Summary: Tore Says “Mockingbird Demonstrated” Video

Oct 22, 2026 · @Dianna

Overview

This is a video from **Tore Says**, an independent researcher and broadcaster with about 90,800 subscribers. It premiered October 22, 2026, and runs about 1 hour 44 minutes. It is made like a documentary. She narrates, shows screenshots of posts, and plays clips from recorded Zoom calls.

Her main idea in one sentence: Tore says she recorded and published Zoom calls of left-wing activists and federal workers first. A much bigger account called **“Data Republican”** later got the credit, and millions of views, without naming her.

1. Her record of reporting to authorities

She opens by listing the times she says she gave information to officials:

- **2017:** Reports to the Justice Department, State Department, Homeland Security, the White House, Congress, and the Senate. Topics included North Dakota funding and voting machine certification.
- **2020–2021:** Zoom calls sent to the FBI before January 6, and information given to Chris Miller (then acting Defense Secretary).
- **Sept. 2023:** Evidence to Congress about Biden family business dealings.
- **Jan. 2026:** Protest chat documents sent to the FBI.
- **Oct. 2026:** Recordings handed to the House Judiciary Committee, and material sent to the IRS and FBI.

2. Who published first

This is the heart of the video. She compares her posts with Data Republican’s, date by date:

- **“Color revolution” (a protest movement used to topple a government):** She says she used the phrase about the U.S. in April 2024. Data Republican’s thread came in November 2025.
- **Training abroad:** Her Zoom call announcement in October 2025 got about 8,700 views. Sixteen days later, Data Republican called the same angle “unreported.” That thread got 4.4 million views.
- **Her book *Inside Job: A Color Revolution Domesticated*** (May 12, 2026, 381 pages) covered No Kings, researcher Erica Chenoweth, and the “3.5% rule.” That rule is the idea that a protest movement wins if 3.5% of people join. Five months later, Data Republican called this her “biggest discovery.”
- **The DSA (Democratic Socialists of America):** Tore called them the “rank and file” in September. Six weeks later, Data Republican called them “foot soldiers.”
- She lists **five pairs** like this. In each one, the later post does not name her work.

3. Where the recordings came from

There is a public dispute over who made the recordings:

- **Tore** says her team recorded calls across the country and holds a "very large" collection. She says she was even a trainer on one call. She says some of her files were accessed without permission, and she planned to file a complaint with the FBI's online crime unit.
- **SK33**, an account Data Republican credits, says they screen-recorded the meetings themselves, and that "no one stole anyone's information."
- **Data Republican** said one lead had an AI tool that recorded everything and accidentally made a public Google link. She described about 250 gigabytes of material.

She explains **"chain of custody,"** meaning a record of who handled evidence, when, and why. Courts want proof of where a recording came from: the original files, transfer logs, and "hashes," which are digital fingerprints that show whether two copies match.

4. How the story spread and changed

- She shows large accounts that shared Data Republican's thread, including Cynical Publius, Lara Logan, James McDaniel, Flopping Aces, and Colonel Towner Watkins.
- Cynical Publius turned it into a "five-step coup plan" and called it "the next Fort Sumter." He also admitted he did not know the source.
- She says each repost made the story **firmer than the original**. For example, Data Republican later said the governors were **not** in a plot to destroy the Constitution. That correction did not travel as far.
- **Her view count math:** Data Republican's post and 8 big reshares got about 2.9 million views. Her 10 posts that day got about 16,300. That is about **180 to 1**.

5. Signs of organized sharing

- She found groups of accounts repeating the same sentences within minutes.
- Cynical Publius openly asked people to tag Elon Musk. More than 1,400 quote-posts followed in one day.
- She looks at account ages and posting rates. Some accounts post 100 to 500 times a day.
- She is careful here. She says a copied headline could come from an organized push **or** just excited readers. She does not claim she proved fake accounts.

6. Background on influence campaigns

She uses real research to explain how messages spread:

- **DISARM**, a framework for describing disinformation tactics.
- **RAND's "firehose of falsehood,"** about Russian propaganda that relies on volume and repetition.
- The **Senate Intelligence Committee** report on Russian troll accounts.
- **JTRIG**, a British spy unit revealed in the Snowden leaks. It used fake posts to damage reputations.

- The **Church Committee** of the 1970s and "Operation Mockingbird," the CIA's past ties to journalists.
- The Army's three kinds of propaganda: "white" (source named), "gray" (source hidden), and "black" (false source).

7. Her questions about Data Republican

- The Pentagon said Data Republican was a **"special government employee"** from July. She also ran a paid newsletter at $3 a month and released a book, *Unelected*, on October 20. Tore asks whether this broke ethics rules about using a public job for private gain.
- Data Republican said she **resigned** October 2. Tore says she was **fired**.
- A State Department official, Sarah Rogers, disputed Data Republican's claim of being "entrapped." Rogers published the documents, and Data Republican removed her posts.
- Data Republican's **map of activist groups** drew criticism. Its own disclaimer says some links are guesses. Tore says an audit found about 21.8% of the links were "inferred."

8. Attacks on her personally

- She shows replies calling her a "grifter" or a "cult" leader, plus insults about her body.
- She plays a clip of activist Ali Alexander bragging about ruining opponents.
- She says someone made a fake account using her name.
- She says she has had **FISA and FBI warrants** on her (FISA is a type of secret surveillance warrant). She also says people were "tasked" to harass her.

9. Clips from the recorded calls

She plays short parts of the recordings themselves:

- A report from a meeting in Italy of protest leaders from countries like Chile, Serbia, Georgia, and Hungary.
- A federal workers' union session. One organizer says she used **agency email and agency Zoom** to invite people.
- Former USAID staff describing how they organized before the 2025 inauguration.
- A speaker describing a **memo for governors**. It says that if the federal government becomes "illegitimate," governors could take over leading the country. He says it reached California, Illinois, and Massachusetts, and stresses it is "not secession."
- A trainer teaching an old **CIA "Simple Sabotage" manual** for slowing down meetings.

10. Her closing message

- Her work is paid for by viewers. She has no sponsors.
- Credit matters because the person who gathered the evidence is the one who can **testify** to it.
- She compares her work to a building made brick by brick, then claimed by someone with a bigger platform.

Honest notes

- This is **one side of a personal dispute**. Data Republican and SK33 say they gathered the material on their own.
- The view counts come from her own screenshots.
- Her claims about **stolen files** and **FISA warrants** are her statements. The video does not show proof of them.
- The call clips are short. The full recordings and their sources are still the open question she keeps raising herself.

Question: If there is evidence in a court of law, does it matter who presents it?

Yes, it does matter, but not in the way social media treats it. A court doesn't care who got the most views or who "discovered" something first. It cares whether someone can **prove the evidence is real**. Usually only certain people can do that.

1. Someone has to vouch for it. Before a recording can be used, someone must show it is what it claims to be. This is called "authentication." Usually that is the person who made the recording, or someone who can explain how it was made and kept. A person who only reposted it can't do this.

2. The chain of custody has to hold up. The court wants to know who had the file, when, and whether it was changed. Gaps in that record make evidence weaker, or can get it thrown out.

3. The witness gets questioned. The other side's lawyer will cross-examine whoever presents the evidence. If that person has a shaky history or a reason to lie, the evidence can lose weight, even if it is real.

4. How it was gathered matters. This is a big one for Zoom recordings. Some states, **including California**, require *everyone* on a call to agree before it is recorded. A recording made without that consent can be illegal. In California it generally can't be used in court. Other states and federal law only need one person on the call to agree.

How this fits the Tore Says video: She has a fair point. The person who actually made a recording is the one who can testify to it, and a big account that reshared it can't. But being able to testify doesn't settle everything. The recording still has to have been made legally, and the custody record still has to hold up.

Note: This is general information, not legal advice. In a real case, a court or an attorney would decide these questions.