BRENDA BALL

Serial Killers #3

Ann

POLACOLOR ® TYPE 108

K 4 0 9 6 3 1 II B

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
Criminal Division

STATEMENT

DATE: 2/22/88 TIME: 1230 hrs. FILE NO:_____

STATEMENT OF: Ted Bundy DATE OF BIRTH_____

ADDRESS:_____

HOME PHONE_____BUSINESS PHONE_____

OCCUPATION_____

TAKEN BY: Robert Keppel

RK: Ted, are you aware this is being taped?

TB: Yes.

RK: Do you have any objection?

TB: No, no. It's ok.

RK: Ok. What we've done, gone through on this form is, we're trying to capture two premises. One is a statewide homicide information tracking system where detectives that have particular questions about a case from the past can call in and find out information. Typically they go through an interview process with some guy that's trying to get out of a burglary charge and he says, "say, I have information on who killed such and such." The police at the time may not know who such and such is, may not know what jurisdiction it's in, so they can call into our office and we can run up what information they have from the fields in here and determine if there has been such a case in the state, to know if this guy's bullshitting them or not or anything like that. That's one phase. It can be used just to identify a nickname, an address in one case associated with an address in another, a names association, circumstance association, M.O. -- anything you want to do. But that's one section of this federal grant we got. The other section is to do a research study on those high priority things that seem to solve homicide cases. Now, we're not just talking about serial murder here. We're talking about the whole spectrum of homicide. So, we could -- I don't know that you can divide the two up at this point, when you're gathering statistics and things on, you know, deaths that occur, you know, in one period and another and another and another and another in another jurisdiction, but, what we've done is kind of combined the two aspects into one form. This will be a form that I myself will fill out, plus the program manager and the research director who will go around to all agencies and look through every single homicide case, which is about 1400 from 1981

through '86, and record the data from those cases on this form. We didn't go back any further in history because 1) the UCR statistics aren't very good prior to that time and we wanted, in case we had questions about the cases, you know, things missing from the files and obviously not where they should be, that we can get ahold of somebody that might know something about it, return back to them and ask them. So we didn't, we kept '81 through '86 as our study period and then we're relying on them filling out the usual VICAP form, 1987, '88, to keep the program up, just for the information part. We will have people calling them back to fill in the rest of the VICAP information and the rest of this form information once we get a staff to do it. But, the VICAP form is in here too, but it's under different questions. We've got more emphasis in certain areas, more detail, so that's where we wanted to go with it, was that our computer now can take a number. Like it just so happens that these first few numbers go particularly with what VICAP has, so we can tell our computer, ok, print out all the 9 through 16. You know, give us the answers to those. And we can virtually print out the whole VICAP form via the computer without ever having to fill it out, by just filling out this form and then we can send that on to them and still cooperate in that program. We didn't want to do anything that would offend those people cause we got the money from the same source that funded them, National Institute of Justice. So, what we're doing here is kind of a first time study. It was a surprise to me that there was never, ever a study done on solvability factors in homicide cases at all. There have been studies in burglary and robbery and rape, but nothing ever done with homicide. A lot of demographic studies done by sociologists and some case studies done by some psychiatrists. But as far and the police goes and the investigation features, there's never been anything done. So that's basically what we've done here. And I wanted to go over some of these questions with you and show you what they look like and ask you about the, what you think of the particular questions here. I'll go right back to the offender section here.

TB: Well, I've seen the VICAP form and it's not nearly as complex, as thorough as this. I've seen one of them. I don't know if it's been updated or not. I've also seen the questionaire that the FBI used in its sexual homicide study. They call it the Protocol. But it's a questionaire. And it's not as thorough as this, in my opinion. Of course, it's for different purposes, but it's, it has some gaps in it in my opinion.

RK: This does?

TB: No, no, no.

RK: Or that questionaire.?

TB: The questionaire. I've spoken to Bill ~~Hagmire~~ Hagmaier some about it.

RK: One of the things that bothers me about that study is that, you know, I've seen several presentations by the FBI and they always tell law enforcement anyway, that they went into this study with the idea to go into people and say, "ok, explain to us how you beat us." But, if you look on the questionaire or the protocol they have, there's nothing to do with any of those questions there.

TB: No, it's not there.

RK: That bothers the hell out of me that -- what have we served here? To me the why doesn't mean shit to a policeman. I mean, we, we're can't be hung up in "whys". We have to be hung up in how and when and where and what. If we start getting into whether or not some guy was beaten by his mother at age 6 and sexually abused by the father, therefore he came out looking like he did, that doesn't mean anything to an investigation. It doesn't mean anything to catching him.

TB: Well, that, there is -- you're right, but I, I think they got that information but I don't know how they got it. The question there puzzled me because I've read a tentative evaluation of the information they got. It was in one of their law enforcement bulletins a year or two ago.

RK: Ahh ha. Right.

TB: And I, the information that they presented in there, albeit very general, I can understand why they didn't want to get into specifics. They kept it real general and preliminary in terms of what they were trying to conclude. But they were talking about such things as what was going on in this man's mind before, during and after and how did he purge the crime scene and all these other things which are, you know, nuts and bolts, practical stuff. But the question there did not address the questions, those concerns in that way. And I felt, well, they must have been getting this information from their individual interviews. I mean, interviews which went beyond the questionaire which were, where they got into feelings and what was going on in this man's mind the day that he did something and the minute, hours preceeding a crime and during the crime and what happened after. I don't have the -- it's been some time since I've read the study, but, you know, I liked what they were talking about. They were talking about the organized crime scene versus the disorganized crime scene and all those things. Which made a lot of sense to me.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Mixed scenes, organized scenes, disorganized scenes, and then persons who are organized or disorganized and how all these fit together. It made a lot of sense. I know you're not interested in why, but I thought they were getting at the heart of the matter there. But I didn't think their questionaire was.

RK: You didn't.

TB: I don't know where they were getting that information, but it wasn't off that questionaire.

RK: Ya, well, they've never really published the results of the study in any empirical form where, you know, a researcher or social scientist could either support it or attack it. It's come out in kind of summary chapter form in that FBI journal. I have no doubt that most of those things that they have in their are factual and are applied to those 36 people that they interviewed. But, I'm not so sure that 36 is a very good number to -- especially with a variance. There seems to be quite a variance in the backgrounds of the M.O., the backgrounds in the offenders. And to generalize to what all or maybe future investigations should be might be kind of hazardous and I would certainly hope that most police officers would view everything with an open mind to the extent that they have, you know, they pursue all angles and not just hone in on one. Cause, you know, the FBI may be experienced and recognized, organized and disorganized crime scenes, but the routine detective doesn't.

TB: Ahh ha.

RK: I mean, he just says "shit, there's a lot of blood around here," you know, and starts picking it all up. And doesn't make the connection yet that the FBI has that the guy lives reasonably close to the, where the offense occurred, right?

TB: Ya.

RK: But as soon as they start making those connections, but how often does a homicide detective in his career get a disorganized crime scene. One that he could say, "ok, this really is a finite, paranoid, ~~schizophrenic~~ murder," right? "And I know I'm going to find my killer within one mile." Shit. I went to their first school where they brought all this stuff out. And I never had one. Never. I did after that, after I went to the school and I paid more attention to what was real close to the crime scene, the house and everything. Didn't have to look far, next door, but it was obvious that it was one of those type of crime scenes. But most detectives will not have read all that stuff. And, you know, you look at the state of Washington, you know, across this perspective of what detectives are, and hell, they're in rotation situations, at maximum three years as a detective. And they rotate back to patrol. Most of the departments have thirty or forty men in them. That's it. So you never really get a situation where there's a real good experienced person, you know, behind the gun being the detective. And usually when they do get in that position, you know, everybody wants them out after awhile anyway because they get, you know, it looks like they're getting favoritism and everything else. Jealousies start up. They got their own problems.

TB: Well, just, I wish I'd brought that copy. I've wanted, it's been, it's occurred to me several times it's be interesting to go over that with you, that particular summary that was in the law enforcement bulletin about the study the FBI did with those 36 persons. Cause I think there's a lot of good information in there. I'll be very general and the fact that, let's face it, 36 is not a very good sample size and we don't know if it's representative, it's certainly, probably not representative of the total population, if we can view it that way, the population of serial murders who are on the streets today.

RK: Right.

TB: And not identified and not in prison. And so, any conclusions you draw from it have to be very -- taken with a grain of salt. You know, very tentatively viewed. And yet there was some very good stuff in there. I still think that -- like you say, your average detective may not understand what the FBI means by a disorganized personality and all those characteristics they associate in terms of background and present behavior and how that relates to, may or may not relate to a disorganized crime scene. And so on and so forth. And probably, in my opinion, it, the real world does not lend itself to those neat kind of caterizations anyway because any crime scene is probably going to be a mixture of various organized and disorganized kinds of aspects, characteristics that, you know, that ultimately each investigator has to go on his gut, on his, you know, on his instincts anyway.

RK: Ahh ah.

TB: But I did think it was pretty good. They're on the right track. I mean, they're talking to the right people. They're trying to anyway. But they're up against some pretty formidible problems because, obviously not everybody accused of that kind of criminal behavior is going to talk to them. And even if they do there's a question whether they're going to be totally candid with them.

RK: Right. I think that was one of the big criticisms is that they had to sit and listen to, you know, people like Ed McKemper talk. And he told quite a few of the details, but there's no question in my mind like you say, he's lying too. He's not telling the whole truth.

TB: Ya. That's, it's curious that someone would admit to that kind of conduct and yet over the years, for whatever reason, whatever psychological need they have to fabricate or imbellish the story of the account, it happens. I've seen it happen. I've seen it -- I've talked to guys who have come to me. I mean, it's interesting guys come to me. They've come to me over the years and, you know, for whatever reason. I don't, you know, they'll try to speculate, but they'll say "hey, let me tell you about

this." And they told me some things and I know they're bullshitting me. And yet I know they're not.

RK: Do you challenge them?

TB: Oh, ya, I know how to -- I mean, I can see through a guy very quickly. It's fascinating when somebody comes to me. I know when they're bullshitting me and I know when they're not. I know when what they're telling me is for real and when what they're telling me is a fantasy. And I've had a guy do both with me. It's a curious, curious situation. I had a guy sit down and just tell me stories. I know he was telling me stories. And yet I also know the, that essentially he'd done what they said he did, but he had a need to tell it a different way. So he looked different, he looked better. In his own mind. Ok? He wasn't a savage, lust-filled killer, but he was this guy who just, he just got mad. The bitch made him mad. So, you know, and these, it's very curious how guys will, well, some guys, some men who committed a var--, a series of murders will over the years, in their own mind, will rewrite history to satisfy their needs. And they will lie. To themselves perhaps. I mean, one person in particular. Fascinating. One was -- maybe some day we could talk about it just for the sake of our discussion, but I don't want to get into it now. I know he's done a lot more than you say he's done.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: And yet he freely admitted to the police a couple dozen murders, many of which he didn't do.

RK: Oh.

TB: He confessed to murders he didn't do and didn't confess to murders he did do. Ok. He was so messed up. And he did it in such a -- his confessions were expressing his inner needs, his inner, reflections of his, of his, of his inner self, which was somewhat juvenile.

RK: Ya.

TB: And which also was, there's a need for approval. And he wanted people to say, "you're doing, you're a good guy. You're doing a good thing." But, anyway, I don't want to get too lost on this, but it's fascinating to see how people will embellish on these accounts, under the best of conditions. So you don't know what the FBI is getting.

RK: Can you generalize to a situation, a little bit earlier we were talking about the need to get right on the interview of the suspect. What would you do in the interview of a suspect, right off the bat?

RK: I mean the obvious, the obvious intent to the police is to get the guy to talk about what he's done.

TB: Ahh ha. Sure.

RK: How would you go about doing that?

TB: Ya.

RK: That need is so important in your mind, to get to it early, get to him quick. How do you do it?

TB: Well, good question. And I've thought about this, you know, using my own experiences and the experiences and over the years I've run across many people who have talked to the police and many who haven't. And I've seen what's happened. And I've seen guys who were handled, in my opinion, from the standpoint of law enforcement, who were handled properly and those who weren't.

RK: You mean legally or do you mean?

TB: No, I'm talking about, if I, you know, in terms of getting information out of them. In terms of whether or not they were getting information out of them or they were getting accurate information or whether they turned this guy off and they intimidated him or threatened him or caused him not to talk. You know, I, I've lived in this environment now for the better part of, well, over ten years. And intimately know the, it's sort of an advocation with me to hear guys stories about what happened to them when they arrest you. Why did they confess or why they didn't confess or what they told the police and what they didn't tell the police. I mean, I, and I get it from a different side you get it from. I mean, I may not be getting the straight dope either.

RK: Ya.

TB: Often times, more often than not. I don't know. If I were, for instance, let me put it this way. When a guy approaches me or even I approach somebody, I think I'd be interested in knowing about his case. Not because I want to tell anybody, for just my own personal information. Some guy comes in, he's been convicted of "x" number of murders and I'm just kind of fascinated by what happened. I mean, how, why did he start? I honestly have that kind of an interest. And I have been approached by, and approached maybe as many as ten different serial, persons accused of serial murder over the years, just to find out what was going on in their minds and how they did what they did and how they got caught.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: And what happened after they got caught. And many guys have been resistent. Occasionally I run up against somebody who's

resistent. So I have to, more or less, try to open them up. And again, this is not because I want to tell anybody, it's cause it fascinates me. It honest to God fascinates me and you probably picked that up perhaps from time to time in my letters. Over the years I've read everything I get my hands on about it. The subject fascinates me. So when I'm confronted personally, not as a law enforcement guy, not as a detective, I'm not playing that role, I'm playing the role of me intrigued about what they did and wanting to know every last detail about it. And sometimes they're not forthcoming or they don't know how to tell me and so I have to help them tell me the kind of stuff that I want to know. Ummm, and I suppose the first thing that helps a guy open up that I've used, to help guys open up to me and tell me things they really didn't want to tell me -- one guy told me about, he would tell me about all the gruesome details of all these murders, but -- and he, and he felt absolutely no remorse. I mean, he would tell it to me in graphic detail but there's one he just, I could tell, he was holding back on this one situation. But he said, his story was well, this girl just walked away and nobody saw her again. And it didn't sound right to me. I knew she didn't walk away. Ok. I just knew she didn't walk away. But I couldn't figure out why, I could tell, the way he was telling me, he wasn't opening up to me. He was telling me without hesitation about all these other cases but not this one.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: And so I just told him he was bullshitting me and that I knew what happened to her and I said, but I'm, but without accusing him I said, "well, listen, this is what I think, why I think people don't believe you when you tell them this. Cause this is what I think happened. I mean, look it, all these other crimes occurred and yet you want people to believe this girl walked away and she never showed up, nobody ever saw her again." I said, "now I could understand maybe why you're holding back on that one, I mean, there's nothing wrong with that man, I can understand it." And he started talking about it relating more or less, not trying to put him under pressure, but because I understood why he was holding back. Because he had a relationship. All these other women were strangers. But this one woman he knew. And he felt justified in killing strangers. He did not feel justified in killing people he knew. He felt these were ok murders, this one was bad. And he could not talk about it.

RK: Which one was the one that broke his back? Was it the one that he knew?

TB: That's the one that he still hasn't told anybody about. He's talked to me about it, in the third person.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: He finally got, and he finally started asking me questions. He said, "well, what would happen if they found a body that was like this and like that, what do you think people would think?" He was worried about what people would think of him. And this is a curious thing that you may have run into, that each individual can't be approached like in an FBI profile. He can't be approached as a disorganized as a collection of disorganized characteristics. This guy had unique needs. And I had, when I was trying to figure out what happened to this girl, in just talking to him, not, again, not as an investigator, just as a curious individual, I had to find out what those needs were. And for him, his own view of the world was certain murders are ok and certain ones aren't. And I had to find out why wouldn't he tell me about this one. Why wouldn't he give me the details on this one? And it took us awhile at first, talking generally about, you know, how our minds work and how I could understand why he might think this was the case. But listen, I said, "you've already admitted to all these others. Why hold back on that one?" Then he says, "ya, but people would think I'm a really bad person if they told me about that one. So we had to work through all this guilt he had about this one versus all these others. Thinking that people would view him more negatively, believe it or not, for this one murder than for these other twelve or thirteen. And this is something he held, like a, like a secret locked away in his chest. And it was logically a foolish kind of reservation on his part because no one would think any, think he was any more horrible than they already thought he was. But in his own mind that was what was holding him back. And this is what I found in a lot of guys that I've talked to. There are some things they'll talk about and some things they won't. And they have a particular view of the world that you have to discover. Why are they holding back? Why does this one guy, for example, not want to talk about the twelve and thirteen year olds he killed, and he may have killed a dozen, but he'll talk about all the prostitutes he killed. Because in his own mind killing all the young girls that he got at roller skating rinks was bad. The prostitutes off the street corner he'll tell you about in a minute. Ok. He had a, his particular morality of murder, if you will, was such that he could talk about some but not others. He could tell you the truth about some but not others.

RK: How does a police officer use that in an interview situation? Should we, should he be expecting that this person he'd be interviewing that's murdered x number of people is going to have some of those emotions about several of those victims or one or two or?

TB: Sure. He's got soft spots. I mean, I'm -- the Green River guy has soft spots. Some of those victims he'll find, he wouldn't have a feeling for in the world. And others, he probably feels bad about. It's hard to say. I mean, I'm guessing. But somebody that you'd feel easier, it'd be easier for him to talk about others and harder to talk about some. And not knowing, you know, the way this man thinks it's impossible

really to speculate at this time just what particular, agh, -- now I can't think of the word here. Losing my train of thought. It's hard for me to imagine what the particular thought patterns he's responding to. What needs he has in terms of just relating to what he's done. But that can become fairly obvious to you, to a person over a period of -- you see, I had the luxury of living with these guys. So I could live with a guy. I mean, for instance a Bobby Long. I was fascinated. I wanted to find out all about what Bobby Long did. Ok. I wanted to know exactly what he did. Even though he'd already told the police. And so if you live with a guy for a few weeks I can figure out well, what's going on in his head. And he knew where I was coming from, also. I mean, he had an idea. A lot of people who come to me have read about Ted Bundy so they know what, you know, they have an image or an impression of what I'm about. That may help them open up some too.

RK: Have a lot of them read these dime novels that have been written about you?

TB: Probably. Probably, ya. They all have as a matter of fact, and, to one extent or another. And that kind of gives them, I mean, a sense, at least, an impression of, let's face it, of comradary, and that may not be the right word, but you know what I'm getting at.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: This guy will understand. Or sharing, like a kid, like a cat that bring the mouse home, you know. Sharing those experiences which he could probably never share with anybody, which he was -- And I've had people tell me things. They said, listen, nobody could understand this. I've never run across anybody I felt I could tell this to without either feeling like they'd turn me in. One thing they know about me is they can trust me, because there's nobody the state of Florida wants more than me. So they know I'm not about to turn them in. And of course, in reality, I wouldn't turn them in if they told me about what they did and told me about things that the police didn't know about. A second thing is some of -- one in particular felt the need to tell me because he, it was a burden. He'd never been able to talk to anybody about it for fear they'd turn him in. Or they wouldn't understand or they would judge him. But when he talked to me he didn't feel like I would judge him. He was right. I wouldn't. And he felt like I would understand and he was right. I did.

RK: How does a detective talk to somebody without judging him?

TB: That's hard. That's very hard. I don't, I can't imagine. I mean. It would take an extraordinary individual.

RK: You talked, you talked earlier about the need to get to this person right away and to interview them in any situation, or in

most. What does a detective do to get in to that same sort of rapore that you have there?

TB: It's scary.

RK: They're not Ted Bundy.

TB: The scary thing is you have to have real empathy. Real, not phony. You don't, not just calling a guy by his first name or shaking his hand or giving him a cup of coffee and going through and offering him cigarettes and going through all the standard procedure of putting a guy at ease, which is important. But there has to be a real empathy which, impossible as it may sound, lacks judgment, lacks -- I mean, how do you detatch yourself and say "this guy did these things which I consider to be horrible and repulsive and I've seen the impact it has on the community and the family and how do you detatch yourself from all that? And all the personal stuff and just really try to get into the guy's head without these barriers. My advantage is, in talking to the guys that I've talked to over the years, is that I don't have those barriers. Still, I encounter -- I don't have those barriers that I've erected between myself and the other person, still I encounter barriers from time to time that they've erected between every -- anyone, about knowing the real story.

RK: Right.

TB: And that's something, that's, as I said before, a curious thing. Even thing when they do, sometime's a guy does open up to me and tells me about stuff. I can tell sometimes he's lying to me, that he's not telling me the straight story. And I know what that's about too. That's because this guy has lived with this "terrible" memory, has lived with these urges and has lived with his behavior for so long and has had to keep it secret just for, just to be able to survive. Just to be able to survive. Let's say a guy has been out there for seven, eight years, periodically doing something, killing people. Now, from the very time that behavior sprang into his brain at some point, for whatever reason, he had to more or less keep that to himself. He couldn't go around telling people, "hey, listen. I'm, this is what I've been thinking about." Before he ever did anything. Ok? I've been thinking about going around and killing people. I mean, I've been reading these books and I've been having all these strange urges. Now, nobody is going to go around announcing that, just for fear of the fact that people will reject them, which they probably would. Right? So in order for this guy 1) to be socially acceptable, to be able to just perform his normal life, he's had to erect a security barrier. He's had to keep these thoughts and later be acting out of these thoughts, tight to himself, and share them with no one because if he did he knew what would happen. He'd be turned in and arrested and I mean, I'm talking in generalities now but I've encountered this in people. I've encountered guys who have held this secret for so long and so tightly even when it really didn't make any

difference any more that they told anybody, they couldn't let it go. Because the psychological barriers, those, the mental apparatus that had been in place for years, was so powerful against revealing this to anyone under any circumstances that they just couldn't bring themselves to share it. Even though they may have wanted to in some, on some level. I mean, the secret, if you can look at it from a lay person's point of view, their secret was so terrible that they couldn't reveal it. Well, that's a judgmental kind of thing. To this guy it's just something that he was so used to keeping to himself, just for his own self-preservation, and this, the way that his thought patterns had to be so tightly controlled, that even when the day comes for him to talk about it it becomes very difficult. Not because, necessarily he doesn't want to talk about it, cause he can, but he really can't open up. It's become -- oh, it's -- I don't know if I'm explaining this, but I run into it many times and I know how that is.

RK: What is the -- then are you saying that the detective cannot break that barrier?

TB: Well, each person is different and they have soft spots. And I'm not saying everybody is like this. I mean, there are some guys that are just going to come out and tell you, under the right circumstances. And I think Bobby Long is a good example of that. And the reason why I think Bobby Long was so forthcoming was because he'd only been at it for a few months. I knew one person in particular who was out there on the streets for seven years. His very first murder was a double, very first murder he admits to, was a double murder. Seven years before he was caught. Now, he was a very busy person over the years.

RK: Comment to you or the police?

TB: No, to the police.

RK: To the police.

TB: To the police. And he only scratched the surface with the police. Cause he was handled so badly. Oh, it was just tragic the way he was mishandled. He had a deep-seated need for approval, which is why he talked to police at all. But they, they really did exploit him, and they traumatized him to the point where he just stopped talking to them. But he wanted to be accepted. He wanted to be one of the guys. He, to this day he feels more comfortable with the police than he does with inmates. But the system's gotten ahold of him. Course he won't talk to anybody any more. But I'm saying, he'd been at it for seven years, at least, before he was caught. So, to survive for that long with those kinds of secrets, those very terrible kinds of secrets, at least terrible in terms of most people's perception, he had to have erected this mental barrier within himself about talking about this stuff. Whereas, someone like Bobby Long who went through a series of incidents and then, like I said, in June

or July started killing people and was apprehended in November, he only had really six months with, you know, a period of only six months where he'd been involved in this before the police caught him. He just opened right up. I think it has a lot to do with how long a person has had to live with this. I think it has a lot to do with how long a person has had to live with this. For instance, the Green River guy, at this point, if he's still alive and he's still out there somewhere, he's going to be a tough nut to crack. Just because -- not because he's intrinsically opposed to talking with police, although he may be. But because he has lived with the knowledge that you want from him for so long and had to guard it so closely. I mean, like, this is the most precious information in his life. If he would reveal any of it he'd be a goner and he knows it. So he's had to keep that more secure than any secret he's ever had. Keep it to himself. And he's -- and he lives with that day in and day out to the point where it's going to be hard for him if he ever really was in that position to talk about it, to talk about it. You see what I'm getting at?

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Whereas if you'd snatched him back in August or September of '82, and he'd only been at it for a few months, the likelihood of him opening up and really just telling everything without a lot of strenuous interrogation would be pretty good. So, I think that's one dimension of what you face with the Green River guy now is that he's lived with this for so long. It's going to be hard for him to talk about it under the best of conditions. But, the extent that you can take the time to talk to him, not just over the course of a few hours, but it took me days, taken me days sometimes, coming at this guy a little bit at a time. Just one question. I might just ask this one guy who I told you has had it for seven years, I might just ask him one or two questions one day and I might wait three or four days before I come back to him. Very gently. And I would catch him with two different stories. And I knew one story was true and one was false. And I'd made him admit to the true version to help us get into, get into what really happened. Or talk about some things that I've experienced that might help, that he might be able to relate to. Just to know. As a detective, I would come across, whenever possible if I thought, and I think more often than not, I would try to come across as somebody that would, had known a lot of people who had done this. Who's investigated a lot of cases like this, who understood what was going on here. Who understood the kind of thought processes, the kinds of motivations that lay behind, that would compell a person to kill another person like that. And not just one, but one after another.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Because I think if -- what has impressed me about the people I've talked to is they have a need to be understood. To share these burdensome secrets they've kept so long. But they don't

want to share them with just anybody. They want to -- if they're going to talk about them with anybody, they want to talk about them with somebody who is not going to judge them. Who's going to understand this bewildering, probably, this bewildering experience that they've been going through. I mean, I'm not saying I understand it. But it's an awesome thing for a guy to confront. And if they can talk to somebody they feel will be able to say -- I'm not saying congratulate them, but say that they understand, that they know they have a good feeling for what's going on in a man's life who does these kinds of things.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Then you have the best chance, I think, of settling the guy down to the point where he feels free to tell things which, which he's kept to himself for so long.

RK: How do -- in most situations though you're going to have a detective that does not have that experience. He's been restricted by his own inexperience. He's never talked to anybody, maybe he's talked to one killer in his time, and that's it. Then all of a sudden he gets a case like this where there could be three or four murders and they have arrested a suspect or they're going to interview somebody as a suspect. They may not have any PC to arrest him, at all. But just by virtue or the circumstances the guy's a suspect and he could be the killer. Approaching somebody who could be the killer and not knowing for sure if he is --

TB: Not knowing for sure. Ya. That's a different situation than what I'm talking about.

RK: It's different than that -- ya. Right.

TB: Cause I -- this guy's already here. They're already in prison. Ya, sure, it's a different perscriptive entirely and I don't, I, there's no, there's no sure answer, but I'll tell you what, in my experience -- I guess there's all kinds of theories that detectives have about what works. But, and maybe coming on real strong and real hard and saying "I know you did it. You might as well tell us." Maybe that -- I'm sure it's worked for some people from time to time. But in my experience nothing will turn, will turn me off, were the kinds of, that the people that I know of more than somebody than a detective that comes on too hard. Because implicit in there is a lot of judgmental stuff and that would, generally, I said generally, tend to put a guy off. Cause he's not -- he knows, again, you have to sense, you know, if the detective is inexperienced it may be is an intuitive kind of guy and can sense what's going on in the mind of the man he's trying to question. We'll deny that he's the kind of guy who can be intimidated to the point where he opens up and then once he's opened up then you can gently pull it out of him. But I'd say, from my own experience that if a guy, if the detective comes off just willing to talk, someone's that's just willing to talk and

not come on real strong, but that's more likely to be the context where he can use his skills as a questioner and an interrogator to develop certain avenues, certain kinds of information that he wants.

RK: Let me go up and talk to that guy a second.

RK: I wanted to show you a couple of questions in here, just so -- one of, a lot of the big things are victim/offender relationships. They are one thing that people seem to use statistically for comparisons. And we're trying to get some view of what this particular category would look like. And essentially we've come up with this. But, you can't cover every category, but do you see anything in there that would, especially in the unknown categories like first-time acquaintance, total stranger, or casual acquaintance, in the definitions of those categories, is there another one that you can think of that would be more appropriate to use in those circumstances? I mean, we've got hitchhiker in there and we got prostitute. I just coded a case the other day and it was the mother's ex-boyfriend that actually killed the daughter. The mother died of cancer and he committed (?). We don't have a category for that in there, yet it's a very prominent category that we're going to add to this. We have the mother's boyfriend, but we don't have the mother's ex-boyfriend.

TB: Ahhh --

RK: But I'm really interested in the categories of not too much of those that know each other and are really close intimates and things like that, but we've got a hazy area here where, where liability of those categories are --

TB: Well, there's a category here of where the offender knows of the victim, but the victim doesn't know the offender.

RK: Ahh.

TB: Let's say he's seen her in a -- you see, she's a clerk in a store. So he knows who she is but she doesn't know who he is. That is that. Or he sees her name and picture in the newspaper. So he knows, I mean, he puts her under surveillance or attracts her and trails her for a time. Again, that's, then he's not a total stranger. He's not a first time acquaintance. She doesn't know him. He's not even a casual acquaintance, but, you know, this is a situation where -- I mean, if you know at all, I'm saying.

RK: We're probably not going to know that unless he says it.

TB: You're probably not going to know that. Ya. Exactly. But the --

RK: Or unless somebody else has seen him stalking her, and we can't prove that she knew him.

TB: Ya.

RK: Like, we had that bus driver that stalked the one gal on the bus. She took his bus all the time.

TB: Ummmm.

RK: And parked the Metro bus and walked, followed her home.

TB: Is that right?

RK: Ya.

TB: Ohhh, that's pretty bold.

RK: Ya.

TB: He didn't have much of a career there I imagine.

RK: Ah, no, no. He didn't. He was caught real quick. But that's an interesting category. If we can --

TB: Well, but a lot of these you won't know until you've either nailed the guy or he's told you like --

RK: Right. Cause we're going to be covering all of the solved cases as well as those that are unsolved. So we'll know, at least from what the case reflects. Now the only thing we're judging from is what is in the file. We're not interviewing the offender. We're not interviewing the detectives unless we really have to for some reason. But, we --

TB: It makes a great deal of difference though from M.O. as to whether or not the guy has previously selected this person as a victim. I mean previously. By previously I mean days or weeks in advance.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Versus whether or not he's just kind of randomly come up, she's just kind of walked into a situation where he's never seen her before but he's sort of either waiting there or looking for something. Like a hitchhiker.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: I mean, that's -- those kinds of thoughts come to mind when I look at this.

RK: Well, the first time acquaintance to me is somebody who meets somebody in a bar and, you know, they're bantering each

other's name around. Everybody can hear, the bartender's hearing them. They're having a good old time and then, you know, it's the first time. And then he ends up murdering her that night. And he's got ten thousand witnesses as to his acquaintanceship, you know.

TB: Right.

RK: So there really is an obvious, witnesses to the --

TB: But would you call first time acquaintances in a situation where a guy walks up to a woman he's never met before and flashes a police badge and says, "you know, you're a prostitute, you're under arrest, come with me." I mean, that's --

RK: I'm not so sure, unless there's a lot of other witnesses around and stuff who could verify that --

TB: I mean, she would be a total stranger probably, or maybe or maybe not, but let's assume that she was a total stranger.

RK: She would be in that instance, right?

TB: Ya.

RK: And you don't have much of a foreplay area here --

TB: No.

RK: In your conversation. You know, it's immediate, blunt, see her standing on the corner and go right up to her and flash the badge.

TB: Ya. But, I say, it certainly has a lot of use for a lot of categories there. I mean, you're going to probably find something will fall through the cracks no matter what you do. But that's really pretty complete.

RK: Well, you know, we could compare things across virtually any of these fields. We can go to the clothing left at scenes. We can go to the types of death. We can go to the weapons used. And, you begin to see patterns. Like, when the son kills the mother. You know, it's obvious to me what's happened here. Most of the time there aren't any firearms. There's knives, strangulation, stuff like that. More physical contact. And that type of thing I think will be significant in this category. And I think that when you talk about wives killing husbands, you know, nine tenths of the time there's a gun involved. There's something handy. There's right there. And they start shooting. And the husband's dead. Or it could be even, in some circumstances, depending like it's in the kitchen, you know, sudden grabbing of a steak knife, wailing on him, is a very real -- course that has to do with location too. That steak knife has got to be available, any place else. But in the bedroom, where

the husband's have been found dead, traditionally, he's been shot by the wife. So, that could be significant in this category. We don't know that yet, but just from my experience, that's what seems to happen. That's what comes to mind when people start talking about categories and how they get killed and what kind of weapons they use and, you know.

TB: Well, and since, from what I understand the statistics are, most people, most victims of homicide knew their, I say, knew their killer. I say knew, I mean, knew the person before it happened. Then certainly most your homicides would fall into these categories.

RK: Well, that is, I think that is crucial one because I think there is data in some cases where we're going to find that out, that the offender is going to have given a statement and that will be in there. Now whether or not it's true or not, we don't have anybody to verify it, but as long as it's there we can record it.

TB: Well, ya.

RK: More than likely it is true.

TB: Well, your study here is covering all types of homicides and that vast majority which, you know, involved victim and offender who knew each other. Of course the ones, the more spectacular ones are those like the Green River killings where in all likelihood the Green River killer did not know, probably did not know, the prostitutes and the young women involved. So they would fall under, somewhere in here. Either casual or first time or something. So, you probably have the bulk of your cases covered in those first couple dozen categories.

RK: Ya. Well, that's what we're mainly concerned with is that we -- if we're going to find a category where we have twelve hundred, five or six that appear to be alike, we want them to be in here so we can computer check. When you start putting other and then you have to specify, any time you see a line and specify in here, so, the terminology used by say ten or twelve different coders could be different, even though it may be defined in the code book as to what this other category means in generalities, it won't tell them how to express, you know, the real victim/offender. Now this question, "What was the relationship between the victim and the offender?" specifies that more than likely you're going in from the offender's point of view, anyway.

TB: Essentially you already know. You should have a pretty good idea who the offender was. The ones you're kind of worried about are the ones where you don't know, unable to determine.

RK: Ya. And that more or less means unable to determine from the file because it's just not present there.

TB: Right. Or it's "other" or you don't know.

RK: Right.

TB: And it may be, it may be the fact that the mother did kill, the son did kill the mother, but you don't have any evidence to prove it.

RK: Here's another big category. We had this big pie-in-the-sky idea that there were solved cases and there were unsolved cases. Ok. But now we have this view that solveability is on a sliding scale. But there's no really solved case and no really unsolved case, because in the minds of police officers they may know who did it. They may have a lot of circumstantial evidence but they can't prove it. So no arrest warrant is issued, no arrest is made. And that's one category of case where all of the evidence in that case emminates around the focal point of that one offender. See? If you compare the elements of that case versus one where the defendant is, say, was tried and convicted, you have a different kind of case. Say same type of circumstances, different kind of case. And all of the other categories are the same. Well, what is the difference between these two where he's known to the police but there's insufficient evidence to arrest, between those that he's tried and convicted? And what we're finding is that the actual unsolved cases in the literature, anyway, when you see the word unsolved, it's referring to those cases that are one and two.

TB: Ahh ha.

RK: And so it's confusing to us, you know, by the rest of the social scientists in the world, if they really know what an unsolved case is. As an investigator, I believe this is an unsolved case also. I believe this is an unsolved case.

TB: It's known by the -- area.

RK: I believe this is an unsolved case. It's known means that you know his name. Not the fact that you don't know his name but you feel (?).

TB: Ahh ha.

RK: Ok. So, essentially, mine, which we will be able to, you know, take the computer and say, ok, computer, lump up one through five as unsolved. Compare that against cases, you know, six through fourteen. If you like that definition of solvability.

TB: Ya.

RK: If you don't like that definition of solvability, what is an unsolved case? You know. What is it in your mind?

TB: Well, like you say, -- well, to me, an unsolved case is in a case -- well, I'll start with one definition. Any case where there's not been an arrest and conviction, or confession. Now that's pretty tight. Like you say, there's the informal definitions law enforcement people have that, the guy, he may never have been brought to trial, for one reason or another. But you know he's one. He may have even confessed, (?), he may have a co-defendent. And he may have taken a deal and they've given him immunity and testified against his co-defendent. This guy would not have been tried or convicted or anything. Now, I guess maybe that would fit somewhere in here. I mean, think of all sorts of different scenerios. But, I mean, how certain do you have to be? Because remember you told me that there is some investigators that just get so dead set on their choice of a suspect. They just believe that's him. I mean, I'm -- there may be some volunteers involved in the task force who would check "known to police but there's insufficient evidence to arrest." Ok.

RK: They would classify the Green River cases as number three.

TB: Ya, because they think that guy the trapper is one or Melvin's the one. So you may have all different responses to this on the Green River case.

RK: Well, unfortunately, or fortunately, which ever way you want to look at it, the people that are going to be coding those cases are myself. So, more than likely, from my estimate anyway, from the evidence in the cases, the closest you can get is number two, is that the guy is unknown, but he has been seen. But, partial descriptions, you know, eighteen months later people are asked to remember what the guy looked like. They last see the guy getting in a truck with a prostitute. You know, and you got the feelings that there people probably have seen the Green River killer. So you're going to check that block. This block means that he's unknown and he's not ever been seen.

TB: Ya, right.

RK: But how good, you know, is the haziness between those two categories? Technically, I suppose the story I just gave you is number one also. They're not going to be any good to choose, pick him out.

TB: No. I guess it's a matter of semantics, with the words "not seen" and "seen". To me, there's no question but that the Green River guy has been seen. I think the question here is where he's been -- Is the description known to the police or not. Because in every case the person's been seen. I mean, there's not a case where the serial murderer was not, the murderer, whoever he or she was, was not seen. They've all been seen, if you know what I mean. Do you mean seen at the scene of the crime?

RK: Right. Right.

TB: Scene with the victim and reported to the police?

RK: Agh

TB: That kind of thing. But, you know, I know what you're getting at there. I certainly don't want to quibble with you about the terminology. But, ahh

RK: Well, I'd like to quibble about it because we got to define this stuff.

TB: Ya, because in every, you know, this -- there's not murderer out there that's not been seen, probably. Whether or not they've been in -- whether it's been at the scene of the crime or in the company of the victim. They're probably rare cases.

RK: See, we have to go through and we're going to, in a code book, ok, 69-2 is going to be defined as: Ok. What does scene mean? It means that he's probably been seen by an eyewitness and a description was given.

TB: Ya. Ok.

RK: That fulfills several of the sightings of the Green River killer too with some of the victims. He has not been scene, however, at the scene of the crime.

TB: Ya. He's not been --

RK: Which may be a different category. In fact, that may be one we may need to put in there, is the fact that he is unknown and he was seen, but he was seen at the scene of the crime.

TB: Seen where.

RK: Ya.

TB: Where was he scene.

RK: The sight where he was scene.

TB: Ya.

RK: Ok. That makes sense.

TB: Was it at the point where the victim disappeared from? Was it the point, at some point after the victim had been abducted, assuming this was an abduction, or after she was in the company or he was in the company of the killer? Was it the murder scene? Was it at the dump sight? Was it somewhere going to or from the dumpsight? I mean, I don't want to get too technical, but where scene? And I get to thinking you have somewhere in here where you go into, you know,

RK: The distances between the sights.

TB: The distances. But you know, where you discriminate between --

RK: Dates, times, and distance in each of those sights.

TB: Ya. And discriminate where the victim was approached or last seen and where the murder occurred and where the body was dumped, if the different place, or if they're the same place, and that kind of thing. Well, that would all come into play here.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: If you wanted to make it a bit, get a bit more particular as to where they were scene.

RK: Ya. We have -- let's see the letter, turn back. Here's the date, time, perimeters. The fact the victim last scene dates, if they're known. Major assault. There can be a victim assault that would not kill, yet. That may be a separate time and date noticed evidencing the fact the death itself, the victim or body found -- this means if the victim's found alive. This would mean, you know, when you were dead. Was the victim reported as a missing or runaway? This question I'm all ready going to change because in the case I just reviewed, they have, the victim was tried to be reported as missing, by the relatives, but the police refused to take it. Now I think we need to know how many occasions victims have been tried to been reported missing and the police wouldn't take them as missing and then they are found dead. There was a big article in the Seattle Times a couple of months ago about this, this girl who was haranged by this guy, and she tried to report over and over and over again that, hey, this guy is harrassing me, this guy's harrassing me. What are you going to do about it? Then she comes up missing. Then the police refused to take the report because she hadn't been gone for the length of time and the family hasn't done enough investigation to find out if she's in jail someplace or if she's off on a one-night stand. Then she ends up dead. And then all these phone calls, of course, are recorded on the police communication lines and they're looking pretty silly about what's happened. But this does not capture that circumstance. This is "no, it hasn't," "yes, it has" and the day recorded if there is one. One thing recorded too is, even though we have all these dates, how do these dates fit against the date the investigation began? Because we have days when, times when all of these may be in the distant pass. And the investigation doesn't start until this phase. So we're trying to find out, you know, how soon do investigations start. Do they start mostly at the time the body are found? Probably so. There may be some rare occasions where they start here. But we can show there is a missing person investigation and somebody's seen it. And this date here corresponds somewhat with this one.

TB: It corresponds with 27.

RK: Ya. Another interesting thing too that we've included is the date the victim ID'ed, because it governs practically all homicide investigations. I mean, traditionally, all the facts emminate from the things they can trace the last steps of the victim. You know, so --

TB: Knowing who the person is is essential.

RK: Ya. Ya. And true, a few cases are solved with where the victim hasn't been identified, but they're usually caught right at the scene.

TB: Ya, and they're unusual. Or they're found like buried in the guy's back yard or something.

RK: Oh, ya. Ya. Then there's, in conjunction with that, are the distances, the distance between the victim's last known location and all those points. Now, we don't know how significant any of these sights would be. "Defender's lodging sight" was where did he live at the time the murder occurred? Was he living out of his car at 216th and Pacific South, or was he -- this isn't the address where he lives. Like in, maybe he lives in Salt Lake City, but the murder occurred in Seattle. Well, where was he living in Seattle at the time this occurred? Was he a hitchhiker or what was he doing, how far away from this lodging sight is all of these circumstances? And each one is around three, the same gamit of distance and time.

TB: I don't remember reading through this. I didn't mean it that -- it looked pretty thorough to me but I didn't sit down and really analyze each point. Trying to see what you were looking for. Now, -- fun to see the distinctions between, for instance, this category and this category. Don't they cover a lot of the same stuff?

RK: It may, if in fact these two are the same spot. The "initial contact" and "last seen". The victim's last known location. Like, you could have a gal that's last seen leaving her apartment. The initial contact probably took at 216th and the highway at the bus stop, to be picked up as a prostitute.

TB: She may or may not have been seen at that point.

RK: Right. Right.

TB: And of course you'll only know this if that guy ever tells you.

RK: Right.

TB: In many cases.

RK: Right. And, this loc---, we may find her purse at this location too. Who knows? That's happened in the past too, but she was actually last seen by somebody at this spot. But true, it may overlap some.

TB: Ya. That just -- I see what you're getting at there and of course, distance between location of assault, assuming there's an assault and assuming you know the location. Like in, again, in the Green River case. Trying to use a specific case. A woman may have been assaulted and showed up dead. Are we talking about something other than a physical or sexual assault, you say? What you're getting at?

RK: More than likely it's a case where somebody actually sees an assault that occurs, right. And then she's dragged into her car, you know, and she's incapacitated from in the car. Like, one more is Framptom that we had. He was a prostitute killer. I mean, he was seen throwing a girl in the trunk in Chinatown, in his car. And that was the assault place. But the actual murder/death site took place at the South Park Marina.

TB: So in this case, well, in that kind of situation, then this and this would be the same. Initial, well, at least this would be the same.

RK: These three maybe.

TB: Ya.

RK: Right. They may all be the same. I think, you know, the big one is necessarily the last one. You know.

TB: Death site and -- ya, well, sure.

RK: Now, while we're on that subject I may as well show you (?) thing I brought that you might be interested in here. Now, considering these sites we've discussed, the hypothesis is, is the more closely you can draw the relationships in time, distance and location. Like if you were to look at this on a vertical scale from above, and all these were in line together, meaning that they all occurred at the same spot. Ok? And maybe the victim is at that spot and the offender is at that spot. The solvability of that case is high. As these begin to spread out, in time and distance, the odds of solving the case become much higher, or much less.

TB: Ya. Right.

RK: Because, suddenly where you have it all in one spot, all in one neat package inside a house and the offender hands the gun over to the police as they contact at the door, that's one circumstance. But where you start to have cases where, I suppose, as in the Green River case, all of these are spread out.

They are spread out so far that the odds of solving that case are very difficult, you know.

TB: If he'd have been dumping them in dumpsters around the airport, the, or in alleyways or, you know, parking lots, in all likelihood he'd have been arrested long ago. Just because of the distances, people been more aware and just the whole thing would be more compact. Somebody would have been more likely to see him dumping the body, for example or they would have been found more quickly and when they're found more quickly there'd be more evidence and that closer the discovery of the body would have been to the time of disappearance, more people would have gone forward to see that, to say they saw something. You'd have found more physical evidence; fingerprints, footprints, tire prints. All these things.

RK: You have the freshness of the evidence too.

TB: Ya. Ya.

RK: And I think that, you know, if there is a long distance time feature here,

TB: Ya.

RK: Maybe we'll find that in most of the murder cases, you know, these, these, and these are probably all together. But, maybe this is the crucial factor here. The distance and the time from the death to the body recovery site. Or from whatever the initial-contact site is or last-scene site is, the body recovery site. Maybe this, this and this are all the same spot.

TB: Ahh ha.

RK: And could be. But maybe, say, this is inside a car, this might be inside a car also. And this might be dumped out in the woods. But, I feel, anyway, if we can demonstrate that all of these appear to be a row and put all those little boxes right on top of each other, you're looking at a solved case. And a more likely solved case. Now, as they begin to spread out, the more difficult it becomes to the police. Because look at all those crime scenes.

TB: Ya.

RK: There're a lot more people to talk to and it's just a two-man tandum working the case and you have this spread out, you probably approaching it wrong. If you have no, if you know that all these are spread out, you're going to have people here, here, here, and here.

TB: And people, prospective witnesses, who are the most, probably the most potent source of information, at least one potent source, are not going to realize they're witnesses because

there won't be any publicity about this crime that they'll be able to relate to what they saw last night or a few hours, days before yesterday or whenever. And it'll just fade in the memory. I'm sure lots of people saw the Green River guy with, for instance, use a prostitute, you know, either approaching them or getting into the vehicle or whatever. But at that time they just didn't really see it as being significant, meaningful. There wasn't any struggle. There wasn't any weapon. It wasn't anything that they would want to remember.

RK: Right.

TB: But there are a few cases as I recall that happened during that period of time, back in '82, prior to the Green River murders that the bodies were found a short time after they disappeared. These are not officially on the Green River list but they happened in the Seattle/King County area. I think one, one young girl's body was found in a dumpster somewhere not long after --

RK: Right.

TB: She disappeared. You may have, you may have a victim last seen and initial contact, and all these occurring really close together. And you found the body in tact and, you know, and yet, you know --

RK: This is still --

TB: That's still blank.

RK: Right.

TB: Well,

RK: The, the fact that these are close together and not on top of each other is a problem already. Because, that one you're talking about especially, I mean, we're talking about a distance here between where this was and body recovery site was, it's probably fifteen miles. The initial contact site -- we don't know where that is specifically, but if that is any indication then she's five or six miles away from this site. So, as much as that, this, this, and this appears to be all in that dumpster or at the back door of the Magnolia HiFi there in Ballard, this, this is really distance from this one. In distance and time too. We're talking about, I think a couple of days too, between these two. And the distance involved is, you know, fifteen miles.

TB: Well, take those other, look back a little more. I remember you sent me a list of unsolved homicides of women in the King County area.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: I think it was '76 through '82 or '83. And there were a number of women who had been found in their homes, in bed.

RK: Ahh ha, ahh ha.

TB: I think that's real close.

RK: Yup.

TB: And I don't know -- has those ever been solved?

RK: Agh, in fact, no. One of the things that go into this too is the amount of work you'll see -- well, you've already seen in the rest of the forms how much work the police did, you know, to identify the offender. And one of the problems, at least -- there were three cases like that, strangulations, females, near, in their own home, in their own apartment or condo. One of which, in my mind anyway, could have been solved. I mean, the police got to a guy soon enough, but they let the contamination of two suspects interfere with both investigations. And they put a, one guy kills himself, ok, that they had approached. Leaves a note. "I'm sorry that Susan is dead. I loved her every much." He didn't say he did it. Ok? Then you got a guy that comes into them saying "I'm picturing myself killing Susan." He was a friend who saw her that night, both of them saw her that night. Now, something drastically went wrong in the interview process of these two guys where they're not to have hashed this thing out right off the bat. Ok? So, I'm not so sure that, you know, this isn't shoved over on top of the pile a little bit. Maybe half way there, by virtue of the experience of the officers handling the case. I had, I teach a class where I have detectives bring in an unsolved case. And this one particular agency, Kent Police is where this one think I'm talking about occurred, in their jurisdiction. Three guys had gone through the class. All three of them had chosen this particular case to review and critique. So, each time they'd come out of there after the class was done -- it's kind of like a college class. It last eleven weeks and they're required to study other solved cases to see how they got solved over time. They're not the gimmies that you get every day, but the ones that took an effort to solve. I've got all kinds of examples of them and they go over and see where they could have been solved sooner and things like that. But the ones that have taken that case and looked this over were so frustrated with the politics in the department at the time, the abilities of the people that were in there, and, you know, how they can investigate. The number of people that were in the crime scene were atrocious. I mean, it was just the whole damn population of Kent went through there before they had a chance to do a real good crime scene investigation. There's a chance that the offender probably shit at the crime scene and the evidence was there. And because of the way they handled it, you know, that particular evidence was destroyed. So it's really kind of debalical.

TB: And, that's, I guess that's one of those (?) --

RK: Typical.

TB: I'm trying to think of the scientific word, you know, you go through, you take a course in the scientific method. The thing, the uncontrolled variable is the, is the fact that no matter how good your information is and how accurate your study is and how much information, how many computer assisted investigative programs you have, it's, they're only as good as the guy who's doing the investigating. I mean, and, you know, there's a great variability in the capability between one investigator and another. I mean, they're only as good and as alert as the investigator on the end who isresponsible for the case and is willing to apply this information the way it needs to be applied to make the best use out of it. And if you have politics and you have sloppy investigation and you have poor crime scene analysis and all that, then the best information in the world is useless.

RK: Well, this is just one example. But it gets you thinking of -- Can you take this pack with you?

TB: Oh, ya.

RK: Are you allowed to do that?

TB: Ya, I can go --

RK: Just give it to them when this time is up?

TB: Ya.

RK: Cause I'd like you to sit and think about it. And, develop -- these things are -- probably all have direct relationship. The solid lines. And the dominate lines are there may be a relationship there or there may not be. There definitely routes to and from that the offender took here that we know happened. Ok? This maybe slid over to this box. That's why it's on dotted lines. But, it's just -- there is no theory of investigation, technically. I mean, you use many theories when you go in, but there no systematic way of approach. The traditional was is that everybody kind of works from the crime scene out, and one of the things I've noticed about detectives is that they process crime scenes now very good. I mean once the initial clutter is over with and everybody gets the hell out, they do a pretty good job of collecting evidence. But, one of the problems they have is they don't think of, at the time, you know, who's looking for the killer? What evidence is there? You'll see six or seven hours go through an investigation case file where they'll have done this thorough crime scene investigation and there hasn't been one creative thought go into, wait a minute, we just found this phone number here. Let's find out who it belongs to right now, not two days later, and go put your hand on the hood of his car as you're walking up and knock on his door, see if it's warm. Ok? So,

who's looking for the killer at the crime scene? And so many times you go through those reports where you've got a found body someplace with no offender in site, and there may be some very real suspect information left behind. It could be in the form of, you know, just a phone number and a first name left on the top pile on a desk. Like we had a coin dealer who was murdered one time and this guy called him about negotiation of coins -- he was supposed to call him back for an appointment. And here he was, right on top, first name, phone number. And you look at that and you say, no, it couldn't be. I couldn't be this easy, and it was. And it was just something you had to get on right then. Fortunately it was something we could do because we ended up getting close enough to him and we could serve the warrant. In any event, ya, you're right. It does depend on the --

TB: Well, it's only as good as the --

RK: Ability of the detectives that work at it.

TB: All this arsenal of information and all these resources are only as good as the guy at the end of the line.

RK: Ya. a favorite topic of mine.

TB: You know, there is something, talking about the crime scene, which happens to be ~~(2), top of the crime~~. Because, I mean, I'm fascinated by pictures of crime scenes because, for a variety of reasons. One of them which is, I mean, from an investigator's standpoint it seemed to me that this is probably the only place an investigator can stand and put his feet right there on the ground or wherever it is and say, "I know that the guy I'm looking for has been right here. And I may not know he's been anywhere else, but I know he's been right here. And why here?" And literally, I mean, I guess this sounds, it's certainly no panacea, but try to put yourself in the -- in mind that the man who chose that spot. Now, if it's a house, it's the bedroom of the victim, that's one thing, but if it's Star Lake or wherever, why Star Lake? Imagine the guy driving there with the body and himself in the vehicle, in the truck or wherever. Look, the guy could use a taxi cab. Imagining looking for this place in the dark. What's going through his mind? What's he looking for? Why this place? Is he looking -- is a car drives by, is he taking any precautions? Does that go through his mind? Is he drunk? Is he high? Is he aggitated? Is he, you know, what are all these things? Does he go back to the site? I mean, Star Lake, again, we're focusing on something real. It helps to put it in context. But, for instance, the Green River site. Something -- in all likelihood I would not be surprised if this guy was going back to these sites on -- to check them over. He was going back there to either check them out to make sure he hadn't left anything there the night before. He may have dumped them in the dark and wanted to make sure that, you know, a charge slip didn't fall out of his pickup truck, you know. Or, he may be going back to look at the bodies or do something with the

bodies or "get off" on the scene, or whatever. So little has been done with that aspect of mass grave sites in serial murder cases. I think it would be fascinating. That's why I suggested the FBI to go over the questionaire and find out what there 36 guys, for example, what, if any, which ones, if any of them, went back to the scenes where they dumped the bodies and why and when and what did they do? Why, and how long were they there? And so on. But, just trying to recreate that. And I know it's very hard. And maybe it doesn't appeal to you as an investigator to try to get the feel, even if it's completely fictitious, a feel for the guy picking up that prostitute near the airport. And, you know, what's going through his mind? Where does he take her? What's his first move?

RK: I think that any good investigator knows, approach every crime scene like that. I mean, even the least experienced guy. I remember when I first started, you know, you're always asking the other guy that's there, "what do you think of this? What significance does this have?" You know. "Why did this happen this way? Where can we find this guy if he was just here and hour and a half ago, where can we find him now and how are we going to get to it?" You know. And those types of things are, I think highly necessary. I don't know how many times I've gone out to the middle of Star Lake Road and just stood there and watched and looked into the trees and down the road, and notice how quiet it was. That in the pullout where one body was found, it's obvious to me why that pull out was important to him. Because he could hear everything coming and going, you know, a mile down the road or a mile up the hill. Either direction. And if not [end of tape].

RK: This is side three. But the crime scenes, how do you do that with bones?

TB: Do that with bones. What do you mean?

RK: Well, the, having a fresh body at a scene is a whole hell of a lot different than having bones sites. You know, where, you know, the guy's been gone for months.

TB: It's been a period of weeks or months and months since this last victim that you know of, anyway. Well, first of all, let me ask you. Do you video-tape these scenes, these sites, when you found them? Have you video-taped, taken various shots in the road and up and road and down the road and so on and so forth?

RK: Right.

TB: I think that would be a potent tool. I'm not sure how to use it, but talking about next time you get a guy that you'd like to -- although I don't know how much you feel you can give away. I mean, you might be nervous if you show this guy too much. You might be giving away information they might use to confess to something he hasn't done, but it certainly, for the person who

did it, to see on video-tape, that these, some of these sites might be something that would loosen them up. It would be something that would start to get his mind into that grove, seeing scenes and sites that maybe he hadn't seen for a long time. It would bring back to memory, vividly, these sites and sounds and smells and sensations that he had had at the time that he was disposing of the victim's body. Believe me, those are extremely powerful recollections for him.

RK: Ahh hah.

TB: This video-tapes would certainly clue, cue that, might cue a lot of that in. And you wouldn't, might not, you might be able to show them some of it without giving so much away that you felt that you might be tainting anything. But that would certainly be interesting if that -- anyway, you talking about bone sites. I mean, how --

RK: How do you get a feeling out of the killer at a bone site?

TB: Well, it's still --

RK: Especially in the woods, you know. Most of these are reasonably remote areas. There's not a lot of traffic.

TB: I don't know. You just, it's, I guess it has a lot to do with what you take there in your own mind. To me, just to be able to -- it wouldn't make any difference if it were a month, a day or a month or six months. If I'd, if somebody would tell me that I was standing, I mean, the bones were found there, and then I was, and, I can stand there and try to recreate how he drove in and what he was looking for and how it'd be and what was he paying attention to, what he was seeing. Just try to get a feel for all that going on in a guy's head. That's not going to break open, that's certainly not going to give me any specific clues, but to me there's a -- it's hard to explain, but for me there would be a --

RK: Well, it's interesting because you can --

TB: To be able to put your -- to (?) -- to get this feel of this man in a way that maybe other people who are less sensitive to what was going on there couldn't. What was going on in this man's mind, as he was -- what was his state of mind? What was he -- was he, as he picked up this dead body and began to carry her, drag it, it was -- and get all those feelings. And try to get those feelings that he had. And I'm not saying that you can like a clairvoiant imagine everything going on in the guy's head. I'm not saying that at all. You know. But, -- I guess there's no substitute for it and I'm not telling you anything you don't know. And I don't know how much sense I'm making.

RK: Well, the, you know, I don't know. I probably sat or stood, even sat in some instances, and probably there were 50 bone

sites, in my time. And most of the time I always felt that the killer was real remote in my mind. It felt like it was, there was such a distance there between what we had, a set of bones, and it was so far back in time that it gives you the feeling that you're way behind in the investigation. And that the murders are most clear to the person who engaged in it, not to the person who follows it up and looks at it, right?

TB: Well, -- this is true.

RK: Ya. I, -- You look at it. I remember one guy that we had. His name was Scribner. We found a set of bones. And the remoteness of that scene, very few bones were found and the victim classification was homicidal violence. Right? But, few pieces of clothing found here and there. Stuff like that. And then we got a live victim one time that had crawled all the way out two and a half miles through the woods, nude, stabbed, laid across the Maple Valley Highway, and finally when she was able to talk we started -- all she could see was a light. Didn't know what direction she came from specifically. And, so we kept trying to find where this guy had taken her in the car. So we drove around, drove around and drove around, and drove around. And finally we get on this road. And then it hits you. Before you even get up there you know she's going to see this same light at 10:30 at night. And there's no question in her mind. And she drove up -- we drove her up to this spot and she didn't even need to say that's it or anything. I knew, cause I sensed it. It was the same spot where we'd taken this skeleton out before. And by the time we put together this case and the skeleton case, we didn't charge with the murderer of the skeleton. Only because we had the opportunity to take a living victim back to a spot, but at the time you find that one set of bones out there, it, you feel so distant and remote from any thought who the killer could be. I know my immediate thought is it's definitely not somebody new, you know. And so that's going to make it a hell of a lot harder and do we really care who this gal is because the bone find site is going to mean more to us that maybe who she is, except it's going to lead us back to where he may have contacted her. But it's -- you really feel remote from anything -- especially with these prostitutes. I mean, all of a sudden you're -- bingo -- it's just -- you don't even know where the death site was. You don't know where the assault site was. And many time you don't even have an initial contact site. You have a fact that they're missing from a particular location, but you know that's not the location where they met. And so the distance is really remote.

TB: Well, ya, and I'm not saying that you can magically put yourself in this guy's mind and see things through this guy's eyes and come up with, with his identity or even some really good clue of some sort. I guess, oh, the thing that could happen, what I guess I'm getting into is just getting a feel for what is, what could be going through this guy's mind in terms of why this place? Why this particular site? If it's a mass grave site or

even if it's just an individual site. And did he pick it for a reason? Is this, especially in remote sites, I say remote or deserted or little known sites. Did he pick it for a reason? And getting back to one of my favorite topics again is, I think, I'm telling you, if I were an investigator and I, I would love to stake out that site, especially if it's fresh. I mean, particularly almost if it's fresh. Now, for instance, I understand that not too long ago there was another young girl found out by the airport, I guess a few months ago. Weeks, months.

RK: Ya. Months. There's been three of them.

TB: Now, we don't -- there's no, certainly there's just no way of saying who's doing that other than to say you can't say it's the Green River guy. Who knows? But somebody, anyway, did that. And I, and you found them fairly quick. I guess they were not, they were in bone, not the bones. There were --

RK: Right.

TB: Right. And, like I said before, I -- that kind of victim, I mean, a young woman found in a lonely area, I don't know -- it doesn't have to be miles, it doesn't have to be up in the mountains, like you say, it can be around one of those, those places around the airport where there, you know, undeveloped places. But once you get a feel for that site, you know, what might be going through this guy's mind when he's approaching it or selecting it. Then staking it out becomes a little bit more, a little bit more effective and you have a feeling for how you're going to watch this place. If he can't see you when he comes in, the next time to either bring in another victim, or checking the scene, to see what's going on. I -- I'm not saying -- I don't like generalities, ok?

RK: Ya.

TB: But I still believe, I still believe very strongly from what I know, my conversations with others, that it's an enormously powerful enducement for a man to go back to the scene where he's dumped the body under these conditions. If nothing new, the other thing would be to drive by. See, umm, you know, whether it be to relive the experience, to check it out or see if the body has been found, or just this sense of --

RK: Or to dump another body.

TB: Or to dump another body for that matter.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: And we've talked about the, the considerations which seem to inhibit law enforcement, virtually all the time from being able to restrain itself to the point where they can leave a body alone

for awhile and just stake it out. But I'm telling you -- And I don't know if it's been done. Maybe it has been done. Maybe you've tried it. I don't know. But I think in a case like that where, particularly a case which has all the signature elements of a serial type murder, or a potential, one which is potentially the serial murderer -- or any kind of murder for that matter, where the perpetrator has gone out of his way to dispose of a body in an out of the way location. I think there's a likelihood of him coming back for whatever reason, curiosity or some particular reason. It's probably higher than the probability of you finding a piece of evidence there that will lead you to him.

RK: You absolutely have to have a situation though where the killer knows nothing has been found there, right?

TB: Ya. Ya, that's --

RK: He's not going to come back with --

TB: Not this guy. Ordinarily. I mean, certainly not the Green River Guy who's just simply to me has a, has an intuitive quality about him which makes him very wary. At least he seems to me to have developed that over time. He may not have had it initially, although I think he learned pretty quick.

RK: I think if you look at, you know, the dates of discovery in comparison to where the next drop is, it's never in the same spot. So he never goes back to a spot, at least to dump somebody, once it's been discovered. Like Star Lake Road. Even though the police didn't know all those other six bodies were there, he never dumped another body there after we found one in September of '83. They were all deposited before that time.

TB: Right. Exactly.

RK: As soon as we found it he went on to --

TB: Ya, I'd have to see one of those maps that you all had with the numbers and the dates and all that. I once, I remember once analyzing the pattern in which he dumped the bodies. But, the fact that he went, that he took the trouble, for whatever reason, to dump more, to often times dump more than one body in the same location, is significant. Now it's significant maybe just because he was just going to use up that site until, for whatever reason he didn't want to use it any more. Right? I think it's significant probably because he felt comfortable there, for whatever reason. He felt it was a good place to dump bodies and when it ceased to be a good place -- Although, that's not true either because he was using several sites simoustaneously at once, as I recall, before anything was discovered, wasn't he?

RK: Right.

TB: I mean he had two or three, at least, that he was using, sort of distributing them around, you know, even before any remains were found. But the fact they were clustered like that is important. That he wasn't leaving them laying in alleyways or in dumpsters. That he was taking them somewhere and dumping them in clusters, I think is, says to me that he was probably returning. He was obviously returning to the site. And he was probably returning there not -- at times other than times he had a body.

RK: When you talk about going back to the site now, are you talking about sites in remote areas? Like, you know, the city of Los Angeles has 20 and some prostitutes that have been murdered, but they were found like the next day. Would your advise to them be leave her there and stake her out? Or?

TB: Well, if it's in a busy -- Again --

RK: It's a tough one.

TB: If it's in an urban area, lots of traffic, like if the body is laying in a ditch somewhere along the side of a roadway, I mean, obviously that's not, you're not going to be able to do much there.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: But if it's, you know, -- Now there's no evidence, for instance, that I know of that the Hillside Guy, Bianchi and Bonno were going back to a site. That I can recall, from what I read. But if the body is out of the way.

RK: But they were getting off on the police discovery of the sites.

TB: Ya. The dam thing about these guys is, I mean, you look at it different from me. Right?

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: I mean, Bianchi/Bonno for example, you said that. And it's true. My position was that, as dense as Bianchi seems to be, seems to have been without his uncle, if they, if together they had taken more time to dispose of the victims they, and managed to stay together despite their stormy relationship, they could still be out there. Cause one of the reasons there was so much heat about those cases, one of several reasons but one of the main reasons was they kept finding the bodies.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: And that was creating a lot of publicity and a lot -- and more publicity, more intense the investigation became. If the -- as much imagination, if you will, these two guys poured into

that, into torturing their victims went into disposing of them and ways they wouldn't be found, they probably would have lasted a lot longer. They just put a lot of heat on themselves. Even with that, nothing would have happened until Bianchi went off on his own and screwed up in Bellingham.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Nothing probably would have come of it if he could of, well, he couldn't, so that's neither here nor there. But, I guess what I'm saying is that -- I lost my train of thought. Alszimers.

RK: But they didn't go back and --

TB: The Green River Guy was going out of his way to put these bodies in places where they would take a while before they were found. That's obvious. I mean, that's very clear. But why? And I just think that to place those sites under surveillence, those kinds of crimes, whether it's a prostitute or whoever the victim is, if the site lends itself to the guy returning, and it can be staked out, they probably should be.

RK: I mean, would the guy like the Green River killer have an interest in typically when those crime scenes are left there's police tape around and, you know, they've taped off certain areas. Would he go back and see what they've done?

TB: That is something I haven't given a lot of thought to. I don't know. I don't have a feeling for that. I'm not saying he wouldn't. But again, because I feel he's --

RK: That's pretty risky.

TB: It is pretty risky and he's such a wary type individual. But he is pretty bold. He was pretty bold, at least in '82 and '83 when those -- all the publicity about all those disappearances and he kept going back to the same area snatching people right out from under the noses of, what I would seem to be a pretty intense surveillance situation. The guy had to have a, to be pretty bold to. But I don't think that he -- I'm purely speculating, I don't think that he would go back to a site that had already been discovered. You know. I may be reading too much into, to this kind of crime scene where you have the body of a young woman, like a prostitute. That's why I wish the FBI had asked a lot more questions of these guys that they studied, because they didn't ask a lot about the crime scene. They didn't ask any questions about whether or not these guys ever went back to the crime scene or why they selected the crime scene or what -- Well, they asked a few questions about what they did there, but they didn't get into it very deeply. They certainly didn't ask a lot of questions about what they did there and if they ever went back and why and so what they did and so on and so forth. And in cases like Green River, or cases that involve serial murder of the kind that the FBI was investigating, I think you have to see

there's a dynamic kind of interrelationship between the perpetrator and even the remains of the victim. Bill Hagmire likes to think that those types of crimes involve a very strong, possessive instinct. And that is the perpetrator gets off on literally possessing his victim. And I think that's certainly one way of looking at it and has validity. And that possession goes on past the point where the victim is killed. And theoritically, being and practically speaking, the perpetrator, the killer, is still the only person who knows where the woman's body is. He's still in many ways of possession of her. And if that's his thing, and I'm not saying it and I don't like to over-generalize, but if that's his thing, then going back and viewing the body or just being at the site might be something that he, you would get off on, vicariously if you will.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Now the Green River guy was so effective he didn't have to stand around and vicariously get off it seems to me. He just went out and snatched somebody. But there must have been a point where even he was so conscious of the publicity and of the heat and he said, you know, "I'd like to go out and do it today but, I mean, I just did one yesterday and last week and if I do it again -- I mean, those things are -- I mean, all hell will break loose and besides I, you know, they're probably looking for me out there." "I just can't risk it." Well, you know, who knows? He might have just hopped in his car and drove to Portland that day. But, or --

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Or he may have just said, "well, I'll just get off and drive down to Star Lake." I dumped one down there a couple of days ago." See what I'm saying?

RK: Ya.

TB: And it's sort of a way of getting some, not getting, satisfying himself along those lines.

RK: What do you feel that the police do wrong in serial murder investigations?

TB: Well. I don't --

RK: Maybe you want to divide that up. Like, privacy analysis, suspect pursuit, eyewitnesses, investigative tactics. Whatever you thing. What do you think they really do wrong?

TB: I don't know if there's any --

RK: I mean, one time I heard you say that the one thing they should do is keep their mouth shut.

TB: Oh. Ya, ya. That's a real good point. Ya. Well, -- let me try to collect my thoughts here. I don't think there's any one thing, I mean, that stands out. I mean, one of -- again, one of my pet, one of the things that, that constantly comes to my mind is how the crime scene is treated. But, we've been talking about that but, considering the disadvantage that police are in serial murder cases because it's a crime between, usually between a perpetrator who doesn't know the victim and so you have a stranger on stranger situation and it's just -- the contacts there are tenious to non-existent to be able to connect the victim to the perpetrator, at least directly. And it's a very, these are very difficult cases to investigate. But I think that, in terms of publicity, ya, I think that too often the police, from what I've seen, release too much information or talk too much about the case. Either release too much information or indicate they don't have anything. In both cases if the perpetrator is paying any attention to what's going on, he is going to know what, how to make his next move. I mean, if you get the sense the police don't know anything, or even if he sees, even if an investigator gives an interview and tries to get suave, get slick and infer they have something they don't, or say something, say they don't have something when they do, in other words, try to manipulate the interview to send signals, false signals to the guy they're looking for, for whatever reason. That's pretty dangerous because again, you're, you're sort of flying blind and if you send a false signal out there and he knows that you know it's false, you see, he knows -- if the perpetrator is reading about statements made by the police, or information attributed to the police, he can gain a lot of stuff from it. And I just think that that's certainly not to your advantage. If he knows you don't have anything, or, or you think you have something that he knows you don't, he's emboldened. He's going to feel more confident. And, of course, maybe you want him to feel confident. But the danger is that if you try, if you try to manipulate him, you may be manipulating him -- I mean, there's so much information you don't know that if you make a sort of a stab in the dark to try to trick him, he'll, generally, he'll be able to tell if you're trying to trick him. He'll be able to -- because there's so little you know about it generally speaking that he'll be able to tell that something's not right. So I think, except in rare instances where perhaps the guy has been in contact with the police through phone calls of letters or whatever, that the less said the better. There's just no question. I think that that's standard procedure, but I think there's a temptation because the police are under political constraints that they have to, that they -- I think sometimes feel they have to say something to the general public.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Well, certainly because -- there's instances where they need the help of the general public. You need the help of the people on the streets. And the only thing you can do is give out information saying we think this guy is maybe driving this kind

of vehicle and is dressed like this. You got to take those kinds of calculated risks. And it may be you're totally wrong. That I wasn't driving that. It didn't look like that.

RK: Is that why you say that it was a calculated risk, that he might not be driving that kind of car or he might not be dressed like that?

TB: Ya. And he'll know that. And if you're right you'll scare the shit out of him but if you're wrong he'll go aaagh, they're on, they're going down the wrong, he'll know that they're on a wild goose chase. So these are, I mean, if you have a, if the information is pretty unequivocal that -- you have an eyewitness who saw the guy and you need more information for the hook, you make a public appeal. There are times for sure when you feel that kind of confidence. And that's what has to be done. But the gist, what I'm talking about is this general chit-chat that you see sometimes. You see sheriffs or their press assistants or someone in authority making statements that just seem to be made to molify the press, just to satisfy the demands of the newsmedia. Talking about things that don't serve any objective of the investigation. Just, just --

RK: Releasing too much stuff?

TB: Just releasing information which may be, which may or may not be the correct-- And the person who knows whether or not it's accurate is out there reading it. And, and that will either cause him -- if it's -- will either cause him to modify his modus operandi in such a way it's going to be harder to find. I mean, assuming this guy has the intelligence and the awareness to pay attention to what's going on. And I think generally speaking these guys do. It's a matter of self preservation. Then, then it's probably wrong to send them that kind of information, saying we know this, therefore you better change your style or chances we'll catch you if you keep it up.

RK: How would you structure information releases?

TB: Well,

RK: I mean, if you feel, it would seem to me that if the police felt that if they really had a good description of somebody and they released it, that it probably would do some good. However, if they were wrong, then they're definitely barking up the wrong t ee.

TB: Ya.

RK: But if they really felt they had the right person, the right description, the right car and then they released that information to get the public to call in about similar people, that would seem to me to be a valuable technique. But if they're

wrong for some reason, then you're premise is that the guy's off the hook. And then --

TB: Well, at least he thinks he is. And you think, he wants to know -- I'm sure this, I'm sure that, unless the guy is totally irrational, he doesn't want to get, doesn't necessarily want to be apprehended and you would like to know what the police know. Just from the standpoint of avoiding being apprehended, being caught. The more he knows about what you know, the, generally speaking now, the more he knows about what the police know, the more he knows what, you know, how to proceed in the future. Does he -- can he go back to the same area or pick the same kind of victim or? I mean, does he have to be more careful? Does he have to change vehicles? Does he have to change his approach in some way? You know, should he go somewhere else for the time being? Change his, the kind of victim he's looking for? You know, assuming that he's capable of making all these rational judgments. And I'm sure there are limits to what, you know, to when and how that I can, a serial killer can modify his behavior.

RK: Does, how about the non -- I mean, you got a series of missing people for awhile, like in the Green River case, and there's really no discovery. And, so there's nothing that can be released because the police don't even know that maybe they're missing, they might be missing from different jurisdictions. And each jurisdiction may have a missing person report on a person, but there really is no publication of the discovery because they haven't been discovered. There's no publication about missing. There may be, you know, two inches of article in the paper that somebody's missing.

TB: Ahh ha.

RK: There may be no fact that it's connected to any series of cases or anything. What, what does a killer get from something like that because he's not getting any information. I mean, he --

TB: Well. He's not getting, he's not getting anything. Right. So he doesn't know. Put yourself, try to put yourself in his position. Let's say, instead of dumping those first six girls in the river, first five girls in the river, the Green River Guy just started dumping them around like he had been later on up in the mountains and willie nillie here and there around south King County, and I think I posed this type of hypothetical in a letter to you once, I mean, had there not been those five in the Green River, Lord knows who this thing would have unfolded. Right?

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: It would not have been quite so spectacular. It may have been many more months or years before any kind of pattern had been detected. You found a few bones one week and a few more bones the next. But put yourself in his position. He doesn't

know what you know. He doesn't know even if you've found these women. Ok? Remember this guy is, I mean, I don't want to infer that he's all the time super curious, but wouldn't you be? Well, I mean, if you'd gone out and abducted a prostitute and done whatever you did to her and dumped her in the bushes somewhere in south King County and a week would pass and a couple weeks would pass. He'd heard nothing. Now, what would you be thinking? Now, would you be a least bit curious if the police had figured out or even discovered the body? Would you be as curious if the the body was still there or if the police are doing any kind of investigating . If for no other reason than that -- I don't want to attribute too much intelligence to any one serial killer, but I think generally speaking that they have in common a desire to avoid detection. Maybe because, for whatever reason they like doing what they're doing or they're getting off on what they're doing, or they're compelled to do what they do and they want to keep doing if for whatever reason. With -- there are exceptions. I'm afraid sometimes those exceptions have been taken for the rule to the point where there's this myth that serial killers want to be caught. And I think generally speaking I don't see that. I see that as an exception. There are noteworthy exceptions -- the daughter scribbles on the bathroom mirror "stop me before I kill again." And that just doesn't happen. I mean, very often. Ummm, so, you know, wouldn't you be curious? Wouldn't you like to know what the police knew? You know, from your standpoint of before you go out again to snatch somebody else, wouldn't you like to know what the police know? So you could feel more confident about whether or not you, how long you could, how far you could push it, how often you could go out, how many you can get. This guy pushed it to the limit. I mean, I think you got this guy pushing beyond the limit. I mean, I'm kind of fascinated by just how much gall he had to keep going back and doing it again and again. Assuming it's one guy.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: That's pretty -- there's a lot of publicity. I mean, not -- withstanding all the criticism about the lack of attention the newsmedia gave these cases because they only involve prostitutes, there's a lot of publicity when you compare it to other serial murder cases. So, ya, I think that generally speaking the guy is real curious. Now, that doesn't mean that he had a morbid fascination with publicity or he gets off on the publicity. And I think you can probably get a good idea whether or not a serial killer is getting off on the publicity or once generate this kind of sensational publicity based upon how he disposes of his victims. If he disposes of them, you know, like the Hillside Stranglers did, out in the open where they could be easily found in a rather grothesque position, they I think it's because everybody is looking. He's not looking to get clean away with it in the sense that he just wants the victim to disappear and nothing else. He doesn't want the victim to be found. But if he's going to the lengths the Green River killer went, then he's looking to dispose of the victims so they won't be found and you

have to, I think the logical assumption is because he wants to keep doing it. And he's curious about what you know. He's curious about if anybody saw him contact the victim. If anyone saw his vehicle. He's curious as to whether the victims were found and what you found at the crime scene. I mean, did he leave anything? Did he leave any shred of evidence? Any hair? Any fabric? Any anything there. And that's one thing that came out of the, all the publicity about that one suspect that was brought in and interregated. The trapper. Based upon what he said, if I were reading that newspaper and I were the Green River Killer, I would just sit back and pop a beer and kick my feet up on the sofa and say "home free." Because, I mean the way they approached this guy was "we know you did it, we got the evidence." Well, you know, words to that effect. I'm paraphrasing. Now it's been a couple years since I've read it. But, what I cot from all the publicity was they didn't have jack shit if they thought they could drag this guy in, if he wasn't the guy, the really guy knows they don't have Jack shit because they were putting that kind of pressure on this guy. If they had real good evidence they would have known he wasn't the one.

RK: That's true. That's true.

TB: And so I just sit back and say, "_____" "They don't have a thing cause if they did they wouldn't have put that guy to that kind of pressure." That's the danger. And it was unavoidable. I mean, it wasn't your, it wasn't the Task Force's fault in the sense that the newsmedia really blew it all out of proportion. And if you have a good suspect you have to bring him in, but the danger is if he goes to the newsmedia and tells the newsmedia what you told him, agh, and they sort of reveal their hand, which was they didn't have anything but they wanted to make them think they did.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Then they've emboldened the real guy. That's the risk, that's the risk.

RK: Well I could see where he'd want to kick back if he had that -- especially if the guy came right out and told everything he thought the police knew about him. I mean, that was -- I think I sent you that article.

TB: Ya, and it --

RK: But it wasn't the one -- there's another one too where it was probably even more detailed about what was done. That was the initial shocker, that one. The next few that came out revealed more and more information about the interview process.

TB: Ya. So he -- if the guy ever gets picked up and brought in for interrogation he's in all likelihood going to be ready for it, probably gone over it a thousand times in his mind. So see,

you're going to have to come up with a different wrinkle. And again, it's --

RK: When you were talking about how serial killers would talk, is getting caught with the goods an overwhelming thing?

TB: That's a good point. I mean, is -- From the standpoint of playing the standard game, playing by the rules of the criminal justice system where you just proclaim your innocence and let your public defender do the talking, if you're caught with the goods it's really kind of reached -- you're gone beyond the point of deniability, whether it be in a legal sense or in a psychological sense. And I think certainly, if a guy were caught with the body of a woman in his trunk, even 8 years, 6 years later, I think he might be more vunerable, you might say, to just saying listen why, we found your -- there's no point in denying it any more. You might as, just talk about it. Let's talk about it, what happened? And start with that and I think that certainly if that were the case he'd be more likely to tell something about everything, than if he were just arrested in his house and taken downtown. Because at that point, based upon everything that's come out so far it's clear the police, it would be, at least I would say, that the, that the police have next to nothing that's of real value. They've got a lot of stuff. A few profiles and some descriptions of vehicles, but in terms of hard evidence, if I were the perpetrator I would feel pretty confident. Although, still, being arrested, if it's the first time he's ever been arrested. If he's never - that's another factor. If he -- and I would -- one of the first things I would do, and I'm sure the first thing you or the Task Force people would do if I had a guy that I wanted, had a warrant issued for to arrest him in this case, find out if he had any kind of criminal background. And I'm not talking just from the standpoint of trying to figure out if he's done anything like that in the past, but trying to find out how familiar he is with the system. Has he been hardened? Does he know what his rights are? I mean, not to say that you'd violate his rights, but has he been through the system before so he is conditioned to how the game is played? Does he know how to be, how it is to be interrogated? How it is to go to trial? Does he know what prison is like and what jail is like? Is he familiar with all that? A lot of people, the Green River Killer if he's never been arrested and gone through the system like that before, gone to jail and gone to prison, even though he's pretty solid in terms of not talking about what he's done, the prospect of jail and prison could still be very frightening to him because he simply has never experienced it before. Anybody who's spent any time in prison, however, would not be as intimidated by the threat of prison or anything, you know, a dark jail and -- so, the less experienced he is with the criminal justice system, obviously the better off you'll be -- I mean, in terms of, the better off you'd be in terms of questioning.

RK: That may be a factor in conjunction with the time span that expires from the murder to the arrest. You were talking about earlier.

TB: Ya.

RK: The shorter the series, the more likely he is to talk about it.

TB: That's my feeling and that's -- I'm very strong feeling along those lines. Early on the guy's more vunerable and all the experience of going out and abducting and killing someone is obviously a very terrible thing, but in terms of how the perpetrator sees it, it's certainly tramatic, can be very tramatic too. If for no other reason that his very life, his freedom, his way of living is, his own identity is threatened by possible discovery. So, early on the guy could be unstable. He hasn't figured it out. He hasn't, psychologically he hasn't adapted to it. He hasn't adjusted to it. Doesn't know how to deal with the membranes of the system. And the more chance he has to rationalize it and justify it and work it out in him own mind and more or less come to terms with it, and carry these very dark secrets, and the longer he carries them, the more he gets used to them, the more difficult it is, will be to get him to talk.

RK: How about some of the people you've talked to though that have talked sporatically about what they've done? Is that the same type as somebody that, I mean, they obviously haven't talked to anybody else, but they've talked to you because you understand what their, you know, at least they sense you understand their feelings.

TB: I've had a couple of guys approach me because they write a lot about me and more or less when it got off on sharing the details of their adventures, their crimes with me [end of tape].

TB: So, and I've also approached guys who haven't come to me first just because I was curious about what they had been accused and/or convicted of. So I would go to them. And of course I would do so very, very descretely, making sure they understood that I didn't want to know any details. And that may be something, that may be a technique that you could use. I don't want to know the details. I don't want to know names or places. I just want to know what happened. I don't want to know names. That's what I would do. I said, "don't tell me. I don't want to know dates, I don't want to know names, I don't know specific places."

RK: Could they even remember that stuff?

TB: That's a good question. Ummmm, the guys I've talked to -- my feeling is that they remember. Now whether or not they are going to tell me exactly what happened for whatever reason is

another question. But I don't know of, I don't know of any -- I haven't, certainly haven't encountered enough guys to run across let's say a split-personality type, you know, like allegedly Bianchi is. I haven't run across anybody who's got that kind of duel personality or anything and I don't run across anybody who professes to have had amnesia or blackouts or anything like that. I think I've run across guys who's memories may be justifiably vague for reasons such as they were under the influence of alcohol or drugs or just the rather, I think the, the fear, the panic, the fright, the causus of that, of the violence that went on there would somehow cloud their memories. But basically I think the guys I've talked to can remember when they talk to me. And again, I've had the luxury of when I talk to any of these mem of having lived with them. So I see they're normal side, their everyday side. You know, the guys that watch "Let's Make a Deal" and how they rout for the, how they rout for the guy, I mean, how they -- the game shows they watch and the canteen items they buy and what they do in the yard. I mean, I can see them, their everyday side and yet I know that -- this other part of them too. And it's a great advantage in not being law enforcement and not being a psychologist and being viewed as who I am when I talk to them. It's -- on occasion I think it gives me insight into some of it, three or four of these guys have been accused of serial murder. And I think they remember. I know they remember.

RK: When you speak of not knowing, not wanting to know names and dates and places and stuff, how do you verify what they're telling you is the truth?

TB: That's a good question. I -- it's hard to put into words. It's just knowing when they tell you something, I mean when they describe how something happened whether it's authentic or not. And let's fact it, the -- the -- you know, after killing someone is, is -- what one experiences is not a common experience. You know, you can read all the murder mysteries you want and you know that as graphic as some of these detective novels may try to be, you just know they're not for real because you can tell the guy's never been there. He's just making it up. Whether you watch some of these so-called slasher films or whatever. I mean, you know that's just Hollywood. This doesn't really happen that way. You just know. I mean, how do you -- you say you just know that -- And so if a guy's making it up or if he's read about it, I just have a sense that he's not being straight with me. You can tell it. Certainly one way that, one of several ways is that -- it's a tried and true way -- is he doesn't tell the same story the same way twice. And I always make them tell it to me two or three times. (?) And I'll say, "hey, how about this?" That doesn't make sense.

RK: It would seem to me that the strategy that you're using is totally opposite of the interests of the police because they want to know times and dates and places, accountability. Maybe, maybe not so much in the framework of getting the goods on anybody as

much as accounting for, you know, that's the only way they've recorded their facts.

TB: Well, this is true. And yet that's a way of opening somebody up. If a guy feels -- if a guy has, for whatever reason, insulated himself from the reality of what he did, but can discuss it in the third person or better yet, in the first person without getting specific, you're getting, gradually getting closer to the truth. I mean, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, including the names and dates and places, what -- I mean, everything he knows. But maybe the more cirquitous route in some cases may be the better route because it, some guys just can't get the, can't give it to you right straight. They can't sit down and say, ok, on this night this is what I did and this is what happened and so on and so forth. They might be better to work them into it gradually, to the point where they say, well, you know, of sort of opening themselves up by degrees. Certainly you want to verify what they say ultimately. You want to verify it by making sure they tell it to you the same way and making sure what they tell you corresponds with the facts and maybe even putting on sodium penethall or on polograph, just to make absolutely sure. Let's say -- in a big case like the Green River Case you're obviously not going to believe anybody who comes forward and starts confessing these crimes. Even if they get some of the names, dates and places right because so much of information has been dissiminated to the public. And I'm sure you've sat down and tried to figure out how you would -- I mean, there are things you know about that have not been made public. But more than that -- this guy's memory might be so bad after all these years he might not be able to remember some of these details that you know about the public doesn't know about.

RK: That's right.

TB: That's another problem. Even if he wants to confess, he might not remember enough to satisfy you. Maybe the only way to do it is would be like say through a polygraph or sodium penathall or something in a very careful debriefing technique. One of the things that I've found just really appalling about how they handled this fellow that I told you about who started, who was for seven years out there doing this, started with a double murder, according to his own admission. And, and confessed, allegedly confessed to some two dozen or so murders over that period of time. Was it -- what bothered me was it was so sloppy and so haphazard and they did the same thing to this guy they did to Henry Lucus. You had one detective sergeant and this, and this county police, or sheriff's department who was more or less the head honcho and he was the guy that all these other agencies in Florida had to go through to get to this fellow. And they would come through and plop their files down on the desk and he'd look through them and they'd talk it over and he confessed to a lot of this stuff. And a lot of the stuff he -- And he was doing it because he likes to be viewed as this, _____ Denzier likes to be viewed as a good guy. He liked the affirmation.

You're doing the right thing. And he liked the special treatment he was getting in jail. He as getting off on all that. But they weren't carefully screening his confessions and verifying them and making sure he was telling them the same thing, you know, day after day. And they didn't bring in any specialists, any psychologists or psychiatrists. They didn't use the behavioral science people, or the FBI. And so Jerry was -- this guy's name is Jerry, Jerry Stano, who is just getting away with all kinds of -- stuff.

RK: What does he think of Crow? Detective Crow? This guy that interviewed him?

TB: Is it Crow? I guess that sounds familiar. Well, I don't know what he thinks of him right now. I last was with Jerry -- we were both on death watch, as a matter of fact, together and we're also lived in the same wing together for some time. And I read that -- a very confidential report prepared by the, it's a pre-sentence report by some state agency, which goes into great detail about his confessions and his past life. And well, Jerry is a long subject. But, Jerry liked Crow. I got the impression at least initially he liked and trusted him. But my impression was that the authorities, I think down in Daytona, wherever, got, finally got tired of Jerry confessing and getting life sentences. See, Jerry first confessed when he was arrested in February of 1980. When he was arrested, the day they arrested for assault on a prostitute and I think Jerry is a case you might want to study from the standpoint of what you might be looking at with the Green River Killer. Because Jerry was out there for seven years, by his own admission. [They're probably having a fight down the hall. They all run down the hall when there's an altercation.]

RK: I'm glad we left that room. It might have been in there.

TB: No, it's right outside the door here.

RK: Oh, is it? Two inmates?

TB: Yes, I'm almost certain, but I don't know. Look at them. They work in here and they still have to ----- They messed somebody up. Oh, well. Well, Jerry would be a case study that maybe you'd want to look at because over the years he did prey on a lot of prostitutes and he was out there for so long, seven years doing that, doing his thing. At least seven years. And so when he was arrested for attempted murder, he attempted to stab a prostitute that was in a motel room. My understanding is that, well, and the record shows, that the day he was arrested he not only admitted to attacking this prostitute, who lived, who would have died. He was trying to kill her but she got away. But he confessed to another murder. Two other murders that day. And that was all he admitted to. In fact they didn't press him any further. And this went on. And so he came to prison here and he was here for a little over a year and for reasons which Jerry has never satisfactorily explained to me, he got in touch with Crow I

guess it was and said he wanted to talk some more about this. And began to, admitted to a few more. And then, maybe half a dozen more. And then he came back a year and a half later in 1983, and confessed to a whole bunch more murders in September and October of '83. And they finally decided to give him the death sentence for some of those confessions. And he wasn't finished yet. I mean, it was just as plain as the nose on your face that he was having a lot of time opening up. And he was doing so a little bit at a time. And perhaps it was maddening that -- to the prosecutors involved that he was dragging this out. Maybe they got impatient with him, but they ended up giving him a death sentence, three death sentences based upon his confession in '83. And he stopped talking to them after that. And he won't talk to them anymore. They scared him. They managed to set him up. But he was badly mishandled. If he was properly handled back in '80 when he confessed to those two murders, if they'd known how to followup on what he'd said and develop and inquire into his activities over the years, they'd have probably gotten more, gotten more out of him then. Instead of waiting for the next two and a half years for him to keep coming back to them. Ya.

RK: Did he ever talk to you about during that seven or eight year span of how close he came to being apprehended at any time?

TB: Well, ya, as a matter of fact. He was -- ya. Let's see. What happened? He was primarily preying on prostitutes and again, this is, in many ways Jerry is a classic situation. And it's been a long time since I've reviewed this in my memory of everything he told me and certainly since I've read his pre-sentence report. But, I think it was in 19 -- late 1970's. "77, '78. He was arrested by vice, by a woman police officer. Jerry was out looking for a prostitute to kill. This was in '77, three years before he was caught, three or four years. I think he was caught in '80. Ya, he was caught in '80. And he was arrested for soliciting. What do they call that? Whatever the appropriate charge is.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: And significantly enough, he was arrested in Daytona and he was bonded and all that stuff. I mean, he was put in jail and he got out and I think he got some sort of fine, a probation. But the next week, instead of going back and looking for somebody else on the, let's see, on the east coast of Florida, the record will show, and Jerry's confessions will substantiate the fact that he drove all the way across to the other side of the state, Tampa, and -- well, he drove first to Orlando and then to Tampa, in succeeding weeks, after his arrest in Daytona, looking for victims and finding, you know, victims. So, it's logical, and in fact it did happen that when Jerry was arrested in Daytona where he'd been doing most of his hunting for -- on that prostitution charge, that shortly thereafter he just drove to another part of the state to do the same thing.

RK: And admitted that.

TB: Oh, that's as close as he, that I know of that he came to being caught. And, again, only part of the story is known of Jerry. And Jerry -- as often as I try to get Jerry to open up to me, he wouldn't. He would always try to bullshit me. And the thing that bothered Jerry no end was that I had this extremely detailed report that someone else had given me. See, Jerry had allegedly confessed to a murder that somebody else on death row is convicted of committing. And so that person managed to get ahold of this report on Jerry. And so I had this report. And Jerry was a, is a pathological liar. And one of the sweetest, nicest, most generous guys you'll ever run across. You put him in a three-piece suit and he'd look like an economist. Like a frumpy haired, college economist. And one of the most harmless, nice, happy-going, good-old-uncle Jerry guys you'd ever want to run across. And so, it, getting to know Jerry was fascinating. Cause he'd tell me stories about things that happened and then I'd read that something else had happened, in the police report.

RK: I've met that detective at a seminar in Atlanta awhile back. You know, he said, "gee, I don't know why I'm up here talking. You should be up here telling your story." And he said, "Look at me." And, you know, it took me awhile to figure out what he was talking about. And he was devistated. I mean, he's, there's, he's useless. Evidentially he was castigated or whatever for whatever he'd done in that case, instead of, you know, learning from it and being able to profit by it, that experience, for some reason it was looked down upon by his own people.

TB: Well, it was a mess. Well, I don't know -- there may be, you may be, it may have been subjected to all kinds of pressures, I'm sure. But, the way Jerry was handled was, it was just a mess. They didn't call up, to my knowledge they didn't call anybody who really knew what they were doing. And they were just taking him haphazard and piece-meal and running around the state and showing him all kinds of stuff. And so thoroughly distorted and contaminated everything Jerry said, and, that, it's hard to say what Jerry's responsible for now. And then end up giving -- I mean, after being patient with him, while across the course of two and a half years, they finally, the prosecuting authorities just got fed up with him instead of giving him these life sentences. They gave him three death sentences and Jerry just stopped talking. And he wasn't finished talking, believe me. I mean, he wasn't finished giving them, telling them all he knew, by a long shot. They just had not thoroughly been able to sit him down and figure out how do we get this guy to tell us all he knows and make sure he's telling us the truth. I mean, there are still a lot of question marks in my mind. But, I've always felt this. If Jerry was telling the truth about the early murders that occurred in '73, if in fact, and there's a lot more probably that he's involved with, if he was telling the truth when he said he killed those two girls, two hitchhikers in '73, then, I know for a fact that he did a lot more that he's talking about.

Because there are huge gaps of twelve months where there's nothing there. I mean, he's told the police -- and I can just look at his patterns and tell, you know, knowing what I know about Jerry and looking at his crime patterns, I mean, sometimes three or four a month, and then there's periods of twelve, eighteen months in that seven year period where there's just nothing. Big blanks.

RK: Really. Nothing, agh?

TB: Nothing. Nothing he's told the police. Nothing that the police got around to asking him about. I mean --

RK: Is that because he wasn't doing anything or out of town?

TB: No, hell no. These were periods of time when, see, Jerry, I'm not trying to psycho-analysis him, but I know Jerry to the extent to know that he's got a poor self-image. He covers it over with a lot of joviality, but he has a poor self-image that was aggravated by alcohol abuse. He could never finish school. He couldn't hold a job. During that whole seven year period he lived in his, in his parents' home or in homes owned by his parents or for a short time with his wife in a trailer. He never held anything more than part-time menial jobs, drinking heavily, driving around, getting money from his parents. And in the period following the separation from his wife, where he lost his job with his father-in-law, had to live in his parents' home, was kicked out of his own trailer by this woman he was married to, a period of time when I know dam well he was angry and hostle and probably was feeling as bad about himself as he had ever felt, and had more time on his hands than he'd probably had for years, there's nothing there for twelve months.

RK: A huge gap by the police.

TB: I know dam well that he was out there doing stuff. It was absolutely, there's just no question. If -- and there's a big if there. Some of the other things he's told the police are true about what happened in '73 and '74. If that's true, and it seems to be true, then there's a lot more and they just didn't know how to get it out of him. And it's a shame now because Jerry's been polarized and the rare opportunity to really find out what was going on in him mind or what he really knows may have passed. The only distrubing thing I find out, I find about Jerry's revelations to the police is I don't know that he ever turned up any bodies, any remains. And that's -- that doesn't necessarily say he's not telling the truth, but, I mean, I don't know. I don't know how much more he has.

RK: I heard a figure one time where he'd confessed to 41 murders.

TB: That's, ya, but in fact, the pre-sentence report which is very detailed and goes into great length about his confessions,

shows that he confessed to 11 murders where he's been charged and given a sentence of some sort, whether death sentence or life sentence. And ten more murders where they haven't yet, where they just never got around to charging him for one reason or another. That's 21. Now there may be others they suspect him of or whatever, but that's -- the report's fairly comprehensive and it pinpoints 21 specific cases. And I've charted them out, integrated them with what Jerry's told me, with what I know, and what the pre-sentence report says, and there are huge, these enormous gaps at very critical times when he was clearly in a state of mind, based upon my knowledge of how these, how these things go, where he would -- more likely drinkage and that kind of behavior than -- You know. Now I think that's the problem that investigators face even when they get somebody that they think has been involved in a series, is, just finding this out, just how extensive his activities have been. And not just settling for the easy conviction or two and locking the guy away. I mean, how much more, I mean, I think they just, for whatever reason the prosecuting attorneys have reached the point where, reached its threshold where they weren't willing to wait anymore to find out. It was more important to them to give him a death sentence than it was for them to find out what he really knew. I think they just reached that point where they said, "We've had enough of this fellow. We can't give him anymore life sentences. We've got to - that's it." And despite the fact that these glaring inadequacies in how he was interrogated, and these big gaps, these unexplainable gaps in his stories. And I say that not to condemn Jerry, and I certainly wouldn't reveal anything specific that he told me, yet I think it stands, it's always just appalled me just how badly that specific case was handled. I mean, how badly Jerry was handled. It would be a good case study for anyone wanting to know how not to approach somebody accused of a series of crimes, is, would be to study Jerry's case. Cause he was lost. I mean, either they're going to kill him and undoubtedly will. I don't know who that's going to end up there. But --

RK: So you haven't seen him in a while then?

TB: No. I haven't -- I saw him today walking down the hall, but I haven't lived around him where we could go to the yard and talk in confidence. We've sent each other notes or whatever. I haven't talked to him for over a year, well, year and a half.

RK: I was -- I'm kind of getting the feeling that whatever the efforts of the police, if a certain time span has gone by and a person has learned to deal with their own thoughts and problems for quite awhile, the efforts to somehow understand or reveal the story in somebody in the interview process would almost totally be controlled by the person that's being interviewed. Whatever the police do, or say, or their presence really doesn't make any difference.

TB: Ya. If he wants to tell you he'll tell you and if he doesn't he won't

RK: Ya.

TB: I mean, we're talking, again, about somebody who has been out there for years and years at this. I mean he's had this, he's integrated this so thoroughly into his consciousness, into his daily life, into his way of being and living and has become so familiar with how to deal with what people commonly refer to as guilt, remorse, or whatever. Deal with it and/or do away with it. And it's become a, these thoughts and memories that constitute, that are related to these crimes have been, he's adapted so well to them and kept them so close because he knows the consequences of giving them up. That, that it's not likely anybody is going to trick him into talking about it or pressure him into talking about it.

RK: What, what is, are the consequences anything that can be visualized? Or conceptualized in some way in the part of an unknown party?

TB: Well, I -- you mean someone like an investigator who's interviewing the guy?

RK: Ya. How does he conceptualize what's been integrated into this guy's mind for so long?

TB: Well, well, I think --

RK: Time? Patience?

TB: Ya. Time and patience. I think those are two good words. You can't hope to drag it out of a guy overnight. Ok? And you can't get frustrated if he doesn't give it to you all at once, in one piece. Because there are, you have to be contend with slowly learning about what kind of person is this. What demands do we, is he responding to within himself? And they may be very particular, very suttle, and very difficult to find out. Like for instance, this fellow I was telling you about who would tell you at the drop of a hat about all the people he killed, except he just couldn't bring himself to tell anybody how he killed his girlfriend and where he put her body. He just couldn't because his view of the world was these other killings were good, but killing somebody you know is bad. And he was afraid if he told people would -- he had this vision in him mind that if he told about, if he admitted to killing his girlfriend and told them where the body was, then people would see him as a bad person. That's pretty bizzare but that's how he was thinking. And it didn't occur to me until after we talked about it for awhile. And so, I think the more you take time to know somebody, perferrably the suspect, if you have a chance to extend, to get all of the information you could beforehand, before he was brought in, know as much about him as possible before he was

brought in, and then maybe even to talk to friends and relatives about him once he's in. Now of course, once he's in custody, he's in custody. But you get a feeling for the guy as much as you can without talking to the guy. And then once you start talking to him you just use your own gut reaction. Just to start, patiently probing without pushing, without being judgmental, taking it a step at a time, the third person, maybe doing it without dates and places or making it an abstract kind of thing. I mean, I'm not -- it's a -- when I'm faced -- when I'm faced with somebody and I want to learn about the case, certainly what I want to learn, my perspective, is different from yours. But still I have to respond to what that guy gives me. And I often know less than you would probably know about someone. My advantage is we know he's been convicted of some kind of murder, anyway. So, that's certainly the starting point. And he trusts me to one degree or another. Still, if you can -- if an investigator can somehow inspire trust and confidence and come off as being nonjudgmental and be patient and probe and get to know how this guy's mind works -- I know this is pretty general kinds of things, but -- That's how I'd approach somebody who'd been out there, who you suspect would be out there for a number of years or involved in serial murder for a number of years. Somebody who'd only been at it for a short time would be more vunerable, I mean, more unstable, more confused, more guilt ridden, more susceptible coersion, you know. Remember that classic case, you've probably run across it, where they bring this guy into an interrogation room and ask if he wants to take a polygraph and tell him to put his hand on this mat or something like this. And every time he gives an answer to a question, the investigator presses a button and a light goes on and said, agh, you're lying. And thoroughly convinced this guy that they knew he was lying about these key questions and he finally confessed. Of course, it wasn't hooked up to a polygraph at all. But that kind of ploy, as crude as it was, will work. Once in awhile it will probably work on those guys who haven't been at it very long, haven't been through the system, Criminal Justice System. Haven't been imprisoned or jailed. And the whole thing about being in police custody is terrifying for you. And everything, their whole identity, everything they know about themselves, is shaping them. And they begin responding to unconscious cues, one of them being that they've always been taught, probably, to cooperate with the police, even when it comes to confessing some pretty horrible things.

RK: How would you approach a known offender that you know is in jail for murder on cases that you have technically unsolved? How would you approach an offender like that? I mean, they obviously know the system. They've been tried and convicted. Maybe sentenced to death. Then all of a sudden there are some unresolved matters of the past where this person is a suspect in those matters. How would you approach somebody like that?

TB: [Long silence]. Well, I don't, again, each case is going to be different. I think generally you've got to, it depends --

it's just an entirely different set of circumstances that you, than you're going to have with somebody who's never been through the system, who's not convicted. And I guess that you'd have to be able to give him something. If -- I don't know. Let's say that you had the Green River guy was locked up here. You had somebody locked up you thought was the Green River Guy. May have been locked up for assault or something and he's in Walla Walla. I mean, what could you -- how would you go to him? I mean, how could you approach such a person who's familiar with the system who's locked up for ten or twenty years to confess to something which obviously carried some pretty heavy penalties and resulted in being a very notorious guy in prison. And --

RK: Maybe it wouldn't result in any heavy penalties.

TB: Well. It would --

RK: I mean, he may be under the death sentence, you know, for crimes he committed now, but what happened in the past there's no death sentence for. I mean, the penalty is not as great for those.

TB: Ummm.

RK: Seems like a pretty impossible situation that where there's still answers to questions that could be resolved and you -- you've talked a lot about the how and how you've approached these people and the development of an appreciation of what was done. And I would expect that a detective in that situation would have to be the same, absolutely in the same criteria to develop some sort of appreciation for what somebody has done and understanding. Now we could end up just by a walk in to a guy that's been under death sentence for awhile in Walla Walla and we're faced with this situation. We have several crimes where the circumstantial evidence is pretty well focusing on one person, yet the opportunity to go interview them is not right, and virtually not knowing how to go operate that type of interview. And --

TB: Well, that's -- in that kind of circumstance you see everything is complicated by the demands of the criminal justice system, of the way everyone is more or less required to play the game. And a guy who is on, who's in prison or whether he's on death row or wherever he is has got appeals and he would simply be foolish to talk to the police about anything as long as his appeals are in tact. Because the system as it stands now is not really geared to getting at the truth so much as it is -- it gets at portions of the truth. It gets at approximations of the truth. Whether it be a trial -- and as long as a guy goes to trial all you're getting is what the witnesses say, you know. And that's only part of the story, probably. The same is true on appeal. You're just, the guy who's been convicted is bound to try to maintain his position and he must be, and he can't say anything, is not in a position to say anything.

RK: Would that type of person be inclined to speak in the abstract?

TB: I don't know. I don't know what that would serve. Remember you told me that that, that didn't totally serve any purpose to the investigators as long as it was so vague that they couldn't really pinpoint anything.

RK: Ya. And then there's two sides to that. Well, what would happen, would that be something that could be used against him?

TB: What?

RK: Any statements he makes? Is that something that can be used against him?

TB: Well, I don't know. It depends on how general they are. But I think you know the -- you know, the old Miranda warning, "anything you say can and will be held against you." And I, it doesn't necessarily even have to mean in a court of law. But, I don't know. It's hard to explain. The way things are set up, I don't see how someone could say that, like you're talking about Walla Walla, where they have any incentive to talk to you. I mean, first, on the one hand, he's got his appeals and so there are disincentives, clearly disincentives to talking to you. On the other hand, what motivations would there be for someone in that position to talk to you about anything?

RK: How about someone like yourself that's obviously astute and _____ there, and admitted by your own admissions several times that you really like talking to other people about this stuff. I mean, you like thinking about crime scenes and seeing pictures.

TB: Well, I --

RK: And you like reading everything you can get your hands on about the subject. You obviously like talking to me about it or otherwise you wouldn't be doing it. Is there something about that atmosphere that is --?

TB: Well. With me, I do enjoy it, and yet I, that, that interest ebbs and flows. There's sometimes I'm more interested in talking about it than others. Like right now I'm sort of ambivalent about it. I mean, it's interesting, I find it interesting. I know a lot about the subject. It's hard to put it in words in the abstract. I mean, to me it's more interesting to have specific things to deal with, you know, specific cases. It's hard -- I don't like to generalize because, like I say, the guy who's responsible for the Green River killer is not a profile, he's not a computer program. He's a very unique human being. So I don't to generalize, but I do like to talk about it and I like to read about it. And yet I can take it or leave it most of the time. I mean, it's certainly not something that I, you know, that I would rather do than anything else. Like, right

now, if I had a choice, I'd rather be outside running around in the sunshine. Sometimes I'm more motivated to talk about, read about this stuff than others. But I don't get off on it. I mean, that is, I don't get a thrill out of talking to you about it, in the abstract. I mean, I'm not trying to, I won't try to make myself out to be a good guy, but I do have motivations of, and generally would genuinely would like to see this questionaire, for example, of yours work. I mean, and I genuinely would like to see -- [end of tape].

RK: Question too, you know, well, don't go out at night and lock your dam door and don't talk to anybody the rest of your life, you know, be a recluse. Anyway, here's this guy on television talking and then they have on two victim's mothers of Galagoes. And then they bring on this asshole serial rapist that obviously shouldn't be out on the street, but he is, and guess who his backup therapist is to help understand this serial rapist on the Donahue show?

TB: Hughseth.

RK: Holmes.

TB: Oh, my god.

RK: And it was a joke. I mean, it was so much of a joke I couldn't believe it. This guy was sitting there talking about, well, most of these people, you know, they have problems in childhood. And the serial rapist turned and, "you're darn right. Boy, I was sexually abused by my father." And then they talked about another thing. "You're darn right." And he just, it was almost like they were in tandum. I couldn't believe that he'd put himself in a situation like that to almost condone this guy being out on the street when it was obvious to most of the audience that they ought to cut his penis off and throw it away forever. The guy, just right out front said, you know, that's what I always want to do is rape women.

TB: That's pretty unusual.

RK: It is. It is.

TB: I mean that he would have the nerve to go on national TV and put the heat on himself.

RK: Oh, ya. Ya. And he was out on parole.

TB: Ya.

RK: California.

TB: Ya. Well, that whole scene. You know, you've read it so much. There's so much. I don't know that serial murder gets as much ink these days as it did for a few years and years back. In

the recent past, I don't know, there's so much misleading information on it, about it. And it is, it is begging the issue to talk about unhappy childhoods and all. And I'm not into that. But I think it's important to try to understand it if for no other reason than the better you understand it the better you're going to (1) prevent it or help you apprehend the people that you need to apprehend. I mean, to that extent maybe it's important to know some of these things.

RK: Of course, look at your own theory to that though. The criminal justice system. We have no way to study serial killers. We sentence them to death. We kill them. We give them a choice of life without parole in some instances or staying in prison forever. There is no, there's no vehicle in which to study those people under cooperative circumstances. I mean, even a guy like Edwin Kemper. I've seen him on television three or four times, talking to news people. I know that behavioral sciences people have talked to him at great lengths.

TB: He's a pretty articulate guy.

RK: He is. He's very smart. He's also a god dam liar. Yet, nobody has gotten him in a situation to say close the door, even though he's 6'9" and 300 lbs and say, "hey, son of a bitch, it's time for you to talk right and straight now." You know. "The game's over with."

TB: That's what I'm saying. You can listen to Edwin Kemper. I haven't heard him. But I'm just saying. I know what you're talking about. And here's a guy who knows what happened in his own circumstances and yet he's going to try to bullshit people. And you can see that in him and I could probably see that in him. And how do you sit down and really get down to get the straight facts, the real truth out of folks who had that information and they can give it up? Oh, by the way, Edwin Kemper did, however, I mean, I did read somewhere where he at least in my mind summarized that the -- what? The savage irrationality of serial murder in a sentence, he said, "it's like this." He says, "I used to see a good looking girl and one minute I'd be thinking how nice it would be to go out with her and then the next instant I was thinking how nice her head would look on a stick. You know, I mean, that, it's a horrible thing and yet it indicates the kind of, the schism between, that exists in those kinds of individuals between their "normal selves" and that other part of themselves that is so destructive.

RK: Well, one of the things he did was on the, he was interviewed on this HBO serial murder thing. And he said that on one occasion he picked up two girls. The second girl he picked up was convinced that the situation was ok because there was another female in the car with her. So she gets in. Now, he says that there's a lot of previous talk and if they would have said something to him like "we understand the way you are and that we're here to help you and do anything that you want" I

wouldn't have got to kill those girls. Well, what he really did was the minute the two got in the back seat in the car, right there in the street -- he's already said this in another statement now, turns right around, boom, boom, both of them. Right? Now, now he's getting on television. He's changing the god dam story around because they weren't understanding, trying to make it look like he's the -- if somebody would just understand me I wouldn't have had to do all this.

TB: Let's try to rationalize his conduct. And that's the curious thing that you see happening, not just press and serial murders, but maybe everyone does that. We all, people, normal or abnormal I think. Look how sometimes you'll see somebody trying to rationalize something that happened in their past and make it look a little bit better. He's just trying to deal with, I think, the needs he has inside to look at other people, maybe. Maybe there's something else happening there. But -- What I was thinking though, when I suggested to Bill Hagmire and the rest when he was here, and I suggest to you, is that, and it has fantastic potential and perhaps for that -- and unfortunately will never happen, but if you can gather together five or ten fairly articulate guys who have been incarcerated and believed to be serial murders and get them into a group setting, they have a forensic facility up at behavior science center, behavioral science unit up in Quantico. Under some kind of control, very secure situation, and get into a group interaction like they have in the sexual offender program. Get somebody who's very skilled at managing a group situation and I think you could really, you'd have the various participants cutting through each other's bullshit. And brainstorming and otherwise talking about and going over each others' cases and getting down to really the heart of the matter in a way that I don't imagine anybody could ever do. And a group, say what you want about group therapy, it can be that kind of group, interaction can be very effective for, by using people to reveal someone's deceptiveness. People who have similar experiences. They use it in, for instance, a variety of theraputic settings, but they use it for, very effectively, for people that have been accused of various sex crimes and sexual offenders. And something like that I think would be very productive. Very effective. Of course, I don't imagine anybody would be willing to stick their neck out to do it either. Restly said that he'd like to try something along those lines if they could develop a, built a forensic facility up there. But, I think that could be very productive. And it's be interesting to be able to see it from somebody else's point of view and interact with people who have had similar experiences. And share that kind of information in ways that they could never do it on their own, one on one with an investigator or a psychiatrist or anyone who really had seen or experienced that kind of thing themselves.

RK: Ahh ha. Is that, that would have to be done with probably people that have at least, in fact most of their cases resolved and --

TB: Ya, you're right. Somebody who is in a situation where they could feel free to open up and talk. Like a Kemper or, ya. Somebody that's at least willing to talk about their cases, and would not be jeopardizing themselves if they were candid about what is happening.

RK: Ya.

TB: And there are a number around the country. I think you'd be surprised if you sat down and tracked down people who were, who are incarcerated for what amounts to serial crimes, serial murders, who don't have death sentences or, you know, don't have the death sentence.

RK: What happened to -- last time I was here you mentioned Otis Toole. Is he here?

TB: Ya, he's still here. But, I just saw him walking down the hall earlier today. What time is it by the way?

RK: 4:35. What time do they close you out?

TB: 5:00.

RK: 5:00?

TB: Well, probably quarter to 5:00.

RK: Really?

TB: Ya.

RK: Ok.

TB: Agh, ya, I just saw him. He lived in the same wing that I did until they moved him out. He was living in the same wing I did and I live __. He's, all of them are on death row. He's -- his death sentence was overturned.

RK: Ummm.

TB: So he's just somewhere. He's not -- I don't think there's anything happening there. I think it's been pretty conclusively demonstrated that he and his partner were not what they -- at least believed that, it's not -- they's not -- people believed them to be early on anyway. I don't know.

RK: Ya, they threw Henry's latest case in El Paso out of court. They didn't have anything. There is so much phonyism behind the police's efforts to attach Henry to their cases.

TB: Aahh ha. Once that ball gets rolling you seen it, they would thoroughly discredit -- back in '84, '84, '85 an

investigative piece came out in the Dallas paper I think. To begin with it showed pretty conclusively that they weren't who they said they were.

RK: Ya.

TB: And still though the myth persists once it gets lodged in the consciouness of the media. They continue to list Henry Lucus as this prolific serial murderer when in all likelihood if he did whatever he did he's not what he, he's not what he said he did. Once the media pegs you and gets your name on their list of infamous character, you're there. It's like every article that comes out, I would imagine on the subject of serial murder now has the name Ted Bundy in it more often than not.

RK: I don't think I've ever seen one that hasn't had it.

TB: Ya. And yet nobody knows. It's -- the references are based upon bad information generally speaking.

RK: Oh, ya.

TB: So --

RK: Oh, ya. They -- except for Holmes. He's got your name specifically documented --

TB: Oh, absolutely.

RK: As a footnote.

TB: Ya. Ya, ya,. Well, that's sad. I was hoping that something like that would work. I must say that I --

RK: What did you have in mind when you talked to him anyway?

TB: Well, a thorough and independent analysis. I was concerned that law enforcement did not have the kind of objective view that I was looking for and I wanted somebody with an open mind who was a skilled social scientist. And yet -- I just -- it's not just the experience with Holmes but generally speaking I've been somewhat disenchanted with my attempts to explain things to folks. And maybe -- it's my fault I guess because I'm not articulate enough to help people understand.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: You know. I haven't given up. I think the FBI though, of all the stuff I've run across, and I may be giving them too much credit, I don't see them as, the FBI as a super law enforcement people. I know they're just human like everybody else. But I do think some of the stuff I see coming out of the behavioral science unit, especially some of the things that I saw printed with respect to their studies, is the best I've read. And I'm

sure there are people that know as much as the folks up there, maybe more. But of all the literature I've read, I think, at least in my opinion, they've managed to capture as best as it can be captured, the character of the serial murderer, generally speaking, if there is such a thing. Pretty good stuff I thought. Pretty, too general for me, I think, to be of any value to you or anyone else out there. They should publish something a bit more specific.

RK: Have you ever thought about writing a definition of serial murder, yourself?

TB: I don't know that -- I don't know there's a definition that would fit. Certainly no definition I know would fit everybody. And,

RK: You would have to be rather general in your --

TB: Ya. It would be on, it would be on --

RK: I'll send you a definition that the MAIT people came up with. See what you think of that. It's kind of general.

TB: Well, --

RK: It's hard, it's hard to use the term. You know, like if you're going to have homicide classifications, mass and serial.

TB: Ya.

RK: How do you define serial? I mean these others are rather simple to define.

TB: Well, how do you tell -- ?

RK: Do you define it by classification or do you define it by motivation?

TB: Ahh ha.

RK: Is homicide classification motivation?

TB: Well you have rape here too.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: I mean, ya, it could be rape serial.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: Or torture of some sort.

RK: Well, we've got, if more than one, rate in order of most important.

TB: Oh, I see. I see. Well, ya. The whole nature of the intellectual behavioral emotional process involved in any kind of homicide that, particularly serial murder, I think is just -- it's made to be something other than it really is. I think it's made to be more mysterious and more maligent a process than it really is. Serial murder is another form of behavior. I mean, it's another form of behavior. It's a particularly destructive form of behavior. And yet it utilizes -- that behavior is, was spawned and developed and used as the same neurological circus as any other behavior. I believe. I've not trying to trivialize it, but I do think people need to see it in the context of what it really is. And there are all sorts of adverant behaviors out there. Well, all sorts of normal behaviors. And they all, and cruel and terrible as serial murder is, it is another form, it is acquired just like any other behavior is acquired. Now, I'm not trying to reduce this just to behavioral as terms, but that's one way of explaining it. It certainly is maintained by a mental component, as it were. It has it's origin. But nevertheless, I -- so, if I were to define the whole nature of serial murder, I'd try to bring in those kind of aspects to say that do you want to understand what goes on in the mind of somebody commits this kind, the kind of behavior we call serial murder. Then, first of all, look at yourself. Look at anything you've done repeatedly over the years that has not been good for you, or somebody else. Drinking, smoking, shoplifting, stealing flowers, taking too many newspapers from the newspaper stand. Again, not trying to trivialize, but trying to personalize it. Because it's unique. But every behavior is unique. So much can be said. I mean, you can't, I can't, certainly wouldn't attempt to describe it here in a few words, because it can't be described in a few words. And every case is different. I'd hoped that we'd talk a little bit more or kind of just talk a little bit more about Green River, but we did talk some about it. I wanted to talk some about what you mentioned in your letter about maybe some things that could be done to reduce the guy--

RK: Ya.
TB: To talk. As long a shot as that might be, I'll write to you about it.

RK: Ok. That -- probably strategies and tactics around that subject would be the most useful. It might be kind of hard to write about. It might take you awhile to describe it. But whatever you feel comfortable with is good for me.

TB: Ya. Well, the guy has gone this long. Who knows what the reasoning is. You can speculate all day, you know, about where he is or what he's doing.

RK: Ya. Well, some of the interesting things that have happened with the recent cases, we've had three ladies, two of which are prostitutes, one's kind of street-type person, murdered. And one of them missing from 216 and the Highway and she's found on 180 --, well, let's see. Right off I-5 near 188th and the Freeway.

And right in the ditch, right in the open. The prostitute is nude, yes. Strangled? Yes. But, you know, a great length of time after. Then they've had another one that was dumped out in the Timberlane area within say three miles of Timberlane out there near Four Corners where Maple Valley Highway meets the Kent Kangley Road. But they know where she's missing from. She is a resident of Timberlane. But when they've traced her last steps up to, again, 216th and the Highway, even though she's a resident of Timberlane out there. And those two are unsolved cases, not, there's no other bodies around. There's no other activity before of after those two. It's just isolated incidents. Of course, they may have not have found a lot too. I mean, I've got this sinking feeling that that son-of-a-bitch has been there all along and the missing person population just haven't been able to identify, you know, the people and he's just doing a better job of taking care of them.

TB: Ya, well, that's the feeling I got, from what I saw happening four years ago. Three, four years ago. But the chances are pretty high this isn't the same guy. Let's face it. As we've talked before about this, there's probably a number of active serial killers in the Pacific Northwest at any given time. Who knows whether it's five or ten or twenty. So you're bound to have this confounding your analysis of both the cases in '83 and '84. There may be some strays in there too, as well as what's happening now. And unfortunately this happens and prostitutes are an easy target. The fact that the one, one was found in the ditch is, would have to be rather significantly departing from his former modus operandi, to be dumping them like that now. But anyway, it doesn't really make any difference however. The, it seems to me the first consideration is to catch him and then find out whether or not -- if you catch the guy that did it, he either will be the guy or he won't be the guy. But in any case it's clear that that kind of thing is the kind of crime he's going to continue doing until he is caught.

RK: Well, I'm probably not going to get down here much before --

TB: At least they're fresh.

RK: Another -- 1984 to 1988. That's every four years. Maybe I can get down more often, but -- Get an excuse. In, let's see. Would it be next September I'm going to go to Atlanta so I might be able to work something out to sneak on down. And, you know, strange as it is, I get invited everywhere in the United States, this is the first time they invited me to Florida, to talk about computers. And how are they used in investigation and stuff. And I've been everywhere else but never been to Florida. And they seem to have more use for them anyway.

TB: Well, sure. Florida, California.

RK: They do.

TB: Have you noticed in the -- do you keep close tabs on the, on crime statistics and things, the stuff both in Washington state and nationally through the FBI I imagine you -- have you noticed any king of change in the incidents of what, of murders nationally and specifically have you noticed that there's been a decline in recent years in the incidents of serial murder if there's a way of really testing that?

RK: My guess is that I have never seen so many serial murders in my life.

TB: As there have been recently?

RK: Ya. The real problems with most of [knock on door]. Ye, Sir.

GUARD: Did you eat supper?

TB: No.

GUARD: Ok.

RK: Want a tray?

TB: Yes, please.

RK: One of the things that I've noticed is that they have a lot more recognition, publicized recognition, of the cases. I mean, the minute two people are found dead together and missing at different times, the whole thing expands into a big serial case. Ok? Which helps to make the awareness part, it's there. I mean, you can look at the crime statistics. I think the actual statistics for murder probably have gone down. Not much, but percentage point. But, there's no way of keeping status on serial cases. I don't think you can actually tell.

TB: I don't think you can, really.

RK: Ya. You just really can't keep the statistics. But that's, if you could figure out a way to do that, you could make a lot of money. Because everybody asks me all the time. "Is it raising? Is it falling? Is there more serial killers today than there was ten years ago?"

TB: Impossible to say.

RK: Ya. My canned response most of the time is that it -- there -- we used to catch them a lot quicker. And maybe the availability of transportation and population have changed to the extent that, you know, metropolitan areas are just butted together from Vancouver to San Diego and the availability of people, the changes in the hitchhiking laws and the, and all of the various factors that go in with making yourself a victim, availability of the victim, the, coupled with the fact that law

enforcement agencies have even become more stronger and more stringent within their own jurisdictions. They don't care what the hell happens. Seattle doesn't care what happens in King County. Really don't.

TB: You'd think that would change if anything. Over the years to more cooperation rather than less cooperation because of what's happening.

RK: I had a robbery detective the other day tell me, cause we were talking about a similar system for robberies. And he says, Shoot, we have the most robberies in the state and do not broadcast out to anyone else. One teletype on a robbery. Once in awhile if they catch him in flight. But that's usually over their radio to King County Police, or over the phone, one's headed your way. But they don't ever -- every agency around sends out a little teletype about a robbery they just had. Well, shoot, if Seattle Police is not cooperating in that respect, who is? You know, some little agencies, that's all they hinge on is the teletype. So, I can think of a lot of serial killers that I would classify as serial killers today. I didn't know about serial killers or whatever way back a long time ago. But, we caught Gary Grant back in the late '60's, in Renton. Killed four kids. You know, he's a serial killer. It made a lot of headlines back then for maybe a year, but then everybody forgets about him.

TB: Ya.

RK: You know.

TB: Ya, publicity is crazy.

RK: And, why? The guy's still alive. He's in Walla Walla. He's never going to get out. But he's there. And they always ask me "Have you ever had a child killer in Seattle?" I'm going, "oh, shit". Ya. "Well, when?" "Well, 1968 for one." And then just on and on and on with all the other child killings we've had. But, still, like Scribner that I talked about. He's a serial killer. He had one murder and one attempt murder. But that guy is a serial killer. There's no question about it. He got caught quicker.

TB: He got caught before it could get going.

RK: Ya.

TB: That's the -- I'm sure you see a lot of those guys who start off and cause their earlier attempts are so unskilled or cause they're so inexperienced they foul up. But if they'd been allowed to go on you could see what they'd be doing.

RK: I think my next study is going to be a -- once I get through with this one, which might take a couple years -- is an analysis of the difference. Take an arbitrary number of murders. Ok. You

happen to have killed over twenty, or ten to twenty, and analyze the differences between how those people are caught, identified, you know, and how they did their victims, versus those that -- you'd have to go with an arbitrary figure of two. That just two or three.

TB: Well, whatever. Three, four, five. I think you're still in the low area.

RK: Ya. But I would really like to get to the types of guys who maybe have done one rape and one murder.

TB: Ahh ha. I see.

RK: You know. For some reason those folks have done some, something that's got themselves caught real quick. But in this study now, one of the things we're going to be looking at, once you've looked close enough, -- Now once you look at, and if you would, I don't know who you'd do it, if, maybe just number 21 on a page and then start writing about it or something. But, how many people have been convicted of murder and re-murder? You know, they've gotten out. The old system and the old, there wasn't determinent sentencing back then, they're out on parole, they've done their time, or been pardoned or whatever the case might be. How many of those people have murdered in 1981 through 1986? You know, and I bet you we're going to find a few.

TB Sure.

RK: I know we're going to find a few.

TB: Sure you are. Like that one -- it's similar -- not the same as, but like that case that I, in Sacramento last year. I think I wrote to you about it. You probably already knew about it. The guy who'd been arrested because they'd found several prostitutes buried in his back yard or something.

RK: Oh, ya.

TB: And then as it turns out, back in the late '70's he was tried and acquitted of a murder of a prostitute. So, during the past seven, eight years, he's just been out there. What's he been doing? You know.

RK: Ahh ha.

TB: He hasn't been running a garden club.

RK: No.

TB: Well, not exactly.

RK: Ya.

TB: So, you know, ya, the guys that not only, the ones who not only go in for murder, let's say in the 60's and 70's and came out again and murdered, the guys who -- this is one you'll never be able to pin down, but it's always fascinated me, this, the guy who's been, let's say he's a serial killer and he gets popped for a abduction or kidnapping or burglary or something and gets put away for a few years, nobody, all they know is that he's a, you know, he was a kidnapper. And he gets out again. And there are a lot of guys in prisons around the country like that.

RK: Yup. And I think that -- you talk about reducing things in trivial terms, but if we can reduce the, forget about those people that killed a lot of people, but reduce it down to the ones that have done the kidnap or the assault or the gal has escaped from him or something and he gets caught, the serial murder framework is still there. Whatever is there ain't going to go away. I don't think it will.

TB: Well, that's -- without some kind of therapy which I'm not aware of.

RK: Ya. The odds of this person being any better by the time he gets out of prison -

TB: Oh, out of prison. There's nothing that can be done for him in prison.

RK: No. No. Well, that's my focus is the ones in prison. Cause it looks to me like there's an awful lot of those people just waiting to kill.

TB: Ya. This is true. Of course you don't know until it's too late. There's so many aspects to it, you know. We haven't even -- you talk about the incidents of serial murder and whether it's going up or down, and yet, I mean, I read through the TV Guide and see some of the stuff on cable. You see some of the stuff in the video stores. And think of young people, young men, particularly boys being exposed to a lot of that. There's very harsh, some of the hard core stuff that they're exposed to today on cable TV or through the video stuff. And imagine what effect that is going to have them in a society where there's an increasing instability because of one parent households and all this. And you wonder if there's a lot boys and teenagers out there who are just, you know, in the formative stages. Would be murders, rapists, what have you, because of the bizarre kind of things they's exposed to as children. The young people. That's not to justify, but it's to say, my goodness, whether it be pornography or some of the violent stuff on TV, that's, I don't mean, I know that that is a powerful influence. It's not to deny that people have responsibility for what they do, but it's to say people, none of us are islands. We're all affected by our environments. And while not everybody who is exposed to violent pornography goes out and rapes or kills, not everybody smokes cigarettes and gets cancer either, but we know it's bad for us.

We know it does cause cancer in some people. Not everybody who is exposed to carcenagens gets cancer, but a lot do. So we ban a lot of those things. But just because everybody, just because only a small percentage of the people exposed to violent pornography are affected in such a way that it's instrumental in them acting out some of their, the aggressions that that inspired in them doesn't mean that it shouldn't be very powerfully controlled. It's like anything. I liken it to ads for Ford Thunderbirds. I mean, the Ford Motor Company does not believe that everybody who sees that ad is going to buy a Ford Thunderbird. Only a tiny, tiny, tiny percentage of the people who see that ad are going to be influenced in some way. But the Ford Motor Company would not spend hundreds of millions of dollars or tens of millions of dollars in advertising if they didn't think it had some effect. And they know it has an effect. Just like pornography. The kinds of, the kind of sadistic and violent things that are associated with that ___ whether in film or in literature, has an effect on some people. A small percentage. And it may not be the only thing, just as that ad for the Ford Thunderbird isn't the only thing. But it contributes to a mind set to buy that car, to act out those aggressions, you know, to beat or strangle that person to death. It's a critical variable in the formula.

RK: Did? I don't recall, but I don't think the FBI asked that question.

TB: Yes, they did. Well, not on their -- the answer to the question is in there, and in their summary of findings, in that bulletin. It's mentioned in three separate places and you know they didn't highlight it and that kind of disappointed me. And I, I put, I made some footnotes to that report to sent to Bill Hagmire. And one of the most prominent influences, and one of the most prominent things mentioned by all these individuals was their exposure to pornography. And it's mentioned three separate places in there and yet they didn't pull it together. They didn't highlight it and yet in three separate places in that report of their study of these 36 individuals, pornography came out as being the most prevalent factor that all these, that connect them all together. Not each and every one but let's say 70/80% of them. And I'd have to set down and look at the report again, but I found it very significant and I thought it'd been underplayed. And I, and in terms of, if we're looking for solutions and not just reactions to crisis, I mean, even if you're successful and you stop a guy after he kills four or five or ten people, and you catch the guy, terrific. But it still has been a great loss. And nobody can repair that loss. And how much better it would be if we could eliminate some of the more obvious contributing factors to the development of this. Which I believe with all my heart. And maybe I'm biased and I, but what I know with all my heard is that it's a terrifically potent force that aggravates tendencies toward violent behavior of the kind that we see in serial murderers. And that influences, in a word, pornography. And I know it's a very broad word, but the kind of

stuff that you encounter not just in dirty book stores but now on cable TV. I shutter to think, you know, as a young person. I grew up in the 50's. Rather auster, victorian era compared to today. When TV was fairly bland.

RK: They didn't have Halloween one through six.

TB: Jesus Christ.

RK: Isn't that something?

TB: And if I, in my formative years if I'd seen that -- and I can imagine young kids who, latch key children, maybe kids that come home with a snoot full of drugs and a bad attitude after being thrown out of school and their mom isn't home and they turn it on and there's Halloween or one of those, one of the many -- they've got -- I saw one the other day. I said, Good Lord. It was a movie on cable called "Strict to Kill". It's a lovely little film about somebody goes around killing topless dancers. And I said, "can you imagine being a fourteen year old boy with some problems, seeing this kind of stuff." I said, "God, it's just sewing those seeds." I know it is. I know it is. I can't, I've often toyed with the idea of trying to, trying to express myself to some group that deals with pornography and violent in the media and saying, hey, I know. Believe me. I wish I could, I mean, I wish somebody would believe me. But I can't really do it without really, you know, being -- saying, hey, look.

RK: Ya.

TB: But it's a tragedy. And I can only guess that given what I see it's going to get worse.

RK: Ya. That's right.

TB: Cause agh,

RK: One of the things that I was noticing one time was the number of pornographic literature in and around murder scenes. Not just serial murder scenes, but all of them. I mean, if you dig deep in that. I mean, you used to just overlook that stuff and not do it. But it's something else.

GUARD: This time I don't think you can stay here.

RK: Well, we're done when you're done.

1-31-74

LINDA ANN HEALY

University of Washington Coed - Missing from her home at 5517 12th Ave. N.E. since midnight January 31, 1974.

White Female, 21, 5'7", 115 lbs., slim build, long brown hair, blue eyes.

3-6-75 TAYLOR MT.

3-16-74

DONNA MANSON

Missing since 7 p.m. on March 12, 1974, Evergreen State College, Olympia, Washington.

White Female, 19, 5', 100 lbs., long brown hair, blue eyes.

4-17-74

SUSAN ELAINE RANCOURT

Missing since 9:30 p.m. April 17, 1974 from Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington.

White Female, 18, 5'2", 120 lbs., shoulder length blonde hair, blue eyes.

5-6-74

ROBERTA KATHLEEN PARKS

Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon. Missing since 11 p.m. May 6, 1974

White female, 20, 5'7", 125 lbs., very long blonde hair, blue/green eyes.

3-6-75 TAYLOR MT.

6-11-74

GEORGEANN HAWKINS

University of Washington coed. - Missing since 1 a.m. June 11, 1974 from alley behind 4500 blk. 17th N.E.

White Female, 18, 5'2", 120 lbs., shoulder length brown hair, brown eyes.

7-14-74

JANICE ANNE OTT

Missing since 12:30 p.m. July 14, 1974 from Lake Sammamish State Park near Issaquah, Washington.

White Female, 23, 5', 100 lbs., shoulder length blonde hair, green eyes.

ID - 9-10-74 ISSAQUAH

7-14-74

DENISE MARIE NASLUND

Missing since approximately 4 p.m. July 14, 1974 from Lake Sammamish State Park near Issaquah, Washington.

White Female, 18, 5'4", 120 lbs., shoulder length brown hair, brown eyes.

ID - 9-10-74 ISSAQUAH

FOR SERIAL KILLERS #3
(Ann)