypto machinery while Kylie — or someone acting with her legitimate authority — supplied the audience.

The hack story remains possible. It simply has not been publicly attributed at the level that the blockchain side has been reconstructed.

PUBLIC THESIS

THE INTERNET SAID "HACKED."

THE BLOCKCHAIN SAID "PREPARED."

KYLIE SAID "IT'S JUST ME."

30. What the Evidence Proves Today

- Kylie's verified X account published the Pump.fun identity `cutekjenner` and then the exact \$KYLIE contract.
- The first deleted crypto post remains tied to Kylie user ID 236699098 through X's surviving conversation graph.
- X currently classifies the first crypto post as deleted by the Post author.
- The last directly recovered normal Kylie post before the incident was at 21:13:27 UTC and was Twitter Web App.
- The public Kylie account objects reviewed show continuity in account ID, profile state and other visible fields around the event.
- AFqty was synchronously funded before token creation.
- The professional token operation existed before the verified X promotion.
- AFqty completed its final creator exit within roughly the same minute that outside observers recognized the Kylie post had been deleted.
- Kylie remained socially active around Aug. 24 and resumed normal Instagram posting immediately afterward.
- Kylie publicly said two days later that she personally runs her social media: 'It's just me.'

31. What the Evidence Still Does Not Prove

- It does not prove Kylie personally typed either crypto post.
- It does not prove Kylie controlled AFqty or any operator wallet.
- It does not prove Kylie received \$KYLIE proceeds.
- It does not prove there was no stolen session, support override or other private account compromise.
- It does not prove the same human controlled every wallet in the reconstructed economic backend.
- It does not prove every secondary-forensic wallet classification or profit estimate until those calculations are independently reproduced.
- It does not identify the real-world operator behind AFqty.

32. Source Notes and Evidence Ledger

Primary / recovered digital evidence

- Recovered X JSON: Pasted text(20260901-113840).txt — Kylie status 2091997340169331000, created 21:13:27 UTC, user ID 236699098, source Twitter Web App, ordinary account/profile fields.
- Recovered X conversation JSON: Pasted text(20260901-011427).txt / Pasted text(3).txt / Pasted text(5).txt / Pasted text(8).txt — TweetTombstone for 2092004950351954006 says 'This Post was deleted by the Post author'; immediate replies preserve parent status ID and Kylie user ID.
- Recovered X conversation/timeline material: Pasted text(20260901-114154).txt — additional Kylie user-object continuity and conversation data.
- On-chain working thesis and transaction exports incorporated into the Aug. 28/29 thesis: synchronized funding tree, AFqty creation, creator exit, EVuFhk intersection, downstream consolidation and Binance boundary.
- Secondary forensic reconstruction preserved in Pasted text(20260901-111755).txt and Pasted text(20260901-112210).txt — 200 SOL treasury, bundle construction, 47.3849% launch buys, router/vault rotation, post-minute timing, 63-key core and 2,425.21 SOL estimated net. These claims are treated as secondary until independently reproduced.

Public / contextual sources

- Better Half with Stas & Vic, Kylie Jenner episode, Aug. 26, 2026 — 'Who Runs Your Social Media?' segment.
- Page Six, Aug. 27, 2026 — reports Kylie personally manages her social media, including Kylie Cosmetics and Khy.
- Page Six, Apr. 24, 2026 — notes Kylie's current Instagram profile used a 2016 pink-hair / diamond-grill throwback image.
- Reddit, r/kardashians, 'New tiktok from kylie', Aug. 24, 2026 — contemporaneous discussion of new Kylie/Stassie TikTok.
- Reddit, r/KUWTK, 'Deleted Tiktok from Kylie and Stas', Aug. 24, 2026 — contemporaneous discussion saying the clip remained live and debating when it was filmed.
- Social Blade, @kyliejenner TikTok daily metrics — 604 videos Aug. 24, 605 Aug. 25, 606 Aug. 26.
- ThePlace / Instagram archive — Kylie feed post Aug. 23 06:05 promoting YouTube return; Aug. 25 08:37 'it's time to clear the air'.
- Contemporary crypto reporting preserved in prior thesis — initial hack framing, market-cap peak reports, and absence at publication of a detailed public access-method explanation.

Appendix A. Key Addresses and IDs

Item	Identifier
\$SKYLIE contract	6b7KQsXqb6JR5Nmeer5zGRmo51dwDfttM5b5Nu2rpump
Creator / cutekjenner	AFqtycYGgGv4HdXwbEApTEirKxnHNS7giPTNWpNz4Rk1
Kylie X user ID	236699098
First crypto post	2092004950351954006
Second crypto post	2092005625463009575
Last recovered normal pre-incident post	2091997340169331000
EVuFhk intersection	EVuFhkPXKZY8PXWxeixy3qghsZ6xwkPdp3wcZrzZNzq1
Post-sale collector	9PkdmyxrXpQrKwfpkgM51a5V7g9Rjj3kkDngAcmEMAY
Binance-labeled endpoint (older thesis)	8zHcWujHhyJri3CRTcWUGmT5WSRdwW7xrns3WTTkPGvS

Appendix B. Final Conclusion

The strongest version of this thesis no longer needs to argue that a hacked-account narrative is impossible. It argues something more precise: the available public evidence does not compel that narrative, while the affirmative model explains an increasing number of independent facts.

The launch was professionally prepared. The social promotion was deliberate and sequenced. The first message established a Kylie-branded Pump identity before the second message introduced the contract. The market machine was actively positioning inventory seconds before the first post and, in the secondary reconstruction, began retaining SOL seconds after it. The public X account objects we recovered show continuity, not a visible recovery transition. The post was deleted at author level. Kylie remained socially active around the event and then publicly described her social-media operation as personally controlled.

None of that is a confession. None of it is a wallet signature from Kylie. But together it makes 'Kylie herself or an authorized person was behind the promotion' a serious evidentiary hypothesis — not fan fiction, not mere lore, and not something the current public record eliminates.

THE INTERNET SAID “HACKED.”
THE BLOCKCHAIN SAID “PREPARED.”
KYLIE SAID “IT’S JUST ME.”

Appendix C. Preserved Original-Chain Findings

C.1 The 464.1564 SOL creator-wallet movement

On Aug. 27 at approximately 19:07 UTC, AFqty sent 464.156433585 SOL to ChzSQbfqVfGXdNEqkTAT9LX69Y7nfM1BXZqETaJaJ9N7. ChzSQ then funded stake account GGcEG6VgpR5N5oi1TNyLzEAhqVaR98CPdagGQr7Xoy9W with 464.156423585 SOL, and a later stake withdrawal moved the same amount into 4qv1QDYxHBAaufkMFYRtH4EpUfLAjpF2xCNQYLjZRh9t.

DIRECT FACT

Approximately 464.1564 SOL left AFqty and entered a reconstructed staking/consolidation route. Because 4qv1 also received stake withdrawals associated with other authorities, the endpoint is treated as shared/consolidation infrastructure rather than as Kylie's wallet or a clean operator identity.

C.2 The persistent EVuFhk intersection

The older June/July network and the later Kylie-linked route intersect at persistent wallet EVuFhkPXKZY8PXWxeixy3qghsZ6xwkPdp3wcZrzZNzq1.

Older route	Later route
C6Eix → 4x9Wo → 7LTRXe → EVuFhk	AFqty → DNAZ → 3Ezx → EVuFhk

The June-side relationship was repeated, and the August-side relationship was repeated. That makes EVuFhk materially more interesting than a public Jito/Astralane tip address. It is a real persistent-address intersection, although it may still represent shared private infrastructure.

C.3 Downstream Binance attribution boundary

A later EVuFhk branch was traced through AdQB3 and mixed infrastructure to GW3M3. Five GW3M3-funded relays then deposited 110.591873905 SOL into the same Solscan-labeled Binance deposit address within 34 seconds.

UTC	Deposit (SOL)
03:08:41	27.061498759
03:09:14	26.551519178
03:09:14	26.704399065
03:09:14	2.967185975
03:09:15	27.307270928
TOTAL	110.591873905

CAUTION

The downstream path passes through mixed wallets. The public chain does not establish that all 110.59 SOL originated from \$KYLIE or identify the Binance customer. The exchange label is an attribution boundary, not a public identity.

Appendix D. Image and Appearance Chronology

D.1 The old profile image

The `cutekjenner` persona used Kylie's recognizable pink-hair / diamond-grill imagery associated with her older 'King Kylie' era. Because the image was public years earlier, it cannot by itself establish private access.

D.2 The 2026 relevance

The notable modern connection is that Kylie herself had revived the same 2016 pink-hair / grill image as her Instagram profile image. Page Six specifically reported that fact in April 2026. Therefore the Pump persona mirrored a visual identity Kylie was actively using in 2026, not simply an obscure archival photograph.

D.3 Matching-clothing / podcast chronology

The earlier investigation also preserved a matching-clothing/image lead involving the Better Half appearance and user-supplied comparison imagery. The high-value question is provenance, not resemblance: when was the podcast footage recorded, when did the compared image first become public, and could an unrelated operator have obtained it before the launch?

POTENTIALLY TRANSFORMATIVE EVIDENCE

If any launch image can be proven to derive from a private or unreleased Aug. 24-26 recording/session and to have been unavailable publicly before the token promotion, that would be materially stronger insider-access evidence. That provenance has not yet been established.

Appendix E. X Platform and Security Context

E.1 Announced anti-memecoin protections

Public reporting in 2026 described X plans to automatically lock or verify large accounts with no crypto history when they suddenly promoted a memecoin. Kylie appears to fit the risk profile that was publicly described. Yet both crypto posts were successfully published.

This report does not treat that fact as proof of authorization. X did not publicly establish in the material reviewed that the protection was fully deployed and operating exactly as described on Aug. 24. The only defensible point is that the publicized protection did not prevent the observed Kylie sequence.

E.2 No public JSON recovery state

- Recovered user objects continue to show Kylie rest_id 236699098.
- The account remains public ('protected': false).
- The profile interstitial field remains empty in reviewed objects.
- The same Kylie Cosmetics URL and general profile state persist.
- No public GraphQL object recovered to date exposes a login, logout, recovery, delegated-user or compromise flag.

LIMITATION

Private X security records could contain decisive evidence — device/session history, OAuth use, support actions, IP changes or recovery events — without any corresponding public User-object transition.

Appendix F. Fresh-Pump Identity Findings

Searches for AFqty's Pump.fun history have not produced meaningful pre-\$SKYLIE activity attributable directly to the creator wallet. The earliest known operational activity is the synchronized funding immediately before the \$SKYLIE launch, and the first known token is \$SKYLIE.

Afterward, AFqty created additional celebrity-themed tokens, including Kendall-, Kim- and Travis-themed deployments. This is more consistent with a fresh campaign/deployer account than with Kylie's longstanding personal crypto wallet.

AFFIRMATIVE INTERPRETATION

A fresh disposable dev identity is fully compatible with a client/operator model: the celebrity supplies promotion while the professional operator supplies a purpose-built wallet and Pump.fun persona.

Appendix G. Updated Closing Synthesis

The revised thesis is stronger than the Aug. 28/29 version because the argument no longer rests mainly on synchronized pre-launch funding and the phrase 'It's just me.' The evidence now spans X continuity, X conversation

graph preservation, author-level deletion, cross-platform social activity, Pump identity design, second-level market timing, and a much larger reconstructed economic backend.

The most important new sequence is now exact: 21:43:40 automated rotation; 21:43:42.393 Kylie crypto post; 21:43:56 next rotation; 21:44:00 first retained SOL in the secondary reconstruction. That is a remarkably tight audience/market handoff.

The affirmative case remains a thesis, not attribution. But the record increasingly supports a professional-launch model in which the social and market sides were coordinated before the public promotion. The remaining unresolved fact is whether that coordination came from unauthorized X access or from Kylie / authorized insider participation.

**THE INTERNET SAID “HACKED.”
THE BLOCKCHAIN SAID “PREPARED.”
KYLIE SAID “IT’S JUST ME.”**

33. Additional Findings Integrated Into the Thesis

The investigation established the prepared blockchain launch, the exact two-post X sequence, the 21:43:40 → 21:43:42.393 → 21:44:00 timing, the author-level deletion tombstone, public account continuity, and Kylie's later "It's just me" statement. The following findings extend that same investigation as part of one continuous report.

- **The pre-incident YouTube return:** Kylie resumed YouTube on Aug. 23, less than two days before the token promotion, and fan accounts immediately recognized the return.
- **The visual/podcast chronology:** public Better Half frames document the black halter look worn during the interview in which Kylie described her social posting as personally controlled. The user-supplied comparison image is treated as a chronology lead, not as proof of the recording date.
- **The same-wallet launch sequence:** indexed token records attribute later Kendall-, Kim/Kardashian-, and Travis-themed coins to AFqty, with exact contracts and creation times.
- **The integrated interpretation:** these facts strengthen the professional-operator component of the case, while also giving the external-impersonator theory a serious counterargument.

NEW HIGH-LEVEL FINDING

AFqty did not simply disappear after \$KYLIE. The wallet continued launching names from Kylie's immediate family and relationship orbit. That persistence is direct creator-wallet evidence. What it means about authorization remains disputed.

33.1 Revised evidentiary map

Finding	Status	What it supports
YouTube return Aug. 23	Publicly corroborated	Kylie was in an active, self-directed content cycle before the X incident.
Fan post: "MY GIRL IS BACK ON YOUTUBE"	Direct public X post	Contemporaneous recognition of her return, not a later reconstruction.
Black halter Better Half frames	Public visual record	Documents the appearance in which "It's just me" was said.
Aug. 26 live-event comparison image	Timestamp visible in supplied screenshot	Shows the black fitted appearance before the podcast material was released; garment identity remains a visual inference.
Three additional AFqty launches	Indexed creator attribution	Shows continued themed deployment by the same campaign wallet.

34. The Aug. 23 YouTube Return Is Part of the Incident Context

On Sunday, Aug. 23, Kylie published a new “Get Ready With Me” video centered on her makeup routine and her cats. People later reported that it was her first YouTube upload in three years and quoted Kylie saying she had been watching old videos and felt inspired to return. The return occurred roughly one day before the Aug. 24 \$KYLIE incident.

A contemporaneous fan post from @acervokyjenner at 11:35 a.m. on Aug. 23 stated:

“MY GIRL IS BACK ON YOUTUBE @KylieJenner”

Another public account, @Khydaily, posted at 11:14 a.m.: “Kylie is back on Youtube yay!” These are modest but useful timestamps because they show that the return was being observed in real time, before the crypto incident and before the later hack narrative formed.

34.1 Why the return matters

- It places Kylie in an active public-content cycle immediately before the X event.
- It weakens any broad narrative that she had been absent from all platforms or was undergoing a visible cross-platform lockout.
- The return leaned into personal identity and nostalgia: Kylie revisited older videos, discussed her “King Kylie” versus “princess” eras, introduced pets, and performed a familiar direct-to-fan makeup format.
- That identity-centered content is contextually consistent with the revived “King Kylie” imagery used by cutekjenner, although the connection is not exclusive and could be copied by an observer.


IMPORTANT LIMIT

The YouTube video does not mention \$KYLIE, Pump.fun or crypto. It establishes social activity and identity context, not authorization.

34.2 The exact phrase issue

The earlier working description remembered a user saying something like “look who is back on YouTube.” The directly recovered public wording is stronger to quote exactly: “MY GIRL IS BACK ON YOUTUBE @KylieJenner.” This edition uses the exact recoverable text and does not convert a remembered paraphrase into a quotation.

35. Visual Exhibit: Live Event Before the Podcast Release



The supplied live-event screenshot visibly records 10:35 PM on Aug. 26, 2026. It shows Kylie in a fitted black, straight-neckline appearance with dark hair styled around her shoulders. The Better Half frame shows the closely related black fitted appearance, dark hair, and the interview setting in which she was asked who runs her social media and answered, “It’s just me.”

WHAT THE COMPARISON ESTABLISHES

The image is no longer merely an unidentified resemblance lead: the screenshot itself preserves an Aug. 26 live-event timestamp before the podcast material was released. It supports a close visual and temporal connection. Because the live frame is cropped and its visible neckline differs from the visible halter configuration in the podcast frame, the images should be described as the same overall black fitted look unless the original full-length footage confirms the identical garment.

35.1 The matching-appearance lead

The comparison is potentially useful because wardrobe, hair and timing can connect a live appearance, promotional recording and interview session. The new screenshot materially improves the chronology by fixing the live event to Aug. 26 at 10:35 PM. It still does not independently establish the podcast recording time or prove that the token operator possessed private podcast material.

36. How to Treat the Matching-Appearance Evidence

The affirmative case should include the clothing comparison, but it should state exactly what would make it probative. The key issue is not that two images look alike. The key issue is provenance: when each image was made, when it first became publicly accessible, and whether the launch operator could have copied it from a public source.

36.1 Four questions that control its weight

- **Capture time:** Does the original file retain reliable metadata or a platform timestamp?
- **First-publication time:** Was the image visible anywhere before 21:43 UTC on Aug. 24?
- **Wardrobe uniqueness:** Is the black halter look distinctive enough to connect the images, or was it worn across multiple appearances?
- **Operator access:** Did cutekjenner use any image, caption or visual detail that had not yet become public?

36.2 Three possible interpretations

Interpretation	What would support it	Current status
Same production window	Matching makeup, hair, black fitted styling and a verified close timestamp.	Live-event timestamp established; podcast recording time remains unresolved.
Same styled look, different time	Same outfit and glam reused for promotion or pickup footage.	Also plausible.
Publicly copied imagery	Comparison image was already public before the token campaign.	Would sharply reduce insider value.

BEST AFFIRMATIVE FORMULATION

The matching clothing is consistent with a shared production window and deserves preservation as a lead. Until the pre-release image is authenticated and its first-publication time is fixed, it should not be described as proof that the token operator possessed private podcast material.

37. “It’s Just Me” Gains Weight When Placed in the Full Sequence

Kylie’s statement is not merely a celebrity quote appended to a blockchain report. It answers the precise operational question raised by the incident: who normally decides what appears on her social accounts? In the Better Half segment, Kylie said “It’s just me,” described an absence of a team dictating her posts, said she generally does not run posts by others, and discussed managing brand social accounts as well.

37.1 The narrow inference

Her description weakens the casual theory that an ordinary social-media employee, acting within routine access, accidentally or independently posted the campaign. If Kylie’s description is accurate, normal posting authority is unusually concentrated in her personally.

37.2 What it does not answer

- Whether an attacker stole a valid session or device token.
- Whether X support, OAuth access, a third-party tool or account recovery was involved.
- Whether a trusted person had temporary access despite not being a standing “social team.”
- Whether the episode was recorded before or after Aug. 24.

37.3 Why recording date still matters

If the statement was recorded before the incident, it would be a pre-existing description of Kylie’s control model. If recorded afterward, it could still be candid and unrelated, but the proximity would attract greater scrutiny. Publication on Aug. 26 alone does not settle recording date.

INTEGRATED SOCIAL-SIDE INFERENCE

Normal Kylie post at 21:13:27 via Twitter Web App → first crypto post 30 minutes later → contract post 161 seconds after that → author-level deletion → ordinary cross-platform activity → “It’s just me.” This sequence does not prove same-human continuity, but it makes the control question substantially narrower.

38. Additional Coins Launched by AFqty

Indexed Solana token records now allow the later launches to be identified by name, contract, creator and creation time. Each record names AFqtycYGgGv4HdXwbEApTEirKxnHNS7giPTNWpNz4Rk1 as creator—the same wallet associated with the cutekjenner profile and the original \$KYLIE launch.

UTC created	Token / ticker	Contract	Creator
Aug. 24, 22:11:34	kendall / \$kendall	ETZmN2vMBRmY1pEfDEPSs1BaYNR61YQe89EH51eapump	AFqty...4Rk1
Aug. 25, 00:00:24	kardashian / \$kim	U829BAonERC7ohdaErCquVWWiF36MMwdN7QCSc2pump	AFqty...4Rk1
Aug. 25, 00:13:57	travis scott / \$travis	DG6o4dEv6unoav8jo7QJL1SJZRtMTUwg4yE9WVwtpump	AFqty...4Rk1

38.1 The timing relationship

AFqty’s final reported \$KYLIE creator exit occurred at 21:54:06 UTC. The `kendall` token record is timestamped 22:11:34 UTC—17 minutes and 28 seconds later. The Kim/Kardashian and Travis-themed launches followed at 00:00:24 and 00:13:57 UTC.

- The wallet remained operational after the original promotion and deletion window.
- The naming sequence stayed inside Kylie's immediate celebrity/family orbit.
- The launches are not independent rumors; they are creator-attributed token records.

DIRECT FACT VERSUS INFERENCE

Direct fact: indexed records identify AFqty as creator of the three contracts. **Inference:** why the operator chose these names and whether the sequence was an abandoned campaign, opportunistic follow-on monetization, misdirection, or serial impersonation.

39. What the Additional Coins Mean for Each Theory

The later launches are significant precisely because they do not point in only one direction. A credible affirmative thesis should confront both readings.

39.1 Authorized campaign / operator reading

- A professional operator may have prepared a broader Kardashian/Jenner-themed campaign around the initial celebrity promotion.
- After the \$KYLIE launch was deleted and AFqty exited, the operator may have continued deploying previously prepared concepts.
- The immediate move to Kendall, Kim and Travis names could reflect a campaign architecture rather than unrelated retail experimentation.

39.2 External impersonator / serial-launch reading

- A scammer who had just exploited Kylie's name would naturally reuse the same wallet for more famous names.
- The sequence could be opportunistic brand impersonation after the original coin received attention.
- The lack of verified promotion for the later coins weakens any claim that those later launches were officially authorized.

39.3 The strongest neutral conclusion

The later coins make AFqty look even less like Kylie's personal wallet and even more like a purpose-built campaign/operator wallet. That conclusion is important for both sides. It supports the affirmative model in which a professional operator handled the crypto layer for an authorized promoter; it also supports the competing model of a professional impersonator monetizing celebrity identities.

WHAT SURVIVES EITHER WAY

The wallet behavior does not support an accidental post. It supports a prepared, professional, themed operation whose relationship to Kylie's account access remains the decisive unresolved question.

40. Expanded Cross-Platform Chronology

UTC / date	Platform	Event	Evidentiary use
Aug. 23, 11:14	X fan account	"Kylie is back on Youtube yay!"	Contemporaneous public recognition.
Aug. 23, 11:35	X fan account	"MY GIRL IS BACK ON YOUTUBE @KylieJenner"	Exact recovered wording.
Aug. 23	YouTube	Kylie posts GRWM/cats return video.	Active personal content before incident.
Aug. 24, 21:13:27	X	Last recovered ordinary Kylie post; Twitter Web App.	Authenticated continuity point.
Aug. 24, 21:39:57	Solana / Pump.fun	\$KYLIE created; coordinated buys follow.	Launch prepared before promotion.
Aug. 24, 21:43:42.393	X	"follow me on pumpfun cuted Jenner."	Identity bridge.
Aug. 24, 21:46:23.352	X	\$KYLIE contract posted.	Asset introduced 161 seconds later.
Aug. 24, 21:54:06	Solana	Final AFQty creator-position exit.	Economic exit.
~Aug. 24, 21:54:48	X observer	Post recognized as deleted.	Deletion/exit proximity.
Aug. 24, 22:11:34	Solana / Pump.fun	AFQty creates `kendall`.	Same-wallet campaign continues.
Aug. 25, 00:00–00:14	Solana / Pump.fun	AFQty creates Kim and Travis-themed coins.	Themed serial sequence.
Aug. 25	Instagram / press	Ordinary Kylie content resumes; YouTube return covered.	No broad public social shutdown.
Aug. 26, 22:35	Live-event post	Supplied screenshot shows Kylie in the black fitted appearance.	Visible timestamp before podcast release.
Aug. 26–27	Better Half / press	Kylie says "It's just me."	Personal-control description.

The cross-platform sequence is not proof of authorization. Its value is cumulative: it places an unusually personal and active content cycle around an X event that was economically synchronized with a prepared market operation.

41. Revised Affirmative Reconstruction

The expanded evidence supports the following best-case authorized-launch reconstruction:

- 1. Kylie is actively reviving personal, nostalgic content across YouTube and social media on Aug. 23–24.
- 2. A professional Solana operator prepares funding, bundle signers, inventory and routing before the promotion.
- 3. Kylie's verified account first claims the Pump.fun identity as “me,” then posts the exact contract 161 seconds later.
- 4. Inventory rotations bracket the exact first-post second; retained SOL begins immediately after the audience arrives.
- 5. AFQty completes its creator exit as the promotion disappears at author level.
- 6. Instead of going dormant, AFQty deploys Kendall-, Kim- and Travis-themed tokens in rapid succession.
- 7. Kylie remains publicly active and later says that her normal social operation is personally controlled: “It’s just me.”

41.1 Why the model is coherent

This model separates roles. Kylie need not understand bundles, routers, bonding curves or Solana settlement. A professional operator supplies the crypto machinery; the celebrity side supplies identity, reach and authenticated promotion. The later themed launches are consistent with a broader operator campaign, though they do not prove the celebrity side approved them.

41.2 The unresolved fork

The same facts also fit a professional attacker who prepared the operation, acquired account access, staged a convincing identity-first launch, exited as access was lost, then kept impersonating adjacent celebrities. The public record proves professional coordination far more strongly than it proves authorization.

DECISIVE QUESTION

Who controlled or authorized the authenticated X session that created status IDs 2092004950351954006 and 2092005625463009575? The blockchain can reconstruct preparation and profit; only platform/access evidence or direct communications can resolve that human-control question.

42. Expanded Evidence Ledger and Source Notes

Additional public and supplied evidence

- **People, Aug. 25, 2026:** “Kylie Jenner Returns to YouTube to Introduce Her 3 All-White Cats — and Asks Fans to Help Name One.” Reports that the video was posted Sunday, Aug. 23, and quotes Kylie describing her return.
- **X, @acervokyjenner, Aug. 23, 2026, 11:35 a.m.:** “MY GIRL IS BACK ON YOUTUBE @KylieJenner.” Status 2091595231342825606.
- **X, @Khydaily, Aug. 23, 2026, 11:14 a.m.:** “Kylie is back on Youtube yay!” Status 2091590001993633813.
- **User-supplied live-event screenshot:** visible post timestamp of 10:35 PM on Aug. 26, 2026; used for the direct visual comparison with the Better Half appearance.
- **Better Half promotional/social clips:** public frames showing the black halter appearance used in the visual exhibit.
- **Indexed Solana token records:** `kendall` ETZm...pump; `kardashian / kim` U829...pump; `travis scott / travis` DG6o...pump. Each record identifies AFqty...4Rk1 as creator and supplies a creation timestamp.

Source URLs

<https://people.com/kylie-jenner-introduces-her-all-white-cats-in-first-get-ready-with-me-vlog-in-3-years-12068042>

<https://x.com/acervokyjenner/status/2091595231342825606>

<https://x.com/Khydaily/status/2091590001993633813>

<https://pump.fun/profile/AFqtycYGgGv4HdXwbEApTEirKxnHNS7giPTNWpNz4Rk1>

<https://ai.mytoken.cap.com/en/sol/token/ETZmN2vMBRmY1pEfDEPSs1BaYNR61YQe89EH51eapump>

<https://ai.mytoken.cap.com/en/sol/token/U829BAonERC7ohdaErCquVWWiF36MMwdN7QCSc2pump>

<https://ai.mytoken.cap.com/en/sol/token/DG6o4dEv6unoav8jo7QJL1SJZRtMTUwg4yE9WVwtpump>

Preservation note

Market pages and social pages can change after publication. Contract addresses, status IDs, exact timestamps, screenshots, and original JSON should be preserved together. Current market cap, P&L; and follower counts are intentionally not treated as fixed historical facts in this report.

43. Final Integrated Conclusion

The additional findings do not transform the affirmative thesis into proven attribution. They do, however, make the surrounding story more complete.

Kylie was not emerging from a long social silence at the moment of the crypto event. She had just returned to YouTube in a personal, identity-heavy format, and fan accounts were publicly celebrating that return before the incident. Her verified X account then executed a deliberate identity-first, contract-second sequence. The blockchain side had already prepared inventory and routing, and monetization aligned almost instantly with audience arrival.

The creator wallet did not simply vanish when the post was deleted. It launched Kendall-, Kim/Kardashian-, and Travis-themed coins in the hours that followed. That continuation strengthens the conclusion that AFqty was a professional, purpose-built celebrity campaign wallet rather than Kylie's personal wallet. It does not, standing alone, tell us whether that professional operator was a contractor, an authorized promoter, or an impersonator.

The Better Half appearance adds the most personally relevant statement in the record: when asked who runs her social media, Kylie answered, "It's just me." The matching clothing imagery should be preserved because authenticated provenance could eventually tie the social and interview chronology more tightly. For now, it remains a lead rather than attribution proof.

The strongest defensible conclusion is therefore precise:

CONCLUSION

The public record strongly supports a prepared, professional, celebrity-themed operation synchronized with posts from Kylie's verified X account. It supports an authorized-launch explanation as a serious hypothesis and prevents "hack" from being treated as established merely because it was repeated first. But the present evidence still does not establish that Kylie personally typed the posts, controlled AFqty, received proceeds, or authorized the operator.

***THE INTERNET SAID "HACKED."
THE BLOCKCHAIN SAID "PREPARED."
KYLIE SAID "IT'S JUST ME."***