

PART III OF III

Integrated Forensic Assessment

The combined record, the final credibility assessment, and the implications for investigative practice

ABSTRACT — PART III

Part III presents the final integrated forensic assessment combining the public-record analysis of Part I and the private-archive findings of Part II. It provides a dual-clock master chronology distinguishing public disclosure events from internal knowledge inflection points, a formal multi-dimensional credibility failure analysis, the case lifecycle model documenting how the narrative was built, sustained, and failed, a final forensic assessment statement, and implications for investigative practice and congressional use. The final assessment is harder than either the public or private record alone could support: the Riley narrative was composite, narratively managed, and sustained by a support environment that substituted atmospheric seriousness for durable documentary foundation across every major corroboration lane. That conclusion is now supported from four independent analytical directions — public-record baseline failure, named-person chronology mismatch, private-archive instability and self-curation, and the Balis corroboration contamination — and survives the removal of any single element without becoming weaker in its core claim.

Keywords: forensic comparative analysis, convergent evidence, credibility collapse, case lifecycle, dual-clock chronology, implications for practice

SECTION 3.1

Master Chronology: Dual-Clock Event Sequence

The following chronology maintains two simultaneous clocks. The **public disclosure clock** tracks events that were visible to outside observers: when claims surfaced, when the amplification wave began, when independent reviews published, and when the public rupture occurred. The **investigator knowledge clock** tracks when specific private facts became known through the inside-access methodology: when the source identified instability, when the operator distrust surfaced, when the Balis chronology became visible, and when the inside assessment shifted. The difference between these clocks is not a minor process note. It is the primary defense against the claim that the final assessment is hindsight certainty retroactively applied to a record that always looked this way.

- JUNE 1973
Birth — Manuel Sascha Barros, Germany PUBLIC
Verified through adoption papers reviewed by multiple independent researchers.
- 1978
Adoption — Greene County, Tennessee PUBLIC
Adopted by William Kyle Riley and Irene U. Riley (née Liske). Confirmed across multiple independent document reviews.
- 1991–2016 (APPROX.)
U.S. Army service — approximately 21 years PUBLIC
DD-214 confirmed by Snopes. Address history consistent with Fort Bragg, Fort Carson, and Fort Sill. Three Iraq War deployments reported. Military service appears genuine.
- MAY 28, 2009
Fort Carson CSAM arrests — documented public record PUBLIC
Denver Post confirmed two Fort Carson soldiers arrested on child-pornography charges. Real bounded event that later became the anchor for a much larger narrative construction.
- APRIL 15, 2021

Divorce filed — Comanche County, Case FD-2021-223 PUBLIC

Contested proceedings. Closed March 15, 2023. Minor children involved. Disputed 529 account. Documented child support obligations. Five months before first public posting wave.

SEPTEMBER 2, 6, 7, 18, 2021

First major public Facebook posting wave KEY EVENT

Core allegations including named elite figures enter public record. Intimate register establishes source voice before the most explosive claims arrive. Snopes confirmed these predate Voldeng recordings by years. Address history at the time places Riley in Duncan, Oklahoma, active voter registration.

JULY 19-24, 2025

Voldeng records six audio interviews with Riley PUBLIC

Six sessions totaling approximately six hours under the Outlaws of Chivalry Substack umbrella. Riley later stated his police deposition was "markedly different" from what he gave in these sessions.

NOVEMBER 23-24, 2025

Voldeng publishes — story goes internationally viral KEY EVENT

Published to ~72,000 subscribers. International media follows within weeks: Hindustan Times, Sunday Guardian Live, Times Now, News24. The New Republic describes Riley as a "decorated Iraq War veteran." Hundreds of thousands of readers encounter the story.

JANUARY 16-22, 2026

Independent reviews begin publishing PUBLIC

Dr. Laura Robinson (Not Peer Reviewed, Jan. 16). Snopes investigation published January 21 — "no credible evidence"; confirms DD-214, adoption, Fort Carson secondary anchor; documents William H. Riley name conflation. Ellie Leonard and Sue Selle independent reviews January 21–22. Dystopeka.com February 2.

MARCH 30, 2026

Five-hour live broadcast — controlling on-record account KEY EVENT

Under sustained questioning: William H. Riley bridge narrowed [48:01–48:09]; Jim Jordan certainty acknowledged as uncertain [55:37–55:49]; Bill Clinton flagged as memory not solid [18:56–19:15]; police deposition described as "markedly different" [18:15–18:47]; UN/Hague submission confirmed as never shown to source [6:53–6:58]; congressional contact narrowed to one phone call [1:37:38–1:38:14].

MARCH 10, 2026

Private archive begins — operator relationships surface INTERNAL

Internal Transcript Archive A captures discussion about Lisa, Croman, and surrounding actors. Private knowledge clock diverges from public disclosure clock for the first time in this investigation.

MARCH 23, 2026

Source identifies pretending actors; decides to go it alone INTERNAL

EX-I01: "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." First private contamination marker; predates public rupture by 18 days.

LATE MARCH 2026

Source narrows George lane; redirects to Lisa INTERNAL

EX-I02: "I only know George slightly... Lise is a different story." EX-I05: "I don't think Lisa is being straightforward. Too many red flags and contradicting statements."

LATE MARCH 2026

Balis outreach screenshot recovered — critical contamination event INTERNAL

EX-T03: Screenshot shows Riley contacting Michael Balis first, identifying himself, naming Habel, framing content in opening message. Reclassifies Fort Carson corroboration bridge. This is the most probative single exhibit in the full case file.

MARCH 10, 2026

Voldeng publicly severs ties with Riley KEY EVENT

"Best of luck to you. I hold no ill will." Two days before Riley's scheduled independent media appearance. Comments closed same day. The break came not when evidentiary problems became clear — those were documented months earlier — but when the source began moving outside operator control toward independent media.

APRIL 9-11, 2026

Private message corpus — Ireland INTERNAL

Source describes finances depleted, adoptive father Bill Riley's recent death, plans for live public polygraph, and strategic team-operation planning. Confirms: "My online persona is different than my real life persona. Online is more accurate." Personal investment in narrative remains fully active.

○ POST-ARTICLE REASSESSMENT

Source describes operator as catch-and-kill equivalent INTERNAL

EX-I03: "The human equivalent of a catch and kill story scheme and a rolling cascade of red flags." Final decisive private reassessment of operator layer. Internal record no longer supports prior public confidence in operator architecture.

○ APRIL 2026

MS NOW / Brandy Zadrozny investigation publishes KEY EVENT

Independent investigation by a major publication confirms the structural findings documented throughout this case study. Full collapse of the public credibility support structure. Riley Protocol case study submitted for congressional reference.

SECTION 3.2

Formal Credibility Failure Analysis

The final credibility assessment does not rest on one contradiction or one personality judgment. It rests on multiple independent categories of failure converging simultaneously across all three source strata. The following analysis evaluates each credibility dimension against the integrated record. The point is not that a single dimension failed dramatically. The point is that all of them failed at the same time — which is why the story held as long as it did and why it became untenable so quickly.

CREDIBILITY DIMENSION ASSESSMENT — INTEGRATED RECORD (SCALE: 0-100%)

Internal Consistency	14%
External Corroboration	16%

Chronological Plausibility (named persons)	7%
Identity Consistency	48%
Relational Consistency (operator lane)	10%
Evidentiary Responsiveness	9%
Claim Migration / Stability	18%
Source Behavior Under Scrutiny	28%
Public / Private Asymmetry	6%
Verified Biographical Facts	74%

Scores represent the integrated evidentiary assessment across all source strata. Values near 0% indicate structural failure under review; values near 100% indicate the dimension withstood scrutiny. Biographical Facts are separated because they do not carry the event-level narrative claims.

Figure 1. Multi-dimensional credibility assessment across nine categories evaluated against the integrated public and private record. Seven of nine narrative-bearing dimensions scored below 30%, indicating convergent structural failure across independent analytical categories.

Table 1. Formal Credibility Failure Analysis: Dimension, Finding, and Primary Evidence

Credibility Dimension	Finding	Primary Evidence	Effect on Assessment
Internal Consistency	Progressive degradation	EX-I04: source confirmed speaking only to "crystal clear and somewhat believable" parts	Public story was a managed selection; not transparent disclosure
External Corroboration	Asymmetric failure; contaminated lane	Records matrix; EX-T03 (Balis chronology)	Story created appearance of corroboration more reliably than it produced it
Chronological Plausibility	Failed across named-person lane	Named-person report; nine official biographies	Every major named figure mismatches required role, geography, or life stage
Identity Consistency	Partial; real biographical facts,	Adoption papers, DD-214, court records confirmed;	Real identity grounding without narrative-level support

	overextended grand narrative	event-level narrative not carried	
Relational Consistency (operator)	Collapsed in private lane	EX-I01, EX-I02, EX-I03, EX- I05, EX-I07, EX-I08	Source privately dismantled operator relationship while public architecture remained aligned
Evidentiary Responsiveness	Consistently failed	Operator reports; records matrix; Reddit suppression of investigative interview	Scrutiny answered with delegitimization rather than documentary stabilization
Claim Migration / Stability	Visible throughout	Provenance map; transcript escalation pattern; live broadcast narrowing	Specific allegations became totalizing system narratives as pressure rose
Source Behavior Under Scrutiny	Mixed; sincere register with inconsistent content	Forensic inconsistency matrix (14 categories); live timestamp record	Sincerity is not the same as reliability; this case needed reliability
Public/Private Asymmetry	Terminal divergence	All delta exhibits; EX-I01 through EX-I08; all six delta lanes	Public confidence rose while private instability rose faster — the core structural finding

SECTION 3.3

Case Lifecycle Model

Viewed end to end, the Riley matter follows a recognizable lifecycle that is analytically valuable not only for this case but as a documented model for how managed-source narratives develop in digitally amplified

environments. Identifying the phases allows future investigators and editorial decision-makers to recognize the pattern at earlier stages.

Phase 1 — Anchoring. A source enters public space with emotionally vivid, plausibly traumatic material and enough biographical specificity to seem investigable. The early personal fragments, the intimate tone, and the initial survivor framing did this work for Riley. The audience is taught how to receive the source voice before the most explosive allegations arrive.

Phase 2 — Adjacency. The story begins attaching itself to real public scandals, real names, real institutions, and real documented events. The Fort Carson case, the William Riley name in Epstein-adjacent files, the Wexner survivor world, and the broader post-Maxwell climate all provided this adjacency. Real fragments lend legitimacy by association without carrying the larger construction.

Phase 3 — Operator Certification. A gatekeeper begins shaping the story's meaning for the audience. The operator supplies institutional gravity, seriousness, release control, implied prior vetting, and a sense that dangerous truth is being processed by someone with access that ordinary readers lack. In the Riley case, this is the Voldeng phase — November 2025 through March 2026.

Phase 4 — Multiplication. Side channels, timelines, support accounts, comment environments, public letters, and cross-platform repetition convert a source narrative into a social object. The same content moves through Facebook, Threads, Instagram, TikTok commentary, operator letters, and relay accounts. Repetition is mistaken for corroboration.

Phase 5 — Curation Under Pressure. Contradictions begin to surface. Instead of collapsing the story, they produce more selective disclosure. This is where EX-I04 — "only speaking about the parts that are crystal clear and somewhat believable" — becomes so important. The public confidence stage and the internal selection stage are now running on different tracks.

Phase 6 — Fracture. Someone inside the ecosystem recognizes instability. In this case, the source himself: "there are at least a few people who are pretending in all kinds of ways." He decides to "go it alone." The

inside clock and the public clock have now completely diverged.

Phase 7 — Contested Collapse. Publicly the environment becomes louder, more accusatory, and more moralized. The operator severs ties. Press coverage shifts. Independent journalism publishes. Privately, the support bridges are failing faster than the public can see.

Phase 8 — Retrospective Meaning Control. Everyone attempts to rewrite what happened. The operator shifts to blame and danger framing. The source continues the campaign from a new location. Critics and defenders fight over what the collapse means. The investigator documents the whole sequence.

What makes the Riley case unusually valuable for the model is that the internal archive preserves evidence from almost every phase simultaneously. Most managed-source narratives leave only public debris after collapse. Here, the private messages, internal transcripts, and local witness material allow the entire lifecycle to be studied with unusual clarity.

SECTION 3.4

Final Forensic Assessment

The full integrated record supports a harder conclusion than either the public case or the private archive could reach alone. The Riley narrative, as constructed, amplified, and submitted for institutional use, was composite, narratively managed, and sustained by a support environment that gave it far more evidentiary force than the underlying record could bear.

The public version borrowed legitimacy from real fragments — a genuine Fort Carson CSAM case, a real private investigator named Riley in Epstein-adjacent files, documented survivor-world testimony from

the Wexner orbit — and overextended each anchor into an architecture those fragments could not support. The operator environment around Lisa Voldeng did not stabilize the story's evidentiary weaknesses. It amplified them while substituting atmosphere, institutional language, suspense, and moral pressure for durable documentary response. The private archive deepens this conclusion in four independent ways.

First, the source privately identified pretending and instability inside the surrounding support network while the public still saw a unified confidence front. Second, the source curated his public disclosures against a "crystal clear and somewhat believable" threshold, confirming that the visible story was a managed selection. Third, the source privately dismissed the operator as a catch-and-kill mechanism and a rolling cascade of red flags after publicly benefiting from her credibility architecture for months. Fourth, the Balis corroboration lane — the most publicly resilient support bridge in the case — was initiated by the source himself in his own opening message to a purported corroborator, changing it from apparent independent confirmation to a source-seeded, potentially contaminated bridge.

These four findings are from independent analytical directions. They all reach the same place. The story was structurally overextended, privately acknowledged as curated, operator-dependent rather than document-dependent, and fortified by at least one contaminated corroboration bridge. When those conditions obtain simultaneously across a single case, the public narrative cannot be sustained as a documentary grand narrative. That is the final forensic assessment.

FINAL FINDING — THE RILEY PROTOCOL

The Riley narrative, as amplified and submitted for institutional use, cannot be sustained as a documentary grand narrative. The public documentary base is materially thinner than represented. The named-person claims fail stable public-record baseline checks across all nine named figures evaluated. The private record documents systematic narrative curation, operator distrust expressed in the source's own analytical language, and source-initiated outreach that contaminates the most publicly resilient corroboration bridge. The story is most accurately classified as a composite survivor-claim ecosystem that became socially persuasive through managed amplification and lost

forensic credibility under multi-lane comparative review. This finding does not require and does not claim that no harm occurred in the subject's life. It addresses the public grand narrative as amplified to hundreds of thousands of people and placed before congressional offices and law enforcement. That version cannot stand.

SECTION 3.5

Implications for Investigative Practice and Congressional Use

This case study should be read not only as a specific file on the Riley matter but as a model problem for source handling in digitally amplified survivor-adjacent investigations. Several practical lessons follow from the record.

Investigators must classify source strata from the beginning. Public posts, private messages, produced records, operator claims, and third-party reconstructions cannot be allowed to blur into a single evidentiary register. The Riley file shows what happens when social confidence rises before source classification is fixed: readers begin treating every repeated claim as if it lives at the highest documentary level.

Corroboration chronology matters as much as corroboration content. The Balis finding demonstrates why. The identity of who contacted whom first, who framed the issue, whether the witness spoke independently — these are not procedural technicalities. They are the difference between corroboration and contamination. A future investigator must ask, before treating any apparent external support as independent, whether that support was generated inside or outside the source's own outreach.

Operator structures must be analyzed as primary evidence. The public often treats handlers and Substack-style truth intermediaries as secondary to the source. The Riley file shows this is a systematic error. The operator shaped what was released, how doubt was moralized, which critics were delegitimized, and what the audience mistook for vetting. A future investigator encountering a similar structure should evaluate the operator layer as early as the source — and should ask specifically whether the operator's financial and institutional claims are independently supported.

Inside access needs classification, not concealment. One reason this file is strong is that it preserves the investigator's evolving assessment in real time, classified by source stratum rather than hidden or merged with final conclusions. That transparency is not a weakness. It is the most powerful defense against hindsight distortion. Future investigators should preserve rather than erase the process record.

For congressional staff reviewing this material, the architectural finding of this case study stands on its own. The structural features of the Riley narrative — not the specific claims, but the architecture of its construction and distribution — match a documented class of online influence operations. Cases like this are dangerous specifically because they are deployed alongside and against legitimate survivor work. Every time a manufactured narrative is amplified alongside genuine survivor testimony, the credibility cost of any later correction falls on the genuine survivors who did not manufacture anything. That is the highest-stakes implication of this entire file.

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*.

Funman, A., & Taylor, J. (2012). Münchhausen 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.