


[return to updates](#)

The Glen Ridge Rape was faked



by Miles Mathis

First published November 7, 2015

As usual, this is just my opinion, based on personal research of the facts presented to us by the mainstream.

This event allegedly happened in 1989, before the golden age of hoaxes, so we find no exposés of it on Youtube. I could find nothing off Youtube, either, but didn't look past the first pages on a search. So I guess I am in virgin territory here, so to speak. Just where I like to be. The first thing we find is that Glen Ridge is a very wealthy community in New Jersey where the median family income is above \$175,000. Although the population is only about 7,000, Glen Ridge has a long list of notable people, including Buzz Aldrin, Tom Cruise, Edward Mitchell, Cindy Sherman, Kerry Bishé, Alison Stewart, Don van Natta, and [internet hoax artist Mike Z](#). Tom Cruise graduated from the high school at which the event occurred, although he was of course there about a decade earlier. This leads us to the discovery Cruise's father worked as a defense consultant for the Canadian military. In other places this is scrubbed by telling us Cruise's father was an electrical engineer, but Wikipedia admits his father worked for the Canadian military as a defense consultant. The family moved around a lot, which leads us to ask what a defense consultant was doing in Glen Ridge in 1980. There must be a defense facility in the area we aren't told about. Perhaps it is the Picatinny Arsenal about 15 miles to the west. According to their website, they supply all conventional ammunition for the armed forces and 90% of the Army's lethality. Wow.



Also interesting in this regard is actress Kerry Bishé, who had a role in the 2012 CIA movie *Argo*. I see this as a red flag for many reasons. One, the movie is based on the book *Master of Disguise* by Tony Mendez, an admitted CIA operative. Two, the plot of both movie and book includes borrowing a scene from a *Planet of the Apes* movie to allegedly rescue hostages from Iran during the 1980 hostage crisis. Unfortunately, [this event's cover has also been blown by previous researchers](#), who have shown it was staged to embarrass Jimmy Carter and ensure the election of Ronald Reagan. So we have a staged CIA event using a Hollywood movie as part of its cover, and the event is restaged by Hollywood years later for an Oscar-winning movie. If you don't see that as a red flag here, you aren't awake. The people coming out of Glen Ridge are involved in some weird stuff, and that was true both before and after the Rape Case.

The next thing we learn is that one of the boys initially charged with rape in the Glen Ridge case was Richard Corcoran, Jr., son of Glen Ridge's Chief of Detectives. This is curious, is it not? That the Chief of Detectives in this small community would find his own son involved in the event? Well, it gets curiously and curiously. Lieutenant Richard Corcoran, Sr., was in control of investigating the case. We are told he assigned Detective Sheila Byron to the case, but they admit it was *his decision* who to assign, which means he was in ultimate control of the investigation. In 1994 the prosecution against Corcoran Jr. was dropped for no good reason. The reason given was that the victim's family no longer wished to press charges, but five years on that makes no sense. Why had the prosecution of Corcoran not proceeded long before that? Perhaps because Corcoran Sr. had stalled the investigation? Or was it to allow Corcoran Jr. to join Special Forces?

That's right, this same Richard Corcoran, Jr. applied to Special Forces and *was accepted*. How does that work? Is it the custom of Special Forces to admit young men indicted on nine counts of rape and torture? You will say he is innocent until proven guilty, but given that all these young men were found guilty in the press long before their actual convictions, that claim doesn't hold much water. Remember, Corcoran was accused by the victim herself in courtroom testimony of actually wielding the stick that penetrated her, so it is difficult to understand how he could not be one of the major players here or how he could not be one of the first ones taken to trial. Seeing that according to the mainstream story, Corcoran appears to have skated based on good fortune more than anything—or more likely the influence of his family—it is somewhat astonishing to find Special Forces considering him a good candidate. I have had friends go into Special Forces, and they background check you all the way to Mars and back. The Glen Ridge event was a huge national story, so there is no way they overlooked it. I suspect they knew something about the event we didn't: namely, that it never happened.

What you need to know here is that Special Forces is closely linked to the CIA, since both their operations include covert ops and various other intelligence operations. Special Forces historically

came out of the OSS and CIA. So to see Corcoran Jr. accepted into Special Forces after the Glen Ridge event is a *huge* red flag.

But the mystery doesn't quit, since in 2005 [this same Richard Corcoran allegedly killed himself](#) in an attempted murder/suicide near Ft. Bragg. To get to that story requires you go to the Wayback Machine, since it has been memoryholed by *The New York Daily News* and the Associated Press. We also learn from that story that Corcoran won a \$200,000 settlement from Essex County in 1997 for malicious prosecution. That's right, not only did Corcoran mysteriously dodge prosecution despite testimony from the victim that he wielded the stick that penetrated her, he actually became \$200,000 richer from the event. Given all that, do you believe this Richard Corcoran really died in 2005 at age 34? I don't.

What I suspect is that Corcoran Sr., the Chief Detective of Glen Ridge, also had a military or Intelligence background, and that he was linked somehow to a nearby base. The event would then have been coordinated from there. That is the way it is normally done. Curiously, a people search on this Richard Corcoran pulls up nothing at Intelius. There is no Richard E. Corcoran of his age listed as ever having lived in New Jersey or Glen Ridge. So Intelius has been scrubbed. If we go to InstantCheckmate, we *do* find a listing for him. He is 69 and has the same relatives as his son. He is also listed as having lived in Henderson, Nevada. This is curious in the extreme, seeing that Nevada is famous for its secret military bases—and not just Area51. There is a large area south of Henderson blacked out in a Google Search. Beyond that, an unmarked base nearby was recently discovered by locals, [making Youtube in 2013](#). If we take that info back to Intelius, we find that his son of the same name has also lived in Henderson.

The next curious thing we find is that a book was soon written about the Glen Ridge saga. The book was called *Our Guys*: and its main point is that guys like this are everywhere, in schools all over the country, in your home town, and just waiting to repeat horrific crimes like this. In the promotion we are told,

What's ultimately most shocking about this crime is how ordinary it was, how predictable—how in one way or another it's happening now, all across America.

Not only sensationalistic, but absolutely false, as we will see below. It *isn't* happening, because if it were they wouldn't have to fake it, would they?

The author, Bernard Lefkowitz, couldn't find any interest in the book from big New York publishers and had to settle for the University of Nebraska Press. In 2006, Steven Hart from *Opinion Mill* asked him about this, finding it odd that such a high profile case with so much publicity wouldn't interest a major publisher. No good answer was forthcoming. But I have a suggestion. University of Nebraska is in Lincoln and also has a presence in nearby Omaha. Offutt Air Force Base is between the two cities. This is headquarters of the US Strategic Command, but in 1989 it also was headquarters of the Strategic Intelligence Wing. So it is possible Intelligence has its hand in U. of Nebraska Press. No, make that *probable*. Intelligence has its hand in all US publishing.

Lefkowitz is a curious character as well, having taught journalism at Columbia and also having been an assistant editor at the *New York Post*. *The Post* was run by the granddaughter of Jakob Schiff until 1976, when it was bought by Rupert Murdoch. Lefkowitz had been in the Peace Corps. All these things are potential red flags, as we know. But it is the Jewish connection that is most curious. He is Jewish of course, and it turns out the University of Nebraska Press has strong connections to the Jewish community, although we aren't sure why or how. It has a collaborative arrangement with the Jewish


Publication Society.

A movie was then made based on Lefkowitz' book. See the under title photo above. Usually, when you see a movie made from a book like this—one based on a sensational headline story—that is more indication the event was faked. Hollywood was an Intelligence creation from day one, and one of the reasons it was created was to make films to back up their propaganda projects. First they run a fake event, then they hire someone to back it up with a book, then they make a film from the book. Each time the story is retold, another layer of lies and emotions can be added.

Now let's look at the event itself. The victim was said to be a mentally retarded girl, but with more research we discover she was co-captain of the high school's junior varsity softball team. Since captain is normally an elected position, it is strange to find a challenged girl in this position. It is also claimed she had been raped six years earlier. She would have been only 11 then. She is now said to work in a department store in that same town. Again, this would be impossible given her IQ of either 49 or 63. She was said to have the mental capacity of a 2nd grader, and department stores do not hire 2nd graders. A person with an IQ of 49 could not even be trusted with unsupervised janitorial work. Retarded girls like this are not allowed to roam the streets alone now, and they were not in 1989. Remember, she was not living in a poor community where her family could not afford to care for her. She was living in an affluent community where no one was that poor. Glen Ridge does not have a bad side of town or a wrong side of the tracks. According to the book written by Lefkowitz, the victim's mother put her on the pill because she feared she was an easy target for rapists. Right. That's what I would do with my challenged daughter, wouldn't you? Give her the pill and a bag of condoms and send her out to wander the streets alone in search of a stickball game.

The spread in the IQ number is also a red flag. Why do we get conflicting numbers? They should have either reported the results of her most recent test or tested her again prior to trial. In either case, we should have only one number, not two. These changing numbers are another red flag, indicating the numbers are just being made up to suit the current phase of the story.

The ringleaders were said to be twin brothers, Kevin and Kyle Scherzer. They were the quarterback and linebacker on the football team, and were the top dogs of the school as you might expect. They were good looking. This is Kyle Scherzer now, at about age 40:



He apparently landed a job right out of prison in 1999 with Dura-lift Elevators and has remained at that company for 16 years in the same part of New Jersey (Sayreville). Does that sound right to you? Do you think if this event had been real Kyle Scherzer could find a prominent job only about 30 miles away?

I found only [one sensible comment in all my research](#):

Many people refused to believe the events had happened. One female classmate summed up

this opinion by saying, "You can't picture them doing it.... It's not like they have problems getting girls." (Greenburg).

In that one report, we get two major clues. Not everyone on the ground believed the event. Not even the girls who attended the high school believed it. But we rarely heard from them. And why didn't they believe it? *Because it wasn't believable*. Why would the handsome quarterback rape a retarded girl? He has his pick of dozens of hot girls, so why would he be interested in this retarded girl? The story makes no sense in dozens of basic ways. It is full of huge holes. That one hole was the first red flag that led me into this hoax.

The next curious thing we learn about the event is that a juror was allegedly dismissed for saying [she didn't believe expert witnesses who testified for the prosecution](#). What? That isn't grounds for dismissing a juror. Jurors are free to believe or not believe testimony. Jurors are like a panel of citizen judges: do you think judges have to believe everything people on the stand tell them? No. If that were the case, how could a judge ever find someone in contempt? People lie on the stand all the time, and part of the point of a trial is to ferret out those lies, so the truth may prevail. Dismissing jurors for not believing testimony is the height of legal absurdity, and isn't believable itself.

The event didn't go to trial until *three years later*. Despite that, the US press picked up the story within six weeks, immediately turning it into a media circus and often—no, *always*—assuming the guilt of the boys. No one in the press questioned whether the story happened at all, and given that the entire event depended on the testimony of the victim, this should have been a question.

Also curious is the way information was leaked to the press. In a real investigation, that wouldn't happen. Until the trial was over, all information was no better than hearsay and innuendo, and a scrupulous press wouldn't print it. Beyond that, neither the prosecution nor the defense in a real case would wish to dump all their evidence in the press, since that is just giving ammunition to the other side. For instance, in your local town, they have trials all the time. Does the local newspaper publish all the details of the event before it has gone to trial? No, because they can't *know* all the details until they come out in the trial, and the trial can't legally be reported until it is over. Until it is over, none of the facts are really known, since they have been *decided*. Even the investigators don't know the truth until near the end, if then. And what they do know they aren't going to tell the papers. Why? Because it would prejudice the jury and give aid to the defense. Only in fake events do we see all the information spilled in the press long before anything goes to trial. This is because that is the point of the fake event: get it into the papers as soon as possible and keep it there for as long as possible.

Not only did the victim's story keep changing in testimony, but the mainstream story now has several variations. I searched on the story on Google, reading accounts of the events from several sources, including Wikipedia, Philly.com and the *New York Times*. They were all different. Wikipedia tells us Chris Archer and the Scherzers were the only ones charged. [But they do not mention Peter Quigley](#), who the NYT tells us was one of five originally arrested. Since he was 18, his name could be printed. What happened to him? Wikipedia tells us Paul Archer was not charged, while Wikia tells us he plead guilty.

You may be interested to know that this same Peter Quigley who was arrested for raping a retarded girl and who found his name in the *New York Times* for it, ended up being a CPA and is now Vice President at UBS Financial in Farmingdale, NJ. That stands for Union Bank Switzerland, the second largest bank in the world. UBS Financial merged with Paine Webber in 2000, making it the top asset management firm in the world. UBS is now famous for many things, including trading in stolen assets during WW2.

More recently it has been at the center of all the messes since 2007, including the sub-prime mortgage crisis, LIBOR, etc. The response from governments has been to infuse these large banks with money directly from the national treasuries to “save” them. This looks so convenient, some have proposed the entire crisis was another hoax, created expressly to allow these treasury thefts. But however that may be, it is highly suspicious to find Peter Quigley involved at such a high level with UBS. It is yet another huge red flag in the case. Ask yourself how likely it is that someone with Quigley's terrible local reputation in New Jersey could not only continue to work there, but advance up the corporate ladder with such alacrity. The only explanation that comes to my mind is that Quigley's bosses knew his early blemish was a hoax. They were probably closely tied to those who ran the hoax. That is the logical assumption, given the facts we have been given.

You will say, “How do you know this is the same Peter Quigley? There must be more than one.” I know because I did the research. You can, too. [Go to Intelius and enter the name and New Jersey](#). It's all there. He is the only Peter Quigley in New Jersey in that age group, and he has both Glen Ridge and Farmingdale on his list. Curiously, he also has Nags Head, NC, on his list. You know who else has Nags Head on their list? Both Paul and Christopher Archer (see below). What are the odds that three major players in this event would up in the same small town in North Carolina, 600 miles away? What is in Nags Head, anyway? Well, according to Wikipedia itself, [Nags Head is the location of a CIA fake defectors program](#). In case that gets scrubbed, I have given you the direct link out of Wiki. I don't see any indicator these guys were fake defectors, but if the CIA is in that location, they can run whatever projects they like. And there is certainly a link, because although these guys aren't fake *defectors*, they are indeed refugees from a recent fake event.

With more research, we find additional strange things concerning Quigley. In Feb. 1993, *The New York Times* [reported Quigley](#) was supposed to have been a witness for the prosecution, in effect turning State's Evidence in exchange for a plea bargain. We are told he plead guilty to a lesser charge in exchange for testimony against Kevin Scherzer. But this is where it gets weird. We are told the prosecution thought the defense team was going to call Quigley, the prosecutors planning to cross examine him afterwards. When the defense rested without calling Quigley, prosecution could not then call him because he wasn't on their list. So Quigley never got called. No lawyer would buy that story. No prosecutor is that stupid. The prosecutor was in desperate need of someone present at the crime to confirm the victim's story, and Quigley was that person. There is no way they would gamble that defense would call him, since defense would have no reason to call him. His story could not possibly help them. Like the rest, this published account of the trial makes no legal sense.

Beyond that, it appears that Quigley dodged charges for even these lesser offenses. Although he plead guilty to them, we aren't ever told he was charged for them or went to trial. When we are given a list of convictions at the end of the event, there is no mention of Quigley being convicted of these lesser charges. If he plead guilty to them, the conviction would be slam dunk. Why don't we hear of it?

We get a similar incredible story concerning Paul Archer, brother of Chris. Like Quigley, we are told he plead guilty to lesser charges in exchange for testimony. But then “he testified as a defense witness”. *The defense cannot offer a plea-bargain*. Only the prosecution can offer a plea-bargain. Do you think the prosecution would offer Archer a plea-bargain so that he could appear for the defense and undercut the prosecution by telling the jury the girl “initiated the encounter and enjoyed the acts”? The whole story told by the *New York Times* is a legal absurdity.

And again, we are never told Paul Archer was convicted of anything. Why plea-bargain with him and then fail to take him to trial for the slam-dunk conviction on the lesser charges he has plead guilty to?

In this way, we see why the various mainstream sources seem contradictory, some saying he was not charged and some saying he plead guilty. *Both are true.* He plead guilty and then was not charged. It isn't the accounts that are contradictory, it is the story that makes no sense. Who pleads guilty and then is not charged? People in fake events, I guess.

For more indication of this, we can look at his brother Christopher Archer's subsequent history. Intelius tells that Christopher K. Archer, age 43, related to Paul Archer, has lived in Glen Ridge, Colorado Springs, Virginia Beach, Takoma Park, MD, and Nags Head, NC. That's curious, seeing that the area of Virginia Beach is simply stiff with military bases, mostly Naval, but Langley AFB is just a few miles away across the channel. Colorado Springs is also stiff with bases, including Peterson AFB, Cheyenne Mountain AFB, Schriever AFB, and the Air Force Academy. [Takoma Park is 8.3 miles away from CIA headquarters.](#) We have already seen that Nags Head is also occupied by the CIA.

A search on Paul Warren Archer gives us similar hits, including Virginia Beach, Washington, DC, and Nags Head. But Paul has also lived in Chevy Chase, MD, 4.3 miles from CIA headquarters, and Aurora, CO. Buckley AFB is in Aurora, just a few miles from where the Batman shooting took place. How much more evidence would you need before you admit this looks like a military intel event?

I don't know if they actually take the time to run these fake trials or if they just run them on paper. I suspect they actually take the time to run them, so that they can bill the State for them. Although I didn't find any pictures from the trial, in many of these trials they need at least a few days of trial to take pictures or create artist sketches. Either way, they are a ridiculous fiction from top to bottom. No real trial could possibly proceed along these lines.

As more evidence of that, we are told Bryant Grober had oral sex with the victim (blowjob), but somehow he got off with three years probation? He was found not-guilty of rape even though his own lawyer admitted the girl performed oral sex on him. That makes no sense. The jury found that the girl was not able to consent, which is why the three others were convicted of rape. So how could Grober be found not-guilty? It is illogical.

After being convicted of rape, Chris Archer and the Scherzers were allowed to remain free on bail while the case was appealed. Really? Is that how it works? None of them served time until 1997, *eight years* after the alleged crime. In a real event, it wouldn't happen that way. They don't let convicted rapists roam free while waiting for appeal. Why would they? Say one of these guys rapes again: well, the victim can then sue the county for gross negligence and huge damages. It doesn't happen.

Of course during this time the event continued to get huge traction in the mainstream and academic press, being cited over and over as evidence boys were dangerous, high schools were dangerous, and society at large was spinning out of control and needed seriously intervention.

You may think the young men—now past the age of 25—finally went to jail in 1997, [but they didn't.](#) They went to a “campus-style youth correctional facility”. Although the Scherzers were 18 at the time of the crime, the judge classified them as “young-adult offenders”. You may wish to compare this to what you are told in other high-profile crimes, where 14 and 15 year olds are tried as adults. Kyle Scherzer was said to have been released in 1999, after serving 2 years of a 7-year sentence. The other two, said to have been sentenced to 15 years, are said to have served only 4 and 5 years. My guess is the young men weren't to be found at this youth correctional facility *at all.*

The appeal was also strange, since the appeals court [ruled the girl complied with the sexual acts](#). What? To find that she complied, the appeals court had to first find she understood what she was complying to. And once they admit that, the entire basis for the original trial is out the window. The age of consent in New Jersey is 16, and the alleged victim was admitted to be 17 at the time. Therefore, if she understood the nature of her actions and complied with the sexual acts, no rape could possibly have occurred, by definition. We are told the appeals court upheld the other charges, but that is impossible. If they threw out the coercion and force and ruled the girl complied, no rape could have occurred. If no rape, then no conspiracy or attempted rape. You can't conspire to do something that did not happen. You cannot attempt to do something that did not happen. More likely is that the appeals court threw out the main findings, sending them back to the lower court. The lower court was expected to throw out the rape charges based on that, but for some reason didn't bother. Instead those running the event decided to wrap it and report an outcome.

Another thing that is completely abnormal about the appeal is what they reversed. Appeals courts are set up to review the *technical* aspects of lower trials, not to reverse the jury findings. But in this case, the appeals court reversed the jury's finding of the girl's mental state. Compliance and assent are mental states. Since the appeals judges weren't present for the live testimony, how could they do that? Remember, in an appeal, they don't rerun the lower trial, bringing in the victim and all the witnesses. They just *review* the earlier trial, and the attorneys ask them to look at discrepancies. These are the *points of appeal*. If the appeals judges agree mistakes were made, they reverse certain technical findings and return the case to the lower court. But it is strictly against appeal procedure for these appeals judges to reverse specific jury findings based on oral testimony. You can see why. These judges would just be *reading* the account of oral testimony, and that account would lack all the emotion and all the finer points of the live testimony. This is why they run live trials. They don't just give the jurors written accounts and have them come to a decision, do they? No, they have the witnesses there in person to tell their stories. Well, the appeals judges don't have any of that. So it is illogical to assume they would be in a position to overrule the jury decision. Appeals don't normally work like that, and anyone in the law would know that. So we just have another huge red flag alerting us to the fact the appeal was faked or tampered with or misreported like the rest.

But if the event was faked, why would the appeals court reverse anything? Good question, and we can't really know all the specifics. But I suspect those who faked the event didn't even bother paying off the appeals court. Since they were in control of the press, they figured they didn't need to. This was 1997, and the event had already done its job. It had already created 8 years of bad press for boys and men. So it is possible the appeals court took the case seriously and came to a real decision. They probably *didn't* reverse the jury finding, but instead reversed everything else they could, including all the decisions of the fake lower court judge. But instead of reporting that honestly in the press, the event coordinators instead reported this garbled account that no reader without a law degree could make heads or tails of. They then tweaked the sentencing a little bit to make it look real, and called it a wrap. As I reminded you, it appears the appeals court instructions were never received by the lower court, since nothing that we would expect to be done was done. Given all the absurdities in the original trial, we would have expected a complete retrial, but that didn't happen. Instead we just got a few tweaks to the script.

Of course the appeals court finding that the girl was both of age and complied with the acts was never reported in the mainstream or academic press. No one on either side of any debate ever mentions that fact.

Most will now admit this event is suspicious in the extreme, but they will say, "OK, maybe it was

manufactured by CIA or someone, but *why?*” Why would anyone want to fake a horrible rape of a retarded girl by good-looking football players? Answer: as part of the longterm project to demonize men and boys, and *especially* attractive ones. See my paper on [Ted Bundy](#), where I try to explain it for the first time. Or see the books of Christina Hoff Sommers, such as *Who Stole Feminism?* and *The War on Boys*. A resident scholar with the American Enterprise Institute, Sommers admits this has happened and *is* happening, and she outs many of the academic projects of the past 30 years. Unfortunately, after outing these projects, she pursues her own project of demonizing men and boys, though in a slightly more subtle way. [I have recently outed her](#), and this paper was a spin-off of my close analysis of her books and bio. She uses the Glen Ridge case to support her own analysis of boys and men, which forced me to take this closer look at it. Of course she never questions the mainstream story, only giving us a 3-page retelling it, with no mention of the appeals court finding.

But why demonize men and boys? **To separate the sexes.** It has been a longterm goal of the billionaire industrialists and Plutocrats to drive a wedge between the sexes. Why? Because this creates trauma, and trauma increases all sales. Scared and traumatized people buy more stuff, period. Happy people in good relationships are lousy consumers. They don't need to compensate and so they shop less. Unhappy people quickly empty the shelves. This was one of the top lessons of Edward Bernays back in the 1920s, although it is rarely publicized. Along with destroying the family and destroying religion, it has been one of the premier projects of the financiers—and thereby the CIA—for over a century. In splitting the sexes, the main target has been women, since they respond more readily to emotionalism. They immediately empathize with any victim, and they are normally hard to convince that a victim is not really a victim. This natural and native female response is commendable and useful to society in normal situations, but of course it is not of much use in abnormal situations like this. At any rate, those running the events discovered early on that both sexes didn't need to be targeted equally, since destroying the trust on one side was enough to kill the whole relationship. If women were traumatized, men would be as well, since the men would be traumatized by the loss of the woman's trust. However, CIA has also targeted men, and the most illogical parts of feminism weren't even created by or for women. They were created expressly to piss men off, turn them off, and make them angry. This part of the project has worked marvelously well, has it not?

As you know, I like to end my papers—and especially any paper that deals with sex or the battle of the sexes—on a high note, so I will give you something to do. People often hear about fake events and say to me, OK, but what can I do about it? Well, what you can do use your new knowledge to defuse the fight. End the battle of the sexes NOW. Find someone nice and get into bed with them. Take care of eachother, pet eachother, and stop buying all the useless products. Tell the CIA and their trillionaire backers to fuck off and leave you alone. Stop watching TV, stop believing the stories, and breathe deep. You have been living in a scary movie for a long time and it is time to turn it off.