

PART VI

PSYCHO-LOGY

Killer Mindsets and Meditations on Murder

UNCORRECTED PROOF

UNCORRECTED PROOF

CHAPTER 15

PSYCHOPATHY AND WILL TO POWER

Ted Bundy and Dennis Rader



We all expect monsters. We hear about serial murders, we find the crimes monstrous and incomprehensible, but we turn on the TV and find relatively normal folk; quiet people, mostly. They are people with families and jobs; people who fit in and go unnoticed. Dennis Rader, the BTK killer, was a code enforcement officer, a Cub Scout leader, and president of his church. He chose the name “BTK” to signal his intention – B(ind them), T(orture them), K(ill them.) John Wayne Gacy was a building contractor who did side jobs as a clown; his family had no idea that he was seducing and killing young men. Ted Bundy was bright, good looking, and personable. People were drawn to his good looks and confident manner. He was an up and comer in the ranks of the young Republicans. So, what gives?

Monstrous acts do not necessarily proceed from monsters. When we perceive the acts from outside and rightly experience horror, we naturally project the horror of our perceptions onto the person committing the acts. When those acts are unthinkable, like serial sexual murder, we expect that the person who committed the acts to be as horrible as the acts themselves. But ultimately we find the evildoer pedestrian, his life outside of the crime and its contexts relatively unremarkable. It is Hanna Arendt’s vision of the *banality of evil*.

But the notion of a perfectly ordinary serial killer is baffling. The enormity of these acts demands that the people who commit them *must*

be monsters. We are given to believe we should be able to identify the monsters – much like Dorian Gray’s portrait or Baron Harkonnen from *Dune*, we expect monsters to wear their evil plainly, on their faces and in their flesh. We want to think of them as insane, or possessed, or something dark and different, but we come to understand that the monsters appear as we do and walk among us with the appearance of respectable citizens.

Our first impulse is that these evildoers must be crazy, wanton criminals or something else. More often than not, serial killers are *psychopaths* – superficially charming people with little or no capacity for empathy, remorse, or compassion. They are rational, but not moral, in many ways like Nietzsche’s *superman*. They know their deeds are unacceptable to the world at large, but they are compelled, by a curiosity or a fantasy, to kill. Where we would be held back from these explorations by compassion or a learned fear of punishment, they go about their projects with as little feeling as a bug collector who, without hesitation, kills a moth in ether so he can pin it to a piece of cardboard. They pursue Nietzsche’s *will to power*.

Psychopaths versus Psychotics

Psychopathy is the diagnostic term for people we call psychopaths. They are not crazy. They are in many ways sane, practical, and able to function in the world. Crucially, however, they live without conscience, compassion, or remorse. As a result, they are unable to learn the kinds of felt associations that create a sense of right and wrong, the moral restraints that prevent us from living out our own fantasies and perversions. As psychologists sought to describe the problem, they labeled such people *morally insane*: possessed of rationality, but incapable of the moral distinctions that the rest of us take for granted. Hervey Cleckley, the first scientist to frame our current understanding of the problem, described them as affected by a *semantic dementia* – the inability to make emotional and moral distinctions in language.

Psychopaths are not *psychotic*. In the context of serial murder, the confusion between *psychosis* and psychopathy stems from the commonsense assumption that the people who act as they do cannot be sane. The linguistic confusion also arises because until the middle of the twentieth century the word *psychopathy* was often used generically to describe any form of mental illness. Starting in the 1930s, the word came more and more to represent the specific problem of the person without conscience or the

possibility of empathy. By the 1940s it was more completely associated with psychopathy as we now understand it, and today it is a technical term.¹

Psychopaths are differentiated from psychotics in that they have been diagnosed with a personality disorder, a systematic pattern of behavior that is lifelong and pervasive but that does not disorder their capacity to function in the world. Non-violent psychopaths might be characterized as suffering from a character flaw.

Psychotics see things that are not there and often have auditory hallucinations; they cannot differentiate between truth and delusion. Their lives are often unmanageable and severely disordered. Psychotics are often driven by delusions. The “Son of Sam,” David Berkowitz, was told by the neighbor’s dog to take the gun and kill the children. Charlie Manson was convinced that the Beatles had told him that he was the herald of the new age and the reincarnation of Jesus Christ.

Psychopaths are often curious about how things look or might feel. They may be seeking sensations or new ways to encounter their missing humanity, but they know what they are doing, they know it is wrong and harmful; they are simply untouched by the enormity of their crimes. If they *seem* to be moved emotionally, it is often part of an intellectual game, or just a fear of being caught. Dennis Rader became incensed when he thought that the police lied to him about the safety of communicating by computer disk. To that point he had bested them at every turn, but then they lied to him. The police cheated. Similarly, in their statements and allocutions, the psychopathic killers are coldly rational. They know precisely what they did and how they did it. They can even tell you on some level why they did it. Not so with psychotics.

Finally, psychopathy seems to be determined by genetics more than socialization. Recent studies have shown that although the anti-social behavior that often accompanies psychopathy has a strong relationship to social class, intelligence, and upbringing, psychopathy itself – the callous, conscience-free, remorseless personality – is the fruit of genetics, not socialization. True psychopathy is inborn.²

The Psychopath

We can begin to obtain a deeper level of understanding of psychopathy by considering several of its root characteristics. The psychopath is characterized by:

superficial charm, the absence of delusions and psychoneurotic manifestations, unreliability, insincerity, lack of remorse or shame, inadequately motivated antisocial behavior, failure to learn from experience ...³

Superficial charm describes the psychopath's capacity to say the right things, to draw you into his or her frame of reference. Ted Bundy exuded it. He was alternately confident and childlike and able to win the confidence of almost anyone. It is said that he was a natural salesman. Dennis Rader was not quite so smooth, but was known as an upright citizen. The people in his church knew that they could depend on Dennis. No one suspected what these men did or were capable of doing.⁴

This trait, superficial charm, may relate to the way a psychopath learns. Scientific analysis reveals that psychopaths most readily learn what pleases. They learn to discriminate between things that are associated with reward much better than they learn most other things. Superficial charm may simply be an expression of the fact that beyond all of their deficits, psychopaths can learn what works in interpersonal situations. They have a marked incapacity to anticipate danger or dislike. Although they can learn to mimic normal emotions in the appropriate situations, they often have no idea what they actually mean. As a result they become chameleon-like and learn to blend in. They learn the right words but there is no substance behind them.⁵

It is now a truism that the diagnosis of anti-social personality disorder (ASPD) includes many psychopaths, but not all psychopaths are anti-social. What is the difference between ASPD and psychopathy? ASPD is characterized by a history of remorseless criminality – conning, lying, and criminal activity. In addition to serial killers and serial rapists, a large component of non-criminal psychopaths participate in the highly social venues of religion, entertainment, and corporate business.⁶ In his groundbreaking book *Snakes in Suits*, Robert Hare, the modern guru of psychopathy, discusses the many psychopaths that walk our streets without revealing themselves through anti-social behavior. He believes that up to 1 percent of corporate CEOs may be “snakes in suits.”⁷

When they are violent, their violence is purposeful. It is not a response to insult or injury, it is a relatively casual, impulsive act; someone or something got in his way and it needed to be removed. In the opening credits of the Showtime series *Dexter*, the psychopathic protagonist is seen lying in his bed as a mosquito lands on his arm and begins to draw blood. Dexter's eye focuses on the creature and without a glimmer of thought, he swats it into oblivion. Psychopathic violence is like that: cold,

objective, sometimes necessary, sometimes not. Common criminals and individuals with ASPD, by contrast, use *reactive violence*. They respond emotionally and spontaneously. Neurophysiologists and psychologists have shown that reactive violence – automatic violence in response to threat or emotion – is less common among psychopaths than among individuals diagnosed as anti-social, although members of both groups are more reactively violent than non-members.

It seems that all psychopaths are simultaneously emotionally cold or indifferent to the suffering of others and impulsive and relatively irresponsible. Robert Hare and many other researchers report that on a deep biological level the disorder does seem to divide into two factors.⁸ The first factor accounts for their lack of empathy, remorselessness, and callous indifference to human suffering, and is shaped largely by genetics. Up to 60 percent of this trait is inherited. The second factor, which is associated with their irresponsibility, impulsivity, and anti-social behavior, has a strong environmental component. Although there is some genetic influence on the second factor, the particular way the individual psychopath is impulsive and irresponsible is determined to a large extent by upbringing, environment, and experience. Indeed, the level to which a psychopath engages in violence is directly related to his intelligence and socioeconomic status: rich smart psychopaths are less violent than poor uneducated psychopaths.⁹

Again, consider the fictional psychopath Dexter. Early in life, Dexter discovers he has a penchant for bloodletting. Caught in the act, his adoptive father teaches him a relatively acceptable way of managing this urge: kill the bad guys. In the real world, real-life Dexters are likely to be taught the ways of big finance, stardom, and big-tent ministry rather than safe ways to kill. Those less fortunate learn the law of the street and often become violent criminals. In many ways the non-violent psychopath is the perfect twenty-first century CEO: cold, rational, and willing to do anything for a profit.¹⁰

Psychopaths are unreliable. It's interesting to note that in early theories psychopaths were identified as suffering from a semantic disability, as their words never seemed to match their actions. But the real deficit probably lies in a failure to consider future consequences. They know how to say the right thing, and because they generally do not have the ability to anticipate how others might react when they don't follow through on their words, they often prove to be unreliable (though sometimes reliability has been learned as a useful means for attaining some short-term outcome). There may also be a problem with attention.

When psychologists evaluate children for psychopathic potential, attention deficits often combine with a callous indifference to others as predictive factors for adult psychopathy.

Other research tells us that in psychopaths the *amygdala*, the brain's center of emotion, is damaged. This means that they are not only indifferent to the feelings of others but the normal processes of learning, including conditioned fear and conditioned pleasure, are defective. In the normal person, our sense of responsibility is balanced between our fear of consequences and our desire for reward. Although their reward systems work on an adequate level, the fear of punishment, disapproval, and consequences more generally are not present to keep them on track. They lose attention or find other things more interesting.

Learning disabilities are common in psychopaths. They do not learn to fear or anticipate the hurt that others will experience as a result of their actions. Although they learn to respond to reward better than they learn fear-based responses, they are still not great learners. In fact, psychopaths learn best by discriminating between two stimuli. They can tell what works as opposed to what doesn't. This means that they can learn to choose between two options – but they don't choose based on punishment, they choose based on effectiveness.¹¹

Language and the Emotional Brain

Insincerity is the mark of a person who is facile with language but either lacks or is unconcerned with any sense of the true meaning of the words. Psychopaths are often not particularly good with language. Studies show that while psychopaths do not differentiate between emotional and non-emotional words, *normals* do differentiate, responding to the emotional words more quickly and also experiencing an increase in skin conductance. For psychopaths, all kinds of words are the same; they just string them together to meet their needs. Because they respond best to what works, they can say all of the right things and mean none of them. Because they have no fear of being caught, they are free to say what they must to accomplish their ends.

Other researchers have shown that the content of the verbal narratives created by psychopaths is often unconvincing, but psychopaths often present a facade of confidence that makes them seem more believable. Because they have no fear of being wrong – they lack *amygdalar connections*

that would produce that fear – they speak with unbowing surety. Even when caught in a lie, a psychopath presses on, unfazed and unconcerned with the revelation of their dishonesty. Recent research confirms that humans tend to believe confident narratives over coherent narratives.¹² In conversation, psychopaths are superb manipulators; normal people perceive them as confident and persuasive.

Curiously, their written language often reveals underlying difficulties that may not appear in their speech. Listening to Ted Bundy or Dennis Rader speak produces a very different response from reading their writing. Bundy failed the grammar portion of the bar exam and Rader's first note to the police was so badly crafted that police thought he was foreign-born. This divergence in speaking and writing skill may reveal one way in which psychopaths are impacted by their inability to learn on an emotional level. In the context of a conversation, there are enough cues from the other person to guide the psychopath's use of language so that it is relatively more fluid. When subject to formal questioning, psychopaths are often unconvincing; however, in conversation, they do well. Writing is generally solitary, so when they write they may not be provided with enough cues or feedback to guide their verbal responses toward manipulation.¹³

A wonderful interview between Ted Bundy and Dr. James Dobson was originally aired in 1989, shortly after Bundy's execution. At the time of the interview, Dobson, a preacher, was an anti-pornography crusader and Bundy a psychopath who used pornography to stimulate his fantasy life. Throughout the interview, you can watch Bundy as he feeds back to Dobson the exact words that he wants to hear. Sitting with his head slightly turned down and away from Dobson, Bundy, with a near smirk, created his last moments of TV glory by "gaming" the preacher. Bundy's words were cynical and chosen with some precision. Bundy reflected the preacher's language back to him, and any language he uses which might betray emotion is canned, repetitious, and meaningless. A significant fact not noted in the preface to the interview is that Bundy and his lawyers had hoped for a stay of execution based upon his cooperation. (Repentance, jailhouse conversions, and offender cooperation are common last-minute ploys of the condemned.)

On the fourth page of the interview transcript, Bundy makes the following statement:

I was a normal person. I had good friends. I led a normal life, except for this one, small but very potent and destructive segment that I kept very secret and close to myself. Those of us who have been so influenced by

violence in the media, particularly pornographic violence, are not some kind of inherent monsters. We are your sons and husbands. We grew up in regular families. Pornography can reach in and snatch a kid out of any house today. It snatched me out of my home 20 or 30 years ago. As diligent as my parents were, and they were diligent in protecting their children, and as good a Christian home as we had, there is no protection against the kinds of influences that are loose in a society that tolerates ...¹⁴

But all of the evidence and Bundy's own statements suggest that by the time he was a pre-teen he was already alienated from family and friends and devoid emotionally. Bundy played to the crowd as he always did. He was providing the answers that would inevitably gain Dobson's approval. These answers are suggested in Dobson's introduction to the piece. With tears in his eyes, Bundy described the monster that took possession of him when he had been drinking and exacerbated his craze to kill: violent pornography.¹⁵

It is almost impossible to appreciate the pure cynicism of Bundy's statements without watching the video. Although Dobson indicates that Bundy wanted to warn the world about the evils of pornography, it is apparent that all Bundy really wanted was a chance to stand before the cameras again and to project an image of his own choosing. Since the interview, researchers have shown with considerable reliability that pornography does not foster violence *except* with psychopathic personalities.¹⁶

Empathy, Lack of Shame, Insincerity

Remorselessness and lack of shame arise in people who either have not developed the capacity to relate to others' suffering or have become hardened. In either case it is impossible for them to relate to the pain that they have caused or to feel shame for the things they have done. Both of these capacities require the ability to relate to the suffering of others or to feel the reality of deserved consequences. Psychopaths can do neither. For most people, emotional words and scenes lead to heightened activity in the amygdala as the emotional sense of the situation overcomes them, often shutting down higher functions. For psychopaths, the amygdala responds less powerfully to the same items and when it does respond it does so in step with higher cortical activity. The cortex is the brain area associated with rational thought and interpretive functions. So, psychopaths presented with an emotional stimulus have to think about its

meaning and rationally make sense of it in order to parse their response. They do not feel the effects of others' fear, sadness, or pain, so they have to work to interpret their environment.

This characteristic appears clearly in the allocution of Dennis Rader, the BTK Killer. Standing in court before the judge, the victims' families, and the assembled press, Rader listened as the judge read out the details of his offenses. Without blinking an eye, Rader stopped the judge at several junctures to correct some minor detail. Unmoved by the enormity of his crimes or the responses of the people gathered there, Rader makes almost casual responses to the facts in the case; at one point making mouth noises as he sought a precise fact. This is a man who cannot even begin to appreciate the impact he had on others.

In the same court scene, Rader appeared monstrously insincere as he cried, hoping that God would receive him after this ordeal was over. He portrayed himself as saddened by the prospect of divine punishment, but as willingly putting his trust in God. In a context calling for compassion, the expression of remorse and deep shame, Rader is only concerned for himself. Perhaps he believed he was doing the right thing, or perhaps he simply felt threatened; in either case his concern appeared to be for his own eternal comfort. Nothing else mattered.

It is tempting to view this type of behavior as *dissociation*, the clinical term for the way an individual distances himself from ideas that are too painful or too upsetting to allow feeling. But Rader's behavior is different. The psychopath is not distancing himself; the response is not protective. His words and actions are cold and heartless because *he lacks the capacity to feel*. It is exactly that incapacity, his innate ability to dissociate, that makes serial murder possible.

Fantasies

Fantasies, in general, create patterns of actions, scripts for action that people can follow. For non-psychopathic fantasies it may be the perfect job interview or the perfect date. For the psychopathic serial murderer, it may be the idealized sequence of hunting, capturing, torturing, killing, and disposing of the victim.

There is a significant body of evidence to suggest that psychopathic serial killers' criminal activities are guided and shaped by fantasy. Fantasies arise in all children and adolescents as a means of dealing

with issues of inadequacy and inferiority. In the psychopathic individual, for whom the normal attachment and maturational changes of adolescence may be particularly difficult, fantasy may become a significant means of dealing with developmental stressors. As with all children, the themes of such fantasies focus on domination, sexuality, and the overcoming of existential stress. There are, however, several differences between the fantasies of normal adolescents and those generated by psychopaths.¹⁷

However aberrant the fantasies of normal people may be, they are almost always constrained to the realm of fantasy by *moral sensitivities* learned in the course of development. We don't act out our fantasies because we possess a conditioned fear of the emotional responses of others, and we anticipate the probable consequences of doing so. The roots of our moral sensitivities, then, are fear and foresight. Psychopaths have neither fear nor foresight. They do not learn conditioned fear reactions or genuine empathetic responses that might guide them; and without such guidance they do not differentiate between appropriate and inappropriate fantasies. Interestingly, they function in the world because they learn not to talk about their fantasies and conquests to others; they learn from seeing others' prior bad reactions. They learn to avoid fights because they can experience direct fear in an immediately physically threatening circumstance. But they fail to anticipate future fear or pain based on abstract environmental cues. A gun in the hand of a present adversary is frightening and a cue to leave, but a police car down the block is easily ignored. These mental limitations can lead them to believe that a violent resolution may be as fully acceptable as a more moderate response is to a normal person. While they may know intellectually that certain actions are "wrong," that wrongness is an intellectual construct. Rather than fearing the abstract punishment and actively avoiding it, they may view it either as an unwanted complexity (it would be inconvenient, or annoying, to be arrested) or as something that makes the activity more exciting (the thrill of potentially being caught).

Witness Dexter in season one. In the course of his inner monologues he reflects on how no one may know what he does or how he feels about it. He knows that murder is wrong and that others find the behaviors abhorrent. During the first season he encounters his biological brother, who invites him to murder his adoptive sister. He is seriously tempted because he would finally have someone he could talk to. Dexter does not experience fear, though anyone else in that situation might fear the murderous drives of the brother or the potential legal consequences of joining

a brotherly killing team. He's not really worried about the future, either, even though his sister just might have been awake and might have seen him pause to consider his options.

Dennis Rader was convinced that he was smarter than the police and that he would not be caught. To satisfy his fantasies he would dress in his victims' clothes, tie himself up, and lay in shallow graves. However, confronted with direct fear, he was not immune to the real fear of being caught. Once he became aware of the possibility of apprehension in pursuing this "project," he became fearful and fled.

Ted Bundy had fantasies of domination and possession. He declared that there was no greater power over a person than feeling their last breath escaping from their body. Yet, he too experienced the direct fear of apprehension. This was not the conditioned fear that might prevent living out the fantasy, but the fear engendered by the real presence of a dead body in his house or car and the possibility that someone might find it.

Part of the psychopathic fantasy may be type of victim chosen. A recent series of serial killings in Milwaukee, Wisconsin focused on prostitutes. Ted Bundy preferred fairly standard middle-class women of college age. Dennis Rader had a certain look and type in mind. Women were designated as appropriate or inappropriate for his idea of a "project."

For some killers, specific patterns of language, actions, and ways of binding, torturing, or killing are preferred. Holmes and Holmes describe patterns requiring specific scripted language patterns. Dennis Rader used a characteristic kind of cord and type of knot to bind his victims. It is not uncommon to find that the victims have had specific kinds of piercings, patterns of injuries, and locations of injuries. All of these represent attempts to replicate the offender's fantasy scheme that ultimately guides his offense behavior.¹⁸

There is another difference between the fantasy life of psychopaths and normals. Normal individuals are often distracted from fantasy by the competing calls of other interests and desires. Even amid fantasy, normals experience distraction and move on to other interests and desires. In contrast, psychopaths are often single-minded and highly focused. Psychological tests have found them to be very difficult to distract from a task once they have begun. Emotional distractions in particular have little capacity to move them, probably due to their emotional response deficits and the fact that their fantasies are not weakened by the usual moral constraints that hamper their expression in normals. There is also evidence that excitement may be a more salient aspect of experience than

any other for the psychopath. Because fantasy is different, because it is exciting, because it represents an intense experience in what is normally an emotionally flat life experience, the psychopathic serial offender may respond preferentially to acting out his fantasy – something most of us rarely get to do.¹⁹

Fantasy builds predispositions to action. Through the mechanisms of internal practice, self-reinforcement (usually through masturbation), and the reinforcement provided by the altered state of consciousness itself, the fantasies of psychopathic serial offenders can become powerful motivators of behavior.

The Serial Killer and Nietzsche

The psychopathic serial killer stands before us as a person who, on a very real level, has an alien perspective on good and evil: moral and immoral. He knows the words, but the attitude of conventional morality has often been replaced by the cold discipline of exclusion and an incapacity for normal human affection. As a result, his highest good becomes the *will to power* over others.

These observations immediately bring to mind Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche and his 1886 work, *Beyond Good and Evil*.²⁰ Nietzsche proposes the possibility that there is not simply a single moral sense, but an attitude of morality whose expression differs from context to context, class to class, and culture to culture. He argues that at root, all of life and all psychology is driven by the will to power and that every manifestation of culture is ultimately rooted in the single urge of an organism to express dominion over its environment, its fellows, and in humanity itself. He suggests that when we transcend the entrenched notions of good and bad, when we begin to see that good and bad only have meaning with regard to a social hierarchy and milieu, we will see that true morality is about disciplined action determined by the value of the outcome.

The psychopathic serial killer is typically a man (Aileen Wuornos is one of the few documented female serial killers) who is incapable of many natural responses. He is by nature Nietzsche's man with a heart of brass. But he has not risen above good and evil by virtue of vision, rank, or discipline, as would Nietzsche's *übermensch*; he has never comprehended the difference between good and evil except as semantic categories. Lacking the capacity for most of the categories of emotion that are

natural to humans, he is a person who, exercised by the need to hide his deepest nature, builds his life in terms of outcomes and disciplines which he creates from his own world of fantasy.

Nietzsche suggests that morality is about discipline. It is the application of one's self to the task of meeting the multiple requirements of an art, a science, or a theology; it is the disciplined self-molding – often as intentional deception and misrepresentation – that sharpens the mind to the point of superiority and the possibility of bold action. It is a self-molding that occurs in a social context and an emotional context, an attitude of morality. Whereas, in the superior man envisioned by the philosopher, this may give rise to exceptional leadership (he cites Napoleon, Julius Caesar and Leonardo da Vinci as examples), the psychopath is subjected to discipline out of necessity. In order to survive in the world, he must learn to emulate, dissimulate, and build masks of sanity. As a result, the psychopath often becomes the facile liar, the artful bully, or the insistent con-man who knows how to go through the motions to get his way. Where the Nietzschean superman awakens to destiny, the minor intellect of the psychopath is only strengthened in deceit and self-delusion, all the better to follow his ultimately petty, narrow, and selfish fantasies.

Beyond Good and Evil indicates that life is by nature cruel; indeed, at the heart of many of our customs, cruelty and exploitation lurk as integral elements in the flow of life. The predator is not regarded as evil or low, but merely as the expression of the basic characteristic of all living things, the will to power. The lion, the conqueror, the artist – all move toward an end that is life-affirming, for their own enrichment and that of the world in which they dwell. They bring order into the world, fulfilling the natural order of life through their actions. In this same context, however, although we may see the serial offender as a predator, he is an unnatural predator. His will to power is perverse, as it serves no end but his own fantasy. Even though he deludes himself with narcissistic fantasies, he remains an aberration, trapped by the narrow constraints of his own perversity, seeking to prove his superiority, but always inevitably falling short. Ultimately, according to Nietzsche, there are failed evolutions, men who aspire to greatness but lack the moral discipline to achieve it. In the case of the psychopathic serial killer, the inadequacy is not a failure of vision, but a simple incapacity: he is incapable of creating a vision larger than himself and incapable of the perseverance under discipline (due to his many deficits in learning and attention) that marks the superior man.

NOTES

- 1 Theodor Millon et al., "Historical Conceptions of Psychopathy in the United States and Europe," in Theodor Millon et al. (eds.) *Psychopathy: Antisocial, Criminal, and Violent Behavior* (New York: Guilford Press, 1998), pp. 3–31.
- 2 Henrik Larsson et al., "A Genetic Factor Explains Most of the Variation in the Psychopathic Personality," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 115, 2 (2006): 9.
- 3 Daz Bishopp and Robert D. Hare, "A Multidimensional Scaling Analysis of the Hare Pcl-R: Unfolding the Structure of Psychopathy," *Psychology, Crime and Law* 14, 2 (2008): 117–32.
- 4 Unless otherwise noted, references to Ted Bundy's statements and attitudes are taken from Stephen G. Michaud and Hugh Aynesworth, *The Only Living Witness: The True Story of Serial Sex Killer Ted Bundy* (Irving: Authorlink, 1999). Likewise, unless otherwise noted, Rader's statements are derived from the Wichita Eagle Archive at www.kansas.com/btk/ (accessed September 25, 2009).
- 5 James Blair et al., *The Psychopath: Emotion and the Brain* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005).
- 6 Scott O. Lilienfeld and Hal Arkowitz, "What 'Psychopath' Means: It Is Not Quite What You May Think," *Scientific American Mind* (2007); available online at www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=what-psychopath-means.
- 7 Paul Babiak and Robert D. Hare, *Snakes in Suits: When Psychopaths Go to Work* (New York: Collins Business, 2007).
- 8 There is evidence for two, three, and four factor models; however, the genetic differences reference the same factor in all of the models.
- 9 Robert D. Hare, *Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths Among Us* (New York: Guilford Press, 1998).
- 10 R. J. R. Blair et al., "The Development of Psychopathy," *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 47, 3–4 (2006): 13.
- 11 Ibid.
- 12 Craig R. M. McKenzie et al., "Overconfidence in Interval Estimates: What Does Expertise Buy You?" *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 107 (2008): 179–82.
- 13 Jeremy Quayle, "Interviewing a Psychopathic Suspect," *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling* 5, 1–2 (2008): 79–91.
- 14 James Dobson, "Fatal Attraction: Ted Bundy's Final Interview," available online at www.pureintimacy.org/piArticles/A000000433.cfm (accessed September 25, 2009).
- 15 Ibid.
- 16 Kevin M. Williams et al., "Inferring Sexually Deviant Behavior from Corresponding Fantasies: The Role of Personality and Pornography Consumption," *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 36, 2 (2009): 198–222.

- 17 Dion G. Gee et al., "The Content of Sexual Fantasies for Sexual Offenders," *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment* 16, 4 (2004): 315–31; Bruce A. Arrigo and Catherine E. Purcell, "Explaining Paraphilias and Lust Murder: Toward an Integrated Model," *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology* 45, 1 (2001): 6–31; Ronald M. Holmes and Stephen T. Holmes, *Profiling Violent Crimes: An Investigative Tool* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2002).
- 18 Holmes and Holmes, *Profiling Violent Crimes*.
- 19 Blair et al., "The Development of Psychopathy."
- 20 Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, trans. Helen Zimmern (Raleigh: Hayes Barton Press, 1997).