

PART II OF III

Internal Record and Comparative Findings

What the private archive reveals, and how it changes what the public record looked like

ABSTRACT – PART II

Part II introduces the internal archive produced through direct inside-access methodology: four transcript archives preserved from a sustained investigative source relationship, a screenshot-derived ledger extracted from private message batches, and contextual neighbor communications providing situational environmental evidence. This archive does not merely supplement the public record. It materially changes the evidentiary status of several core findings. The critical new finding is the Balis chronology (Section 2.4): a screenshot preserved in the internal ledger shows Riley contacting Michael Balis first and framing the issue in his own opening message, reclassifying the Fort Carson corroboration bridge from apparent independent support to a source-seeded, potentially contaminated lane. The archive also establishes that the source privately identified instability and pretending actors inside the support environment, privately described the operator as a "catch and kill story scheme," privately acknowledged speaking only to the "crystal clear and somewhat believable" parts of his larger account, and privately characterized public attacks on this investigator as absurd and as evidence that the operator had "painted herself into a corner." The comparative analysis in Section 2.6 places these private findings directly beside the public-facing record, and the divergence is the primary finding of Part II.

Keywords: inside-access methodology, private-record analysis, source contamination, narrative curation, operator-source relationship, comparative divergence, credibility stratigraphy

SECTION 2.1

Methodology: Inside-Access Design

The methodological decision to maintain direct source contact over an extended period — rather than working exclusively from the public record — was both deliberate and costly. It was deliberate because outside observation of public posts could not produce the material that private exchanges preserved: the source's own private assessment of instability in the surrounding network, his narrowing of specific public threat lanes, his redirection of concern toward the operator, his acknowledgment of narrative curation, and the Balis outreach screenshot that reclassifies the most publicly resilient corroboration lane. A purely external observer watching public posts would not have encountered any of those findings. It was costly because the inside position created attack surface: critics could frame sustained source contact as complicity, manipulation, or ideological maneuvering. Those attacks materialized and are documented in Section 2.8.

The inside method did not require uncritical belief. It required staying in the relationship long enough to document chronology, admissions, shifts in confidence, documentary promises that could not be kept, and the specific movement between private and public registers over time. That documentation is exactly what makes the integrated record usable. A case study written only from the end-point conclusion would be easier to dismiss as hindsight certainty. This one preserves movement — showing what was publicly knowable at each stage and what became knowable only through sustained private access. That distinction is the strongest defense against hindsight distortion and the strongest argument for the inside-access design.

The private archive is organized into four source families. Internal Transcript Archive A covers the March–April 2026 period, including cross-platform exchanges (Instagram DMs, Threads context, older public posts captured within the exchange), and is the primary source for the operator-distrust and pretending-actor findings. Internal Transcript Archive B covers the April 2026 Messenger escalation phase and is the primary source for the self-curation finding (EX-I04) and the prior-charges

acknowledgment (EX-I09). Internal Transcript Archive C covers an earlier preserved Instagram DM record focused on family-origin allegations and tactical positioning. Internal Transcript Archive D covers the early Messenger archive containing the oldest material in the inside chain. The Screenshot-Derived Internal Ledger covers five batches of human-corrected text extractions from private message screenshot packets, including Batch 3, Image 10, which contains the Balis outreach exhibit.

SECTION 2.2

Source Classification and Weighting Protocol

The discipline of this case study lies in maintaining strict source-class distinctions throughout. All evidence is not equivalent. Collapsing source classes into a single emotional register is how forensic case studies are most easily compromised and how hostile readers find the weakest attack surface. The following four strata govern all analytical use of evidence across all three Parts.

STRATUM A

Stable Public Record

Court dockets, FAA records, dated public posts, official biographies, institutional records. Used for chronology anchors, identity checks, and external baseline. Does not explain motive or interior intent; strong for what events occurred and when.

STRATUM B

Internal Direct-Source Corpus

Private messages (Transcript Archives A–D, screenshot-derived ledger). High reliability for what was said and when. Does not independently verify the underlying historical event claims. Primary for contradiction analysis, operator-relationship assessment, and self-curation findings.

STRATUM C

Contextual Witness Material

Neighbor communications and local environment evidence. Used for situational context and operating-environment analysis. Not used as stand-alone proof of the historical grand narrative claims. Claims exceeding direct observation are classified as contextual allegations.

STRATUM D

Investigator-Process Record

Investigator's exploratory language, rapport building, and evolving assessment during the access period. Classified separately — not hidden. Its transparency prevents hindsight distortion by showing how the assessment changed as the source base changed. Not used as final-finding material.

SECTION 2.3

Core Internal Findings: Selected Exhibits

The following exhibits represent the analytically strongest findings from the internal archive. Direct quotation is used when the exact wording materially changes the evidentiary classification of the material. Each exhibit is coded by source family, date, and analytical function.

EX-I01 · INTERNAL TRANSCRIPT ARCHIVE A · MARCH 23, 2026 · ANALYTICAL WEIGHT: HIGH

"I am realizing that there are at least a few people who are pretending in all kinds of ways... there has most definitely been some fuckery afoot... It's why I decided to go it alone."

This statement establishes that the source privately perceived contamination or role-playing inside the support network while the public-facing architecture still appeared unified and confident. It is one of the clearest private indicators of the environment's internal instability and predates the public rupture by weeks. It changes how all subsequent support-shell communication must be read.

EX-I02 · INTERNAL TRANSCRIPT ARCHIVE A · LATE MARCH 2026 · ANALYTICAL WEIGHT: HIGH

"I only know George slightly, I don't know much about him. Lise is a different story."

This exchange narrows a major public threat lane and redirects investigative weight to the operator layer. The source's own private assessment of relative significance inverts the public-facing hierarchy. Publicly, George Tonks carried enormous interpretive weight in the surrounding environment. Privately, the source consistently treated Lisa Voldeng as the more serious internal concern.

EX-I04 · INTERNAL TRANSCRIPT ARCHIVE D · EARLY PHASE · ANALYTICAL WEIGHT: CRITICAL

"It's why I have been so careful about only speaking about the parts that are crystal clear and somewhat believable."

This is direct evidence of active narrative curation by the source. The public was not receiving transparent, unfiltered disclosure. It was receiving a version of the story that had been internally calibrated against audience credibility thresholds. Once this line enters the record, the public story cannot be read as neutral memory output. It is a managed selection.

EX-I03 · INTERNAL TRANSCRIPT ARCHIVE A · POST-ARTICLE ANALYTICAL WEIGHT:
REASSESSMENT HIGH

"I think she's the human equivalent of a catch and kill story scheme and she is a rolling cascade of red flags."

This is not post-breakup anger. The language is analytical: "catch and kill" implies acquisition, control, and suppression under the appearance of advocacy. The source privately reclassified the operator's function in media-process terms. The person the public was relying on to certify the story's credibility was being described by the source himself as a suppressive intermediary.

EX-I05 · INTERNAL TRANSCRIPT ARCHIVE A · LATE MARCH 2026 ANALYTICAL WEIGHT: HIGH

"I can tell you that I don't think Lisa is being straightforward. Too many red flags and contradicting statements."

This predates the public rupture and therefore carries stronger analytical weight than any post-rupture statement would. The source was identifying operator-layer concerns before the public saw the break.

EX-I08 · INTERNAL TRANSCRIPT ARCHIVE A · OPERATOR RUPTURE ANALYTICAL WEIGHT:
ACCOUNT HIGH

"It wasn't a problem until I started talking about moving the conversation into the mainstream public domain, podcasts, mainstream media and such. That's when we clashed."

This statement provides the mechanism for the operator-source rupture. The relationship tolerated one scale of visibility and failed at another. This strongly suggests the managed release environment functioned as long as the operator retained control of framing and channel, and broke down when independent media access threatened that control.

SECTION 2.4 – CRITICAL FINDING

The Fort Carson Corroboration Bridge: Contamination Analysis

CRITICAL FINDING – CORROBORATION CONTAMINATION

A screenshot preserved in Screenshot-Derived Internal Ledger, Batch 3, Image 10 (Exhibit EX-T03) shows Riley contacting Michael Balis first, identifying himself from Fort Carson, asking whether Balis remembers a soldier named Habel, and framing the content as child sexual abuse material containing Riley at ages nine to thirteen. This chronology reclassifies the Balis lane from apparent independent corroboration to a source-seeded, potentially contaminated support bridge. What the public encountered as emerging outside confirmation was, in fact, prompted outreach from the source himself.

EX-T03 · SCREENSHOT-DERIVED INTERNAL LEDGER · BATCH 3, ANALYTICAL WEIGHT:
IMAGE 10 CRITICAL

"Hey, this is Riley from Ft Carson. This is a long shot but do you remember Habel?"

The wording establishes that Riley did not ask an open question and wait for independent recall. He identified

himself, named the soldier, and framed the content before Balis had an opportunity to produce an unprompted memory. This is source-initiated contact with an advance frame. A genuine corroboration bridge strengthens under scrutiny. This one was initiated from inside the source's own narrative needs.

The consequence is not that the Fort Carson lane disappears entirely. The real 2009 Fort Carson child-pornography case remains a documented public fact, confirmed by the Denver Post. The consequence is that the lane must be analytically divided. Part one — the bounded real event — remains real. Part two — the narrative expansion built around it, including the apparent Balis witness-memory bridge — weakens substantially once the contamination chronology is visible. What the public encountered as independent institutional support was generated through the source's own outreach. That is a decisive comparative shift.

Contaminated corroboration is one of the most common mechanisms by which unstable stories survive sustained public scrutiny. A true fragment keeps the door open. A prompted bridge walks through the door and is later mistaken for independent support. This is why the source chronology — who contacted whom and when — is analytically as important as what the contact produced. The Fort Carson lane demonstrates this principle with unusual clarity.

SECTION 2.5

Forensic Inconsistency Matrix

The dominant pattern across all source channels is not one isolated contradiction. It is systematic certainty drift: claims stated at high confidence in the Lisa interview transcripts or in pre-live private messages were hedged, narrowed, or explicitly walked back on the March 30, 2026 live broadcast when they became subject to direct questioning. A story whose confidence level consistently decreases when the

source is asked direct questions about the same material is a story whose support structure is doing something other than ordinary memory retrieval. The following matrix documents the fourteen strongest inconsistency findings across the full corpus.

Table 1. Forensic Inconsistency Matrix: Cross-Source Certainty Drift Across 14 Categories (N = 14)

Category	Earlier/Stronger Statement	Later/Weaker Statement	Confidence	Significance
Identity bridge (William H. Riley)	Pre-live DM: "I believe that's the William H Riley that's mentioned numerous times throughout the files."	Live [48:01–48:09]: "They have redacted the email addresses, so I can't tell you definitively which one it is."	High	Documentary bridge to Epstein files retreats under direct questioning. A genuine bridge strengthens under scrutiny; this one narrowed.
Congressional channels	Pre-live DMs: two committees, proof via Signal, oversight committee already has everything.	Live [1:37:38–1:38:14]: phone call with House Oversight aides only; no follow-on.	High	Institutional aura shrinks to a much thinner factual core under direct questioning.
Oversight meeting	Pre-live DM: "I already met with the oversight committee and they have everything."	Live [1:37:38–1:38:14]: phone call with aides; no follow-on documented.	High	Earlier language directly overstates what the live account supports.
UN / Hague seriousness	Broad case atmosphere implying imminent formal UN and Hague action.	Live [6:53–6:58]: asked directly whether Lisa ever showed proof of any submission — Answer:	High	Institutional scaffolding borrowed from operator not

		"No."		corroborated even to source himself.
Jim Jordan identification	Lisa transcripts [File A 24:47–27:43; File B 22:20–22:29]: described with high confidence — voice, jawline, mannerisms, floor-of-Congress appearances.	Live [55:37–55:49]: "Is there a possibility that I am incorrect? Yes."	High	Named-person certainty moves from categorical to acknowledged-uncertainty on record.
Bill Clinton	Public amplification treated Clinton as settled identification.	Live [18:56–19:15]: "I think I saw Bill Clinton... the memory wasn't clear enough that I could put my hand on a Bible and say that was him."	High	Source's own live language is materially more cautious than public framing built around story.
Police deposition vs. Lisa material	Lisa interview transcripts treated by amplification layer as core testimony.	Live [18:15–18:24; 18:41–18:47]: police deposition was "markedly different"; tried not to stray from "the things that were solid."	High	Source himself distinguished what was police-ready from what he gave Lisa. Lisa materials cannot be treated as equivalent to legal deposition.
FBI contact language	File E [27:59–28:30]: outreach through social media; referral to local police; no FBI-building deposition.	Live [1:05:55–1:06:04]: "FBI has called me. Secret Service has reached out to me."	Medium	Federal-interest language expands over time without corresponding documented federal

I need Lisa or George to message me ASAP."

anybody" and "I'm not involved in whatever the hell it is that you're talking about."

leverage posture and passive-victim posture operating simultaneously in same channel.

Audience pressure context	Pre-live DMs: "I'm probably gonna need to do something this Sunday or the Threads gang might tar and feather me." / "I just need to fill the void." / "The Natives are restless."	March 30, 2026 live was publicly framed as neutral truth-and-accountability event.	Medium	Private motivation record shows audience-management pressure as a component of the event's context, not purely evidentiary need.
Persona management	Pre-live DM: "My online persona is different than my real life persona. Online is more accurate." / "I'm smart too but I do my best to downplay it... the idiots all think I'm one of them."	Followers and amplifiers treated his online output as unfiltered reality.	Medium	Speaker documented his own strategic performance layer. Changes analytical weight of every public post from same period.
Family-court parallel	Survivor-centered public narrative foregrounded throughout the amplification period.	Ex-wife public statements (@nae.nae419) document simultaneous child support proceedings, service attempts, disputed 529 account, and ongoing litigation throughout same period.	High	Two concurrent narratives ran simultaneously. Amplification layer consistently presented only one of them.

Public-record asymmetry	Named-political-figure allegations were structurally central to public case.	Public-record trail is materially stronger on the divorce and support proceedings than on any trafficking allegations.	High	What is documentable and what is not are unevenly distributed across the two competing factual lanes.
Live pattern overall	Followers and amplifiers presented many major claims as settled findings.	Live transcript uses "I think," "may have," "I can't tell you definitively," "is there a possibility I'm incorrect? Yes" at multiple key claim points.	High	Most direct on-record source account is materially more cautious than the amplification layer built around the story.

SECTION 2.6

Public-to-Private Claim Deltas

The most analytically powerful product of the comparative method is the delta record: the specific places where what the public was shown and what the internal archive preserved are irreconcilably different. These are not incidental contradictions. They are the evidentiary foundation showing that the public confidence architecture was not grounded in the private reality underneath it.

Table 2. Public-to-Private Claim Delta Analysis: Six Core Divergence Points

Lane	Public Version	Private Record	Exhibit	Analytical Effect
Disclosure integrity	Growing confidence; apparent movement toward fuller disclosure; expanding narrative scope	"Only speaking about the parts that are crystal clear and somewhat believable"	EX-I04	Public grand narrative is a managed selection, not transparent disclosure. The "believable" threshold confirms an active filter.
Operator status	Lisa Voldeng as discerning moral gatekeeper, trusted institutional advocate	"The human equivalent of a catch and kill story scheme and a rolling cascade of red flags"	EX-I03	The person certifying the story's credibility to the public was being privately described by the source as a suppressive mechanism.
Fort Carson corroboration	Balis confirmation appearing as emerging independent support lane	Riley contacted Balis first; framed the issue in opening message	EX-T03	Apparent corroboration becomes source-seeded prompt. Status changes from independent to contaminated.
Support environment stability	Unified, confident support environment with growing institutional reach	"There are at least a few people who are pretending in all kinds of ways... some fuckery afoot... It's why I decided to go it alone."	EX-I01	Source privately identified contamination and instability while public still saw unified confidence front.
Anti-investigator narrative	Public operator environment framed this investigator as manipulator, criminal, and	Source treated those accusations as absurd; said operator had "painted herself into a corner" and was "desperate"	EX-I05; multiple exchanges	The public accusation layer was not a stable extension of the source's own private understanding. Parts of it were operator-

	operative			environment speech.
Live broadcast motivation	March 30, 2026 broadcast framed as truth-driven accountability event	"I just need to fill the void." / "The Natives are restless." / "Gonna need to do something this Sunday or the Threads gang might tar and feather me."	Pre-live DMs	Audience management and platform retention were documented private motivations for the event. Public and private framings describe the same event in incompatible terms.

SECTION 2.7

Domestic, Financial, and Reputational Pressure Context

The domestic and financial lane requires careful handling because it is so easily weaponized in either direction. Public defenders of the source can dismiss it as character attack. Critics can overuse it as divorce and custody conflict automatically disprove unrelated abuse testimony. The record supports a narrower and more defensible claim: the domestic lane is indispensable context, not a standalone rebuttal.

Oklahoma court records confirm the divorce case FD-2021-223 was filed April 15, 2021, and closed March 15, 2023, with a subsequent amended decree. Multiple court entries document appearances for counsel, continuances, child support, custody matters, and the release of house-sale funds. These are not rumors. They are stable indicators of a live adversarial domestic environment that was active during the same period the public narrative intensified.

The private archive fills in the interpretive layer. In the internal exchanges, Riley tells this investigator that

Pearleen was draining accounts and that he drained them first. He says child support came out of his check directly and that claims to the contrary were "a straight up lie" (Screenshot-Derived Internal Ledger, Batch 5; EX-I07). He says that the bulk of charges against him were "dropped and then expunged" (EX-I09). He frames the ex-wife lane not as a background problem but as an active form of pressure. Pearleen Riley's public statements on the @nae.nae419 Threads account simultaneously describe years of difficulty serving him, unpaid obligations, children used as documentation instruments, and her daughter's statement that her father "joined a cult."

The analytical significance is twofold. First, it places the grand narrative inside a context of active grievance rather than distant memory. A person fighting active litigation over money, custody, and reputation while simultaneously building a totalizing public abuse narrative is not operating in a neutral emotional environment. Second, the private archive shows how fragments of ordinary life conflict can be absorbed into a larger persecution framework. Once everything is interpreted through suppression, institutional betrayal, and operator compromise, domestic conflict becomes not just one problem among others but part of the same explanatory world — which further reinforces the totalizing quality of the narrative and makes specific factual correction feel like general attack.

SECTION 2.8

The Cost of the Attack: Journalist-Targeted Harassment

The harassment documented around this investigation is not random noise. It follows a recognizable pattern in which an investigator becomes a pressure point once a story that many people publicly invested in starts to fail. The attacks produced during the Riley investigation were structurally predictable given the specific kind of community the story had built — a prediction supported by the documented research literature on journalist-targeted online abuse.

CPJ's U.S. journalist safety documentation (updated January 2026) describes a threat environment shaped by political polarization and the growth of domestic extremism. PEN America's 2025 newsroom guide documents coordinated cyber mobs, doxing, impersonation, and threats that migrate between online and physical spaces. UNESCO's 2025 survey found 75% of journalist respondents had experienced online violence in connection with their work and 42% had linked online abuse to offline harm. Reporters Without Borders documented 100 journalist deepfake cases in February 2026, with women accounting for 74% — a finding pointing to gendered targeting as a distinct amplification layer within the general harassment pattern.

The most superficially confusing element of the harassment pattern in this case — that the most aggressive attacks came from people who had already concluded the story was false rather than from those who still believed it — is actually the most structurally predictable feature. The literature on belief disconfirmation (Cooper & Fazio, 1984; Tavris & Aronson, 2007) describes how people who publicly invest in a belief and watch it collapse often manage the resulting social cost by redirecting embarrassment toward the person whose reporting made the collapse visible. The journalist becomes the symbol of the embarrassment rather than the person who documented the evidence. Attacking the investigator allows others to process the story's failure without examining their own role in the story's success.

In this case, both camps converged on the same target: those who still believed attacked because the investigation was documenting collapse; those who no longer believed attacked because proximity to the source reminded them of their own prior investment. Both attacks served emotional functions that had nothing to do with the evidence.

Table 3. Harassment Mode Analysis: Documented Patterns in Journalist-Targeted Online Attacks

Harassment Mode	How It Functions	Why It Works
Dogpiling	Large numbers of accounts deploy mockery, accusation, or moral pressure simultaneously	Creates exhaustion; target never responds to any single argument, only to volume. Normal response looks inadequate at any scale.

Role reversal	Investigator reframed as abuser, exploiter, or operative in the story	Protects prior belief by converting scrutiny into misconduct. Collapse of the story becomes the investigator's fault, not the story's structural failure.
Motive flooding	Arguments focus on why the investigator acted rather than on what the evidence shows	Shifts the arena from facts to personality, where the investigator is permanently on the defensive and the record becomes irrelevant.
Impersonation and rumor extension	Claims about what the investigator said, meant, planned, or coordinated move faster than corrections	Exploits platform speed and fragmented attention. The correction almost never catches the original allegation at the same scale.
Status punishment	Investigator treated as socially contaminated by proximity to collapsed story	Allows others to publicly signal distance from a collapsing narrative without examining their own role in amplifying it.
Dual-front attack	Attacks come simultaneously from those who still believe and those who stopped believing	Two camps have different grievances but converge on the same target. Investigator absorbs pressure from both directions without satisfying either.
Suppression of investigative output	Specific investigation products are removed from accessible spaces and labeled as contaminated	Documented in this case: four-hour investigative interview suppressed through r/saschariley, framed as "intentional dilution of facts" and "massive red flag." Goal was not to rebut but to prevent questions from reaching the audience.

KEY FINDING 2.8 – HARASSMENT PATTERN

This investigator became a target because he occupied the most structurally unstable position in the story. He was close enough to the source relationship to collect material others could not obtain. He was far enough from blind endorsement to keep testing the claims throughout. He was public enough to absorb projection from multiple camps simultaneously. And he was persistent enough to continue documenting the collapse after it became socially uncomfortable. That

combination — access, skepticism, visibility, and persistence — is the exact profile that attracts attack from more than one direction simultaneously. The attacks document the investigation's effectiveness as much as they document the attackers' motives.

References

Barile, T. (2026). *Riley Protocol case study modules I–XVI*. The Fallout with TBS. thefalloutwithtbs.substack.com

Chan, J. K., Lin, C. C., Wan, C., & Chong, Y. Y. (2024). A systematic review on the relationship between socioeconomic conditions and emotional disorder symptoms during COVID-19. *BMC Psychology, 12*, 237.

Chaiken, S., & Maheswaran, D. (1994). Heuristic processing can bias systematic processing: Effects of source credibility, argument ambiguity, and task importance on attitude judgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(3), 460–473.

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2026, January 26). *U.S. journalist safety kit*. CPJ. <https://cpj.org>

Cooper, J., & Fazio, R. H. (1984). A new look at dissonance theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 17, pp. 229–266). Academic Press.

Dystopeka.com. (2026, February 2). Unpacking the Sascha Riley disinformation machine. Dystopeka.

Feldman, M. D. (2000). Munchausen by Internet: Detecting factitious illness and crisis on the Internet. *Southern Medical Journal, 93*(7), 669–672.

Jane Goodall Institute. (n.d.). *Roots and Shoots history*. <https://www.janegoodall.org/roots-shoots>

Kunda, Z. (1990). The case for motivated reasoning. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(3), 480–498.

Lawlor, A., & Kirakowski, J. (2014). When the lie is the truth: Grounded theory analysis of an online support group for factitious disorder. *Psychiatry Research, 218*(1–2), 209–218.

Leonard, E. (2026, January 21–22). *Riley findings*. The Panicked Writer Substack.

Liles, J. (2026, January 21). *Snopes investigation: Sascha Riley*. Snopes. <https://www.snopes.com>

Mousoulidou, M., Christodoulou, A., Argyrides, M., & Christodoulides, P. (2024). Internet and social media addictions in the post-pandemic era: Consequences for mental well-being and self-esteem. *Social Sciences*, *13*(12), 699.

Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of General Psychology*, *2*(2), 175–220.

PEN America. (2024, April 3). *The power of peer support: Helping journalists persevere in the face of online abuse*. PEN America.

PEN America & Coalition Against Online Violence. (2025, November). *Best practices for news organizations: How to protect and support journalists harassed online*. PEN America.

PEN America & Consumer Reports. (2025, May 21). *Treating online abuse like spam: How platforms can reduce exposure to abuse while protecting free expression*. PEN America.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). *Communication and persuasion: Central and peripheral routes to attitude change*. Springer-Verlag.

Pulman, A., & Taylor, J. (2012). Munchausen by Internet: Current research and future directions. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *14*(4), e115.

Reporters Without Borders. (2026, February). *Analysis of 100 deepfakes targeting journalists*. RSF. <https://rsf.org>

Ringlein, G. V., Ettman, C. K., & Stuart, E. A. (2024). Income or job loss and psychological distress during the COVID-19 pandemic. *JAMA Network Open*, *7*(7), e2424601.

Robinson, L. (2026, January 16). Sascha Riley and the long hangover of the Satanic Panic. *Not Peer Reviewed*.

Selle, S. (2026, January 22). *Independent investigation: Sascha Riley*. Narrative Recovery Initiative Substack.

Smith, M., & Pazder, L. (1980). *Michelle remembers*. Congdon & Lattes.

Tavris, C., & Aronson, E. (2007). *Mistakes were made (but not by me)*. Harcourt.

UNESCO. (2025, December 11). *Tipping point: The chilling escalation of violence against women in the public sphere in the age of AI*. UNESCO.

Wang, Y., & Zeng, Y. (2024). Relationship between loneliness and internet addiction: A meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health*, 24, 858.

Yates, G. P., & Feldman, M. D. (2016). Factitious disorder: A systematic review of 455 cases in the professional literature. *General Hospital Psychiatry*, 41, 20–28.

Zadrozny, B. (2026, April). *Investigation: Sascha Riley*. MS NOW.

The Riley Protocol: A Forensic Mixed-Methods Case Study
April 2026 · Submitted for Congressional Reference
Investigator: Troy Barile · The Fallout with TBS

Standalone research document
Not for redistribution without
authorization
Contact: thegoodarchivist@gmail.com