

CALIFORNIA BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

**CHARISMATIC LEADERS OF DESTRUCTIVE RELIGIOUS CULTS:
AN EXAMINATION INTO THE UNIDENTIFIED CULPRITS OF SEXUAL HOMICIDE**

by

Brianna N. Bishop

A thesis submitted to the
College of Behavioral and Social Science
in partial fulfillments of the requirements
for the degree Masters of Arts in Forensic Psychology

Riverside, California
May, 2020

© Copyright by Brianna N. Bishop

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

Victimization is not limited to the innocent and, as such, we must extend compassion to those whose actions may have victimized others. As such, this thesis contains a two-part dedication:

This thesis is dedicated to the innocent victims of the Manson Family's infamous slayings — Steven Parent, Wojciech (Voytek) Frykowski, Abigail Folger, Jay Sebring, Sharon Tate, Leno LaBianca, and Rosemary LaBianca. I hope that the information contained in the following pages provides an improved understanding of cultic violence and that, through such understanding, the harrowing events that occurred on August 9, 1969 and August 10, 1969 will never again occur.

This thesis is also dedicated to the victims of Charles Manson's charisma — Charles "Tex" Watson, Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel, Leslie Van Houten, and Linda Kasabian. I hope that the information contained in the following pages provides an improved understanding of Charles Manson's charm, as well as the lengths that Charles Manson went to achieve absolute obedience. I hope that, one day, you forgive, as I have, the youthfulness that desperately sought love, and, in that desperation, placed it into the manipulative hands of Charles Manson.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank, first and foremost, the incredible faculty of the M.A. Forensic Psychology program at California Baptist University. Your passion for education is palpable, and you inspire future generations on a daily basis.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee and, specifically, my committee chair, Dr. Jenny Aguilar. You have been an integral part in the completion of this thesis, and, throughout the past two years, you have been a captivating professor, a wonderful mentor, an inspiring soul, and, most importantly, a caring friend.

I would like to thank my friends and family for their support. You have all pushed me to strive for better, in all aspects.

Thank you for actively listening to my ideas, considering my thoughts, and responding with your honest opinion. You have been the motivation and the muse of this project. I would never have been able to write this paper, or to become the person that I have become, without you. I love you, Bubba. Always.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY TO SYMBOLS OR ABBREVIATIONS	xi
ABSTRACT	1
CHAPTER	
I. THE PROBLEM STATEMENT	2
Introduction.....	2
Problem Statement	5
Purpose of the Study	6
Research Questions/Objectives.....	7
Delimitations.....	8
Assumptions.....	9
Definition of Key Terms	9
Organization of the Remainder of the Paper.....	16
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	18
An Introduction to Homicide and Sexual Deviance	18
Review of the Literature on Sexual Homicide.....	19
An Overview of Sexual Homicide.....	19
Characteristics of the Offense.....	20
Pre-Crime Characteristics	21
Crime Characteristics.....	24
Ritualism.....	25
Post-Crime Characteristics.....	26

Identifying Instances of Sexual Homicide Based Upon Offense Characteristics..	29
Characteristics of the Offender	30
Environmental Characteristics	31
Attachment.....	32
Behavioral Characteristics	35
Psychopathological Characteristics	37
Personality Disorders	38
Psychopathy	38
Other Personality Disorders.....	39
Paraphilic Disorders.....	42
Sexual Sadism.....	43
Differentiating Between Non-Homicidal and Homicidal Sexual Offenders	44
Differentiating Between Non-Sexual and Sexual Murderers	48
Differentiating Between Nonserial and Serial Murderers	50
Motivational Models of Sexual Homicide.....	52
The Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide	52
Ineffective Social Environment	52
Formative Events	54
Patterned Responses.....	54
Actions Toward Others	55
Feedback Filter.....	55
Incentive-Motivation Model	57

Typologies of Sexual Homicide.....	61
Anger vs. Sadistic	61
Disorganized vs. Organized	63
Impulsive vs. Ritualistic.....	65
Catathymic vs. Compulsive	66
Sexualized vs. Grievance vs. Rape	67
Power-Assertive vs. Power-Reassurance vs. Anger-Retaliatory vs. Anger- Excitation	69
Angry vs. Situational-Precipitated vs. Sadistic vs. Predatory.....	70
Review of the Literature for Religious Cults.....	72
An Overview of Religious Cults.....	72
Characteristics of Destructive Religious Cults	73
Characteristics of Charismatic Leaders of Destructive Religious Cults.....	76
Characteristics of Members of Destructive Religious Cults.....	78
Recruitment and Brainwashing.....	79
Sexual Abuse in Destructive Religious Cults	80
Violence in Destructive Religious Cults.....	82
The Perpetration of Homicide by Destructive Religious Cults: A Case Study.....	85
The Family and the Tate/LaBianca Slayings	85
III. METHOD	88
Participants.....	88

Design	88
Procedure	89
IV. RESULTS	91
Introduction.....	91
Results.....	91
Offense Characteristics	91
Pre-Crime Characteristics	91
Stressful Environmental Stimuli (“Triggers”)	91
Negative Interpersonal/Positive Intrapersonal “Frame of Mind”	93
Intentional Planning.....	94
Behavioral Pattern of Ascending Proclivity (“Build-Up”)	95
Crime Characteristics.....	96
Ritualism.....	96
Power, Control, and Domination	96
Rage and Revenge.....	97
Degradation and Humiliation.....	98
Sexual Fixation	99
Post-Crime Characteristics.....	100
Forensic Countermeasures	100
“Trophies” or “Souvenirs”	101
Proactive Involvement in Criminal Investigation.....	101
Offender Characteristics	101

Biographical Characteristics	101
Environmental Characteristics	101
Childhood Abuse.....	101
Insecure Parent-Child Attachment/Familial Instability	102
Behavioral Characteristics	106
Occupational, Educational, and Relational Attainment	106
Childhood Behavioral Concerns	107
Psychopathological Characteristics	108
Psychopathy	108
Boldness	108
Meanness.....	112
Disinhibition.....	114
Other Personalty Disorders.....	116
Paraphilic Interests.....	117
Sexual Sadism.....	117
Other Paraphilic Interests.....	118
V. DISCUSSION.....	122
Introduction.....	122
Conclusions.....	123
Ineffective Social Environment	123
Formative Events	124
Patterned Responses.....	125

Actions Toward Others125

Feedback Filter.....125

Implications.....126

Recommendations.....128

Future Research129

References.....131

Appendix.....141

KEY TO SYMBOLS OR ABBREVIATIONS

BDSM	Bondage and Discipline, Dominance and Submission, Sadism, and Masochism
DSM-V	Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed.)
HSO	Homicidal Sexual Offender
NHSO	Non-homicidal Sexual Offender
PCL-R	Psychopathy Checklist-Revised
TriPM	Triarchic Model of Psychopathy
UCR	Uniform Crime Reporting Program

ABSTRACT

Empirical research on destructive religious cults is severely limited, specifically with regard to the existence of a possible universal motivation for cultic violence. The widespread acceptance of individualized motivations for cultic violence (e.g., Manson's Helter Skelter philosophy), however, negates the existence of striking similarities between characteristics — both offense and offender — of cultic violence and sexual homicide. The current study, in an attempt to examine the motivational implications of such striking similarities, utilized archival data to investigate the presence of 16 commonly-identified characteristics of sexual homicide within a singular case study — Charles Manson and the Manson Family. Results indicated that Charles Manson exhibited all of the commonly-identified offender characteristics of sexual homicide, while the Manson Family (and, the resultant Tate/LaBianca murders) exhibited 93.7 percent of the commonly-identified offense characteristics of sexual homicide. These findings suggest that the Tate/LaBianca murders were the product of Manson's sexually-related fantasies, as well as the willingness of the Manson Family to execute these fantasies by proxy. Despite the limited generalizability of these findings — as a result of a limited sample size, as well as the use of strictly secondary sources (i.e., biographies) —, Charles Manson emphasizes the possibility that cultic violence exhibits an underlying sexual motivation; further research should, therefore, continue to examine this possibility within additional destructive religious cults (e.g., Jim Jones and the Peoples Temple).

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

Introduction

According to *Crime in the United States* (2017) — an annual publication by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that reports compiled data from the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program —, approximately 17,000 homicides occur annually within the U.S. (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017). Investigative efforts by law enforcement result in the clearance of a mere 60 percent ($N = 10,000$) of these homicides, indicating that 7,000 (40%) annual homicides lack sufficient evidence (e.g., physical, forensic, circumstantial, motivational, etc.) to identify the respective offenders and, therefore, remain unsolved (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017).

While physical, forensic, and circumstantial evidence (e.g., presence of third-party bodily fluids, DNA, victim-offender relationship, etc.) tend to be absent within unsolved instances of homicide, motivational evidence, by definition, cannot be absent, as each respective offender commits homicide for the fulfillment of a specific purpose personal to that respective offender (Ressler, Burgess, & Douglas, 1992). Due to this ever-present nature of motivational evidence, the lack of such motivational evidence within unsolved instances of homicide is the result of an inability of law enforcement to recognize and identify motivational evidence, rather than the complete absence of such motivational evidence (Carter, Hollin, Stefanska, Higgs, & Bloomfield, 2017; Ressler et al., 1992), indicating that a greater understanding of various homicidal motivations is needed for the advancement of the investigative abilities of law enforcement agencies, the improvement of clearance rates, and, consequently, the increase of general public safety.

The motivation for sexual gratification, more than any other motivation, is difficult to both recognize and identify, often as the result of the intensely personal nature of interests (e.g., pornographic preferences, fetishes, etc.), actions, and behaviors related to sexual gratification (Carter et al., 2017; Ressler et al., 1992). As a result, sexual homicide — homicide that is characterized by a sexual element (Douglas, Burgess, Burgess, & Ressler, 2013) — is an underreported occurrence that is believed to account for a significant proportion of unsolved homicides in the U.S. (Carter et al., 2017; Meloy, 2000; Ressler et al. 1992). In spite of the fact that considerable attention has been afforded to this topic in the realms of academia (Kerr & Beech, 2015; Whiteway, 2004), such attention has focused mainly on the scholarly value of insight into the severe physiological and psychological dysfunctions that exist in sexual murderers, as well as the manifestation of these dysfunctions within respective crime scenes, rather than the value of the application of such insights by local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies.

Little, if any, empirical research has addressed such an application, especially with regard to the application of identified offense and offender characteristics to instances of homicide that, despite exhibiting similar characteristics, have been classified under a differing motivation (e.g., argument-motivated murder, substance-motivated murder, etc.; Ressler et al., 1992). One such differing motivation that exhibits strikingly similar offense and offender characteristics (e.g., reliance on humiliation and manipulation, childhood abuse) is a form of group cause homicide that is perpetrated by destructive religious cults (Douglas et al., 2013).

Destructive religious cults — defined as groups of individuals that fail to adhere to both socially- and societally-acceptable religions (e.g., Christianity, Catholicism, Judaism, Islam, etc.)

and are characterized by the use of various techniques, such as brainwashing, sexual abuse, and violence (Melton, 1986) — became a substantial consideration of law enforcement during the counterculture movement of the late-1960s and 1970s (Melton, 1986) with the perpetration of the following events: the Tate and LaBianca murders by Charles Manson's Family (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974). This introduction of destructive religious cults and, consequently, cultic violence into American society generated an exponential increase in empirical research regarding the physiological and psychological characteristics of charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, as well as the manifestation of such characteristics within the formation of (e.g., structure, membership, etc.) the respective destructive religious cult (Galanter, 1999; Melton, 1986) and within the crime scenes (Hume, 1996), themselves.

According to empirical research, destructive religious cults have been associated with both geographical and social isolation (Galanter, 1999), the use of humiliation (Navarro & Poynter, 2014) and manipulation (Robbins, 1984) as methods of asserting absolute control (Navarro & Poynter, 2014), and highly patriarchal organizational structures that view women as inferior (Dayan, 2018), as well as various forms of sexual deviancy (e.g., pedophilia; Dayan, 2018). Such findings mirror the findings of sexual homicide-related empirical research, as sexual homicide has been associated with social isolation (James & Proulx, 2014), the use of humiliation and manipulation (Darjee, 2019; Schlesinger et al., 2010) as methods of asserting absolute control (Toates et al., 2017), sexism (i.e., categorization of women as inferior; Hazelwood & Warren, 2000), and various forms of sexual deviancy (e.g., sexual sadism; Darjee, 2019). As a result of the markedly similar characteristics exhibited within destructive religious cults and instances of sexual homicide (Dayan, 2018; Darjee, 2019; Galanter, 1999; James &

Proulx, 2014), it is reasonable to propose that cultic violence (i.e., violence perpetrated by destructive religious cults) satisfies the classification criteria for sexual homicide; cultic violence, therefore, may simply be unidentified and unrecognized instances of sexual homicide that are committed by proxy in the guise of mass murder-suicides, racial wars, or other motivational factors.

Problem Statement

Two of the most infamous destructive religious cults — Charles Manson’s Family and Jim Jones’ Peoples Temple — have resulted, at the very least, in the deaths of 926 individuals (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974; Guinn, 2017). Despite this appalling statistic, empirical research on destructive religious cults is severely limited, with little-to-no empirical research examining the existence of a universal motivation for cultic violence; rather, individualized motivations, such as Manson’s Helter Skelter philosophy (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974), for each respective destructive religious cult, as well as each instance of cultic violence, have been historically accepted.

While violence perpetrated by destructive religious cults has historically been explained through such individualized motivations, destructive religious cults, regardless of the respective motivations, exhibit shared characteristics (e.g., geographical and social isolation, apocalyptic beliefs, hierarchical structure, etc.; Hume, 1996), suggesting that instances of cultic violence may be the result of an unrecognized universal motivation rather than a multitude of individualized motivations (Carter et al., 2017; Ressler et al., 1992). While such characteristics seem to be universally-identifiable within destructive religious cults (Dayan, 2018), such characteristics are also universally-identifiable within instances of sexual homicide (Ressler et al., 1992), indicating

that cultic violence may be universally motivated by sexual gratification and, therefore, may simply be a previously-unidentified instance of sexual homicide.

Purpose of the Study

While the existence of a universal motivation for sexual homicide has been extensively studied, the existence of a universal motivation for cultic violence has not. Despite the existence of shared characteristics (e.g., social isolation, sexual abuse, etc.; Dayan, 2018; Darjee, 2019; Galanter, 1999; James & Proulx, 2014) between sexual homicide and cultic violence, law enforcement continues to identify individualized motivations (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974), rather than a universal motivation, for each respective instance of cultic violence.

Due to the totalitarian leadership of charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults (Navarro & Poynter, 2014), it is reasonable to expect that these individuals are the origin of cultic violence and, consequently, the motivation behind the cultic violence. In-depth analyses of these leaders indicate that characteristics that have been empirically associated with sexual murderers (e.g., narcissism, psychopathy; Burgess, Hartman, Ressler, Douglas, & McCormack, 1986; Darjee, 2019; Hare, 2016) are often evident in charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, as well, suggesting that cultic violence may exhibit a universal sexual motivation rather than individualized motivations.

As the large majority of charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults perish in the perpetration of cultic violence (Guinn, 2017), motivational insights cannot be gleaned from a question-and-answer format (i.e., surveys, interviews, etc.); therefore, it is critical to consider the influence of sexual motivation on cultic violence using alternate methods, such as comparative analyses of offense and offender characteristics of sexual homicide and cultic violence. Such an

analysis will provide law enforcement with increased insight into the motivational factors (e.g., untraditional motivational evidence, such as uncommon sexually deviant behaviors; Ressler et al., 1992) related to cultic violence and, consequently, will improve the ability of law enforcement to accurately identify and solve previously-unrecognized instances of cultic sexual homicide.

Research Questions/Objectives

Are there similarities between instances of sexual homicide and cultic violence, as well as between sexual murderers and charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, and, if so, is this violence sexually motivated? Empirical research suggests that instances of sexual homicide and cultic violence exhibit shared offense characteristics, such as intentional planning (Ressler et al., 1992) and ritualism (Schlesinger et al., 2010). Furthermore, empirical research suggests that both sexual murderers and charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults exhibit signs of narcissism and antisocial personality disorder (Burgess et al., 1986; Darjee, 2019; Hare, 2016), perpetrate physical and sexual abuse (Dayan, 2018), and utilize humiliation and manipulation to exert absolute control over those perceived to be inferior (Navarro & Poynter, 2014), as well. As a result, it is hypothesized that similarities will exist between offense and offender characteristics of sexual homicide and cultic violence, as well as between sexual murderers and charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults; consequently, it is hypothesized that cultic violence will be sexually motivated, necessitating the formation of a universal motivation for cultic sexual homicide.

Delimitations

Due to the personal (i.e., motivation) and criminal aspects of both cultic violence and instances of sexual homicide, the current study faces methodological constraints. With little-to-no access to the intended populations of study (i.e., charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults and sexual murderers), investigative reports (i.e., criminal records, mental health records, medical records, etc.), and other forms of primary or secondary sources within the private sector, the current study will rely solely on the examination of biographies of well-known charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults (e.g., Charles Manson, as well as both primary (e.g., FBI documentation, audio recordings, visually-recorded interviews with reputable news sources) and secondary (e.g., peer-reviewed journal articles) sources within the public sector. With the introduction of a third-person (e.g. author or news reporter) narrative into the current study and the redaction of certain information from publicly-available documentation, the possibility of unintended personal bias and misinformation exists.

In addition to these source limitations, the rarity of destructive religious cults, as a population (Melton, 1986), is problematic, such that the current study relies solely on a limited, nonrandom convenience sample of infamous charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults that, in order to limit culturally-related formative or structural differences, were conceived and established in the U.S. Due to the size, location, and nonrandom sampling methods used to obtain this sample, the generalization of the resultant findings to the population of charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, as a whole, is minimal, at best. However, as no universal motivation for cultic violence has ever been proposed, even minimal generalization furthers the understanding of cultic violence, as a concept, in the realms of academia and law enforcement.

Assumptions

As the majority of previously-conducted empirical research on sexual murderers and charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults examined, in most instances, solely male sexual murderers (Burgess et al., 1986; Ressler et al., 1992) and male charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults (Dayan, 2018; Hume, 1996), with little-to-no reference to female counterparts, it was assumed that the participants included in the current sample would be male. As a result of the association between sexual homicide, destructive religious cults, and violence (Hume, 1996; Ressler et al., 1992), it was further assumed that participants included in the current sample would have engaged in or commanded violence at some point in their cultic reign. Lastly, as infamous destructive religious cults are associated with violent culminating behaviors that result in numerous deaths or injuries (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974; Guinn, 2017; Hume, 1996), it was assumed that the destructive religious cults featured in the current study would have committed multiple murders prior to the dissolution of the respective cult.

Definition of Key Terms

Antisocial Personality Disorder - a pervasive pattern of disregard for and violation of the rights of others that is characterized by deceitfulness, impulsivity, irritability, aggressiveness, a lack of remorse, irresponsibility, and unconformity to social norms (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

Arousal - the physiological manifestations of stimulation, often operationally measured using heart rate and skin conductance (Kavish et al., 2019)

Attachment - an emotional bond between an individual and an attachment figure, typically a parent or parental figure (Ritblatt & Longstreth, 2019)

Authoritarian Parenting - a parenting style that is characterized by absolute parental authority and, consequently, nonexistent child autonomy (Steele & McKinney, 2019)

Autoerotic Asphyxiation - a deviant sexual interest in and sexual arousal to self-strangulation (Atanasijević, Jovanović, Nikolić, Popović, & Jašović-Gašić, 2009)

BDSM - a sexual interest, or corresponding activity, in interpersonal control — domination and/or submission — and the act of giving and/or receiving pain that is associated with bondage (Luo & Zhang, 2018)

“Behavioral Tryout” - the perpetration of a first-time behavior that is utilized to gain experience toward the homicidal intention by allowing the sexual murderer to perfect the manifestation of fantastical content (Burgess et al., 1986)

Blitz-Style Attack - a form of attack that consists of rapid incapacitation, often through the use of surprise (i.e., an ambush; Ressler et al., 1992)

Brainwashing - the process of indoctrination into a destructive religious cult that consists of psychological, physical, and emotional manipulation, resulting in the creation of unrestricted conformity (Dawson, 1998)

“Build-Up” - the rising level of aggression, often manifested in violence or criminal acts, that immediately precede the perpetration of sexual homicide (Ressler et al., 1992)

Charisma - a term used to describe leaders of destructive religious cults who, as a result of both personality and interpersonal skills, have a profound influence on cultic followers; this influence results in unquestioned obedience and, as a result, has the capability to generate violence (House, 1976)

Clearance Rate - the percentage of committed offenses that have resulted in the prosecution of or would-be prosecution of (barring exceptional events, such as suicide) an alleged offender (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017)

Compulsive Masturbation - a paraphilia-related disorder that is characterized by frequent, persistent masturbatory behavior that negatively impacts physical health, as well as social and occupational functioning (Karia, De Sousa, Shah, & Sonavane, 2015)

Confirmation Bias - the tendency for individuals to attend to and recall information that supports or confirms their pre-existing attitudes over information that challenges such attitudes (Knobloch-Westerwick, Mothes, & Polavin, 2017)

Cultic Violence - a form of violence that is committed by destructive religious cults

“Danger Markers” - characteristics of destructive religious cults that indicate the propensity of destructive religious cults to perpetrate cultic violence (Hume, 1996)

Depersonalization - the act of removing a victim’s individuality (i.e., humanity), often through the mutilation or objectification of the victim (Sewall, Krupp, & Lalumière, 2013)

Destructive Religious Cult - a religious cult characterized by deviation from accepted societal norms through the use of various techniques, such as brainwashing, sexual abuse, and violence (Melton, 1986)

Disinhibition - the conscious process through which an offender exerts an effort to obtain short-term rewards (e.g., sexual contact), while devaluing long-term rewards associated with the avoidance of such efforts to obtain short-term rewards (Toates, Smid, & van den Berg, 2017).

Disorganized Offender - a perpetrator of sexual homicide who is characterized by social isolation and inadequacy, childhood abuse, impulsivity, and a lack of understanding (Ressler, Burgess, Douglas, Hartman, & D'Agostino, 1986)

Excitation Transfer Theory - a theory that posits that residual emotional stimulation generated by an initial event compounds with emotions response to an ensuing event, thereby heightening the response to the ensuing event (Cummins & Berke, 2017)

Exhibitionism - a paraphilia that is characterized by recurrent and intense sexual arousal to the exposure of one's genitals to an unsuspecting person (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

Fantasy - detailed thoughts regarding one's desires that are characterized by preoccupation (Prentky et al., 1989)

Fetishism - a paraphilia that is characterized by recurrent and intense sexual arousal to nonliving objects or nongenital body parts (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

"Frame of Mind" - a dominant emotional state that acts as a primary interpreting filter of external events (Ressler et al., 1992)

Habituation - the process through which an individual, after prolonged exposure to a specific stimuli, experiences a decrease in the intensity of response to such specific stimuli (Ben-Sasson & Podoly, 2020)

Homicide - deliberate killing of one individual by another (Ressler et al., 1992)

Hostile Attribution Bias - the tendency for an individual to interpret the ambiguous behavior of another individual as hostile, regardless of the other individual's intention (Zhu, Chen, & Xia, 2020)

Incentive Stimuli - a stimulus that is associated with a desirable outcome (Toates et al., 2017)

Indoctrination - the process of instructing an individual to unquestionably accept the beliefs of the cult that consists of exhaustion — physical and psychological — and sensory deprivation, among other techniques (Dawson, 1998)

Insecure Attachment - a form of parent-child attachment that is characterized by negative interpersonal interactions (Ritblatt & Longstreth, 2019)

Isomorphism - the tendency for sexual victims to reenact prior victimizations from the perspective of the perpetrator when triggered by certain environmental cues (Levenson & Grady, 2016)

Modus Operandi - the conscious technique utilized by the offender in the perpetration of a crime (Schlesinger, Kassen, Mesa, & Pinizzotto, 2010)

Motivational Evidence - evidence that provides insight into the motivation of the offender

Narcissistic Personality Disorder - a pervasive pattern of fantastic or behavioral grandiosity, need for admiration, and lack of empathy that is characterized by a high level of self-importance, a preoccupation with power, a sense of entitlement, a lack of empathy, and a use of exploitation (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

Necrophilia - a paraphilia that is characterized by recurrent and intense sexual arousal to the sexual violation of a corpse (Pettigrew, 2019)

Organized Offender - a perpetrator of sexual homicide who is characterized by high intellectual ability, premeditation, attempts at concealment, and sexual sadism (Ressler et al., 1986)

Paraphilia - an intense and persistent sexual interest other than sexual interest in genital stimulation or preparatory fondling with phenotypically normal, physically mature, consenting human partners (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

Paraphilic Disorder - a paraphilia that is currently causing distress or impairment to the individual or a paraphilia whose satisfaction has entailed personal harm, or risk of harm, to others (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

Paraphilia-Related Disorder - sexually-arousing fantasies, urges, or activities that are culturally sanctioned aspects of normative sexual arousal and activity that increase in frequency or intensity so as to significantly interfere with the capacity of reciprocal affectionate activity (Briken, Habermann, Kafka, Berner, & Hill, 2006)

Personality Disorder - an enduring pattern of inner experience and behavior that deviates markedly from the expectations of the individual's culture (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

Premeditation - the act of intentionally planning the perpetration of a crime (Ressler et al., 1992)

Psychopathy - a personality disorder characterized by self-centeredness, callousness, an inability to form relationships, and a lack of empathy and remorse (Hare, 2003)

Ritualism - the pattern of present crime scene acts that were committed by the offender, though were unnecessary for the perpetration of the homicide (Schlesinger et al., 2010)

Serial Murder - three or more separate events in three or more separate locations with an emotional cooling-off period in between homicides (Douglas et al., 1992)

Sexual Deviance - sexual interest in activities, situations, people, or objects that are illegal, inappropriate, or highly unusual (Smid & Wever, 2018)

Sexual Posing - the deliberate act of sexually positioning a body in a crime scene (Geberth, 2010)

Sexual Sadism - recurrent and intense sexual arousal from the physical or psychological suffering of another individual, as manifested by fantasies, urges, or behaviors (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

Sexual Coping - a coping method that relies upon the externalization of sexual victimization (Levenson & Grady, 2016)

Shared Ideology - a belief system that consists of beliefs, attitudes, values, etc. that is shared by each member of the religious cult (Galanter, 1999)

Signature - a unique, ritualistic act that is independent of a repetitive pattern (Schlesinger et al., 2010)

Social Cohesiveness - the product of group relations that preserves group membership, often through the facilitation of a sense of belonging and dependency (Galanter, 1999)

“Souvenir” - an object that has been removed from a crime scene for the purpose of future sexual gratification (Ressler et al., 1992)

“Trigger” - a stimulus and/or event that pushes an offender to either act on his/her fantasies or to protect his/her fantasies (Ressler et al., 1992)

“Trophy” - an object that has been removed from a crime scene for the purpose of increasing power and/or pride (Ressler et al., 1992)

Us-Versus-Them Mentality - a mentality in which members of a group identify more with members of said group than with non-members of said group (Galanter, 1999)

Voyeurism - a paraphilia characterized by recurrent and intense sexual arousal from observing an unsuspecting person who is naked, in the process of disrobing, or engaging in sexual activity (American Psychiatric Association, 2013)

Organization of the Remainder of the Paper

Following the general overview of the current study (i.e., problem statement, purpose of the study, etc.) presented in the current pages, Chapter 2 provides an exhaustive review of the academic literature on both sexual homicide and destructive religious cults, as well as provides the background information of the two case studies of cultic violence that are referenced in both Chapter 3 and Chapter 4. To improve overall organization and comprehensibility, Chapter 2 is divided into three independent parts: sexual homicide, religious cults, and the introduction of the two case studies. Sexual homicide is defined and followed by a discussion of various offense and offender characteristics (e.g., post-crime characteristics, psychological characteristics, etc.), as well as various motivational models of sexual homicide and a number of proposed dichotomous and trichotomous typologies. A definition of religious cults, as well as destructive religious cults, are provided, followed by a discussion of offense and offender characteristics associated with destructive religious cults (e.g., subversive tactics, such as brainwashing and sexual abuse, and “danger markers”), charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults (e.g., the presence of various personality disorders or psychological dysfunctions), and members of destructive religious cults.

Chapter 3 illustrates the various demographic characteristics of the sample utilized in the current study, the materials used to code and obtain data, the design of the current study, and the procedure utilized for data collection and analysis. Chapter 4 discusses the results of the current study, specifically with regard to the examination of similarities between sexual murderers and charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults as a means for identifying a sexual motivation. Chapter 5 consists of general conclusions that will be reached following data analysis and an in-depth discussion of the implications of these conclusions in furthering law enforcement’s ability

to accurately recognize instances of sexual homicide and identify the respective perpetrators, as well as limitations of the current study and proposed directions for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

An Introduction to Homicide and Sexual Deviance

Homicide is the “unlawful killing of a human being, or a [postembryonic] fetus, with malice aforethought,” as evidenced in the existence of sufficient intention — i.e., premeditation, deliberation, willfulness — to lethally harm another without adequate provocation (Cal. Penal Code §187-188; *People v. Davis*, 1994). Despite the widespread acceptance of such a vogueish definition within the legal system, homicide may be categorized into various sub-classifications (e.g., felony murder, argument-motivated murder, etc.), as determined by the overt, as well as covert, motivations of the offender[s], suggesting that homicide is far more complex than the general legal definition insinuates (Ressler et al., 1992).

Empirical studies have, in fact, identified a myriad of homicidal sub-classifications, as motivated by childhood trauma, neurocognitive (e.g., intellectual impairment) and psychological (e.g., psychopathy) abnormalities, and substance use, as well as sexual deviance (Ressler et al., 1992). With 17,000 homicides — of which 7,000 (40%) remain unsolved — occurring annually in the United States of America (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017), increased examination into the various homicidal motivations is necessary for the improvement of such clearance rates, specifically with regard to the one-fifth of annual homicides that contain an unknown motivation (Ressler et al., 1992).

While the evidence (e.g., forensic, physical, circumstantial, etc.) found within commonly-identified homicidal sub-classifications (e.g., substance-motivated murder, argument-motivated murder, felony murder, etc.) provides a significant amount of information into the motivation of

and, consequently, the identity of the offender[s], sexually-motivated murders provide little, if any, evidentiary insight into the motivations of the offender[s], suggesting that a substantial amount of sexually-motivated murders may be incorrectly attributed to an unknown motivation and, therefore, remain unsolved (Carter et al., 2017; Ressler et al., 1992).

Despite a lack of conventional motivational evidence (e.g., offender-victim relationship, theft of items for monetary gain, etc.), unconventional motivational evidence is often present in sexually-motivated homicides, often in the form of sexually-deviant behaviors (e.g., mutilation, bondage, asphyxiation, etc.; Ressler et al., 1992), or behaviors concerned with the fulfillment of illegal or unorthodox sexual interests (Smid & Wever, 2018). Through an examination into the motivational association between sexual deviance and homicide, it may be possible to further identify instances of, as well as perpetrators of, previously-unrecognized instances of sexually-motivated homicide, thereby improving the ability of law enforcement to successfully recognize latent sexual motivations, identify possible suspects, and, therefore, solve sexual homicides.

Review of the Literature on Sexual Homicide

An Overview of Sexual Homicide

Sexual homicide — defined as murder that is characterized by a sexual element — is a relatively rare occurrence, with a (probable) prevalence rate of less than one percent (Chan & Heide, 2009; Douglas et al., 2013; Sturup et al., 2019). Despite the rarity of sexual homicide in the “real world,” sexual homicide dominated academic literature and media coverage, as well as various forms of entertainment (e.g., television, film, literature, music, etc.), captivating U.S. society with the extreme brutality, unpredictability, and perverseness that characterizes these offenses (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000; Ressler et al., 1992).

U.S. society, for instance, remains enthralled with “Jack the Ripper,” an unidentified serial murderer that is featured in hundreds of non-fiction texts, as well as thousands of fictional novels, films, songs, and television programs (Whiteway, 2004). Despite being responsible for significantly fewer murders than many other serial murderers, “Jack the Ripper” remains the front-runner in criminal popularity (Whiteway, 2004), suggesting that the extent of the brutality, unpredictability, and perverseness, rather than the sheer number of victims, intrigues society.

The extent to which “Jack the Ripper” utilized such brutality, unpredictability, and perverseness is best illustrated by Annie Chapman’s murder — one of the first modern cases of sexual homicide — on September 8, 1888 in the Whitechapel District of London, England (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000). Annie Chapman was found with a lethal laceration to the throat, eviscerated, missing her uterus and portions of her vagina and bladder, and with her dress pulled over her head and her legs arranged in such a way as to make the genital region fully accessible (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000). Annie Chapman’s murder emphasizes the profound depravity that is characteristic of sexual homicide and, consequently, demonstrates the necessity of developing an increased understanding of the offense, as well as the individuals that have the capacity to commit such an offense.

Characteristics of the Offense

Despite variations (e.g., *modus operandi*, signature, etc.) within known instances of sexual homicide — “Jack the Ripper’s” blitz-style attack and post-mortem mutilation (Douglas & Olshaker, 2000) versus Dennis Rader’s strangulation and bondage (Ramsland, 2016) —, sexual homicide is relatively homogenous, suggesting that the motivational uniformity toward

sexual gratification (Ressler et al., 1992) may extend to other areas of sexual homicide, such as pre-, crime, and post-crime behaviors and characteristics.

While the homogeneity of sexual homicide indicates that such motivational aspects may be evident in pre-, crime, and post-crime behaviors and characteristics, it is important to note that sex and sexuality (e.g., sexual interests, behaviors related to sexual gratification) are immensely personal and, therefore, subjective; with little insight into these singular sexual motivations, law enforcement faces difficulties with recognizing sexual interests and behaviors related to sexual gratification (Carter et al., 2017), as such interests and behaviors may be utterly unrelated to sex and sexuality for the majority of society (e.g., hair collected from brushes and drains, high heels, etc.; Ressler et al., 1992). The complexity that accompanies such singular sexual motivations necessitates further understanding of homogenous pre-, crime, and post-crime characteristics related to individual or personal sexual interests (e.g., collected hair, female undergarments, theft of high heels, etc; Schlesinger et al., 2010), as well as characteristics related to sexual homicide that, at the same time, are independent of any individual or personal sexual interests or behaviors (e.g., intentional planning, stressful environmental stimuli, etc.; Ressler et al., 1992).

Pre-crime characteristics. Despite the existence of numerous heterogeneous aspects of sexual homicide (e.g., *modus operandi*, signature elements), Ressler et al. (1992) found various homogenous aspects within the pre-crime characteristics of offenders that, when applied to the investigative efforts of law enforcement, indicate the presence of sexual motivation. For instance, Ressler et al., (1992) found that stressful environmental stimuli, such as financial (48%), occupational (39%), and legal (28%) difficulties, as well as relational (59%) and parental (53%) conflict, physical injury (11%), and bereavement (8%), frequently precipitate the precipitation of

sexual homicide. The homogenous presence of such stressful emotional stimuli indicates that the perpetration of sexual homicide is not random, but is facilitated by a high level of arousal (i.e., stress) that prompts the respective sexual offender to “act out” and, thereby, reduce the level of arousal felt (Ressler et al., 1992).

Due to the existence of stressful environmental stimuli, sexual murderers frequently experience a multitude of negative emotions prior to the perpetration of sexual homicide, such as frustration (50%), anger (48%), agitation (43%), nervousness (17%), sadness (14.6%), fear (10%), and confusion (7%; Ressler et al., 1992), that prime the respective sexual murderers to perceive others’ actions as hostile, threatening, irritating, or, simply, unwanted (Ressler et al., 1992). Interestingly, though, sexual murderers also report the presence of positive emotions, such as excitement (41%) and calmness (8.8%; Ressler et al., 1992). The presence of negative, as well as positive, emotional states suggests that sexual murderers perceive others’ actions from a negative perspective and, at the same time, perceive personal actions from a positive perspective; in viewing others’ actions negatively and personal actions positively, sexual murderers exhibit an inability to empathize with others (Ressler et al., 1992), as evidenced in the commonly-reported homicidal justifications of entitlement (e.g., “I deserve [victim]”), grievance (i.e., revenge), an insatiable male sex drive (e.g., “I couldn’t help myself”), and control (i.e., power, domination; Toates et al., 2017). These pre-crime emotional states (i.e., “frame of mind;” Ressler et al., 1992) indicate that sexual murderers experience negative interpersonal emotions in conjunction with positive intrapersonal emotions, thereby highlighting the ability of sexual murderers to distance and depersonalize victims through the use of a hostile attribution bias.

As a result of the predisposition of heightened arousal toward outward manifestation of negative emotional states, as well as the empathic ineptitude and depersonalization of the victim, sexual murderers possess the capacity to deliberately plan the perpetration of sexual homicide (Ressler et al., 1992). In fact, Ressler et al. (1992) found that one-half of sexual murderers engage in some form of intentional planning, such as the identification of an identified victim or the selection of a predetermined location. Further examination provided that, even in the absence of overt intentional planning, sexual murderers exhibit a preconceived willingness to murder, as evidenced in compulsive “hunting,” (i.e., continuous searching) for favorable circumstances (e.g., absence of law enforcement) and a suitable opportunistic victim (e.g., smaller female that is engaged in high-risk activities, such as prostitution, that limit the noticeability of the homicide) that, together, present a significant likelihood of success (Ressler et al., 1992). Fewer than one-quarter of sexual murderers report a complete absence of intentional planning and a willingness to murder (Ressler et al., 1992); in spite of this denial of intention, however, empirical research posits that this perceived impulsivity is merely the result of an unrecognized instance of planning (Ressler et al., 1992), suggesting that sexual murderers do not act “on a whim,” but, rather, plan — consciously or unconsciously — to kill.

The combination of stressful environmental stimuli, a negative “frame of mind,” and a form of intentional planning prompt sexual murderers to engage in certain behaviors prior to the perpetration of sexual homicide. According to Ressler et al. (1992), the introduction of stressful environmental stimuli, such as the loss of a job or divorce proceedings, influences the fulfillment of or maintenance of fantasies, as such “triggers” affect the level of inadequacy and rejection felt by the sexual murderer; as such levels of inadequacy and rejection rise, behavioral patterns of

increasing anger, homicidal proclivity, and, consequently, dangerousness commence (Ressler et al., 1992). In the days prior to the perpetration of sexual homicide, sexual murderers within this behavioral pattern often perpetrate alternative criminal activities, such as assault, arson, or fetish burglaries (Ressler et al., 1992). As this ascending behavioral pattern continues, sexual murderers often consume alcohol or other intoxicating substances and begin “hunting” for the ideal victim in the hours preceding the perpetration of sexual homicide (Ressler et al., 1992). As instances of sexual homicide typically do not occur without such a behavioral pattern, it seems reasonable to suggest that the perpetration of sexual homicide truly begins at the commencement of this rising level of aggression (i.e., “build-up”) in the hours and days prior to the perpetration of sexual homicide, rather than at the commencement of the homicide, itself.

Crime characteristics. According to Ressler et al. (1992), the culmination of the pre-offense “build-up” of aggression and the identification of an intended or suitable victim prompts sexual murderers to kill. As a consequence of the pre-offense “build-up” of aggression, instances of sexual homicide are typically characterized by unconventional components, such as torture and mutilation, as evidenced in the presence of evisceration or the insertion of foreign objects (e.g., broom handle, tree branch, etc.) into the vagina or anus, among others (Ressler et al., 1992); the use of such aspects of torture and mutilation frequently result in visible overkill, in which victims receive injuries that far exceed those needed to incapacitate or kill (Ressler et al., 1992). Ressler et al. (1992), in addition, found that sexual murderers commonly engage in behaviors associated with various forms of sexual perversion, such as persistent, deviant sexual fantasies, paraphilia-related disorders, or paraphilias. As such unconventional and sexually-deviant components are often present throughout a respective offender’s criminal career (e.g.,

mutilation was present in all murders associated with “Jack the Ripper”), empirical research posits that such components may be ritualistic (i.e., meaningful and consistent) to each respective offender (Schlesinger et al., 2010).

Ritualism. The majority of sexual murderers exhibit at least one persistent, deviant sexual fantasy, paraphilia-related disorder (e.g, compulsive masturbation; Briken et al., 2006), or paraphilia (e.g., fetishism, voyeurism, transvestism, etc.; Meloy, 2000) that influence the characteristics of the offense in a ritualistic, or, in other words, meaningful and consistent, manner. In order to examine the ritualistic influence of such persistent, deviant sexual fantasies, paraphilia-related disorders, and paraphilias on sexual homicide, Schlesinger et al. (2010) examined the occurrence of ritualistic behaviors — defined as behaviors that are “unnecessary for the perpetration of the homicide” — within instances of sexual homicide.

Through this examination, Schlesinger et al. (2010) identified four classifications of ritualistic behaviors, as motivated by: (1) power, control, and domination, (2) rage and revenge, (3) degradation and humiliation, or (4) sexual fixation. While sexual murderers tend to exhibit behaviors within a specific motivation (e.g., bondage within the context power, control, and domination), Schlesinger et al. (2010) posits that overlap and experimentation occurs, with sexual murderers exhibiting ritualistic behaviors that are motivated by various combinations (e.g., bondage within the context of power, control, and domination, as well as posing of the victim within the context of sexual fixation) of the identified classifications, as evidenced in the concurrent presentation of overkill, sexual posing, mutilation, evisceration, and foreign object insertion, among others. Due to the unique combinations of ritualistic behaviors found within instances of sexual homicide, it is reasonable to suggest that sexual homicide is influenced by

and dependent upon the specific motivations (e.g., rage and revenge, sexual fixation, etc.) of the respective offender; in understanding the innate meaning (e.g., sexual fixation) of such ritualistic elements, law enforcement may be better able to identify the motivational basis of certain offense characteristics and, in turn, to identify instances of sexual homicide.

Post-crime characteristics. In the aftermath of the perpetration of sexual homicide, sexual murderers are confronted with the residual consequences of the murder and, as a result, must address the risk of apprehension through the disposal of the victim's body. According to Ressler et al. (1992), sexual murderers tend to leave the body at the crime scene or dispose of the body in a visible area, such as in an alley or an abandoned lot, suggesting that sexual murderers are unconcerned with the risk associated with the discovery of the victim's body or confident in their ability to leave little, if any, forensic evidence. Often, at the time of discovery, victims are nude or partially clothed (i.e., exposure of buttocks, breasts, or genitals without complete nudity) and are posed or positioned in a sexually-indicative way, as illustrated in the sexual positioning of Annie Chapman by "Jack the Ripper" (Ressler et al., 1992); in fact, Ressler et al. (1992) found that a mere one-fourth of victims are found in a state of complete dress, suggesting that, once the victim's body is discovered, identification of sexual homicide is seemingly straightforward.

While the majority of sexual murderers tend to be unconcerned with the risk associated with the discovery of the victim's body or confident in their ability to leave little, if any, forensic evidence, a significant minority of sexual murderers either bury, hide, or keep the body in various states of dress or undress (Ressler et al., 1992), indicating that sexual murderers also may exhibit concern with regard to the risk associated with the discovery of the victim's body; a more plausible explanation, however, stems from the suggestion that sexual homicide, to some sexual

murderers, may be an exceedingly private act that either provokes shame or, more likely, may be relived at a later date for the obtention of sexual gratification (Ressler et al., 1992). In fact, Ressler et al. (1992) found that a significant amount of sexual murderers return to the site of the victim's body or to the crime scene to either relive the sexual and homicidal fantasy or to engage in necrophilia with the victim's corpse, thereby affirming the suggestion that avoidance of bodily discovery may be concerned with both avoidance of detection and the obtention of future sexual gratification through satisfaction of deviant (e.g., homicidal-related) sexual fantasies, paraphilia-related disorders, or paraphilias.

In spite of the fact that the majority of sexual murderers do not bury, hide, or keep the body for the future obtention of sexual gratification, the majority of sexual murderers are able to obtain sexual gratification on a later date, as well, indicating that the future obtention of sexual gratification is not limited to the visitation of the respective corpse (Ressler et al., 1992). In fact, Ressler et al. (1992) found that a significant amount of sexual murderers — including those that leave the victim's body at the crime scene or dispose of the victim's body in a visible area — removed “trophies” or “souvenirs” from the crime scene, such as the victim's underwear or accessories (e.g., jewelry, shoes, etc.); the removed “trophies” or “souvenirs” often represent the persistent, deviant sexual fantasy, paraphilia-related disorder, or paraphilia (e.g., the removal of the victim's underwear, as related to the paraphilic interest in transvestism or fetishism) and, as a result, facilitate the obtention of future sexual gratification in relation to the respective instance of sexual homicide (Ressler et al., 1992). These “trophies” or “souvenirs” are even, in some instances, gifted to the wives, girlfriends, or intimate partners of the respective sexual murderers (Ressler et al., 1992), thereby associating homicidal-related sexual gratification and significant

other-related sexual gratification and increasing the sexual murderer's perception of invincibility as both intimate partners and law enforcement fail to suspect the respective sexual murderer (Ressler et al., 1992).

This overt recklessness (i.e., gifting of "trophies" or "souvenirs") provides sexual murderers with a narcissistic satisfaction and a perception of invincibility (Ressler et al., 1992), indicating that sexual murderers may engage in risky behaviors that threaten the freedom (i.e., lack of detection) of the respective sexual murderer. In support of this contention, Ressler et al. (1992) found that nearly one-half of sexual murderers become proactively involved in the investigative efforts of law enforcement, often by intensely following media coverage of the investigation, by keeping detailed records (e.g., diary, scrapbook) of the investigation, or by participating in the discovery of the victim's body (e.g., participating in a voluntary search; Ressler et al., 1992); such involvement indicates that sexual murderers view law enforcement as highly incompetent, inferior, and, as a result, a pawn to manipulate for mere entertainment (Kerr, Beech, & Murphy, 2013; Ressler et al., 1992).

A small proportion of sexual murderers, in fact, exhibit such narcissistic self-assuredness that they engage in serial sexual homicide, killing again while law enforcement continues to investigate the primary sexual homicide (Ressler et al., 1992); the development of serial sexual homicide indicates that a small proportion of sexual offenders may be responsible for a large proportion of sexual homicides, suggesting that the majority of sexual homicides include, often as a result of narcissism, unconventional evidence (e.g., "trophies" or "souvenirs," participation in law enforcement investigations, etc.) that may facilitate the identification of sexual homicide and sexual murderers (Ressler et al., 1992).

Identifying instances of sexual homicide based upon offense characteristics. The presence of unconventional motivational evidence, such as the level of proactive involvement in the respective investigation, the state of the victim's body (e.g., state of clothing, sexual posing, etc.), and the removal of "trophies" or "souvenirs" from the crime scene (Ressler et al., 1992), suggests that law enforcement may be able to significantly improve homicidal clearance rates by identifying aspects of unconventional motivational evidence, as well as aspects of conventional motivational evidence (e.g., sexual intercourse) within instances of sexual homicide. In fact, Ressler et al. (1992) claim that sexual homicide may be identified if any of the following are discernible:

- (a) victim's attire or lack of attire, (b) exposure of the sexual parts of the victim's body,
- (c) sexual positioning of the victim's body, (d) insertion of foreign objects into the victim's body cavities, (e) evidence of [oral, anal, or vaginal] sexual intercourse, or (f) evidence of substitute sexual activity, interest, or sadistic fantasy (Beauregard & Martineau, 2012, p. 1458).

Despite being the most widely-used checklist of identifiable evidence of both conventional and unconventional sexual motivations, Chopin and Beauregard (2019) assert that Ressler et al.'s (1992) criteria incorrectly requires the presence of overt sexual actions (e.g., sexual intercourse), suggesting that Ressler et al. (1992) mistakenly assume that stimuli associated with sexual gratification — conventional and unconventional — are familiar and easily detectable. Empirical research supports this contention, citing the insufficient accuracy rate (48.3%) of Ressler et al.'s (1992) criteria (Stefanska, Higgs, Carter, & Beech, 2017); such a low accuracy rate suggests that overt sexual actions do not provide a sufficient basis for sexual homicide classification.

Sexual activity, if present, may occur before, during, or after the relevant homicide in various forms — conventional and unconventional — and, therefore, may not be a recognized form of sexual gratification (e.g., collection of hair from hairbrushes or drains) or overtly visible within the crime scene (Kerr et al. 2013). Various authors, in fact, have even posited that sexual homicide need not contain any evidence of sexual activity at all (Beauregard, 2019). As a consequence of the lack of detectable evidence of sexual activity — often, as a result of the personalization of sexual gratification to include actions that are unassociated with sexual gratification —, law enforcement has difficulty recognizing and classifying instances of sexual homicide as sexually motivated, suggesting that classification must include factors, such as offender characteristics, that contain evidence of sexual motivation not found in the crime scene.

Characteristics of the Offender

Unusual stimuli for sexual gratification, such as the collection of hair from hairbrushes or drains, found within instances of sexual homicide often confound the investigative efforts of law enforcement (Kerr, Beech, & Murphy, 2013). Empirical research indicates that such behaviors may be the manifestation of personal emotions or cognitions, suggesting that the required sexual element may address diverse sexual motivations using various distinct methods and offense characteristics (e.g., sexual posing; Ressler et al., 1992) that are meaningful to the respective offender. Classification must, therefore, include factors relevant to the complexity of sexual homicide — often, as the result of the personal nature of sexual homicide — that may be traced back to said offender through the investigative efforts of law enforcement.

In an attempt to identify factors relevant to this complexity, as well as to the personal nature, of sexual homicide, Ressler et al. (1992) and Ressler et al. (1986) analyzed the court

records and autobiographical interviews of 36 sexual murderers — all male — that were incarcerated in U.S. prisons, thereby allowing both crime scene characteristics and offender characteristics to be analyzed. According to Ressler et al. (1992), sexual murderers tend to be Caucasian individuals of above-average intelligence that offend intra-racially, killing adult females of the same race (Chan & Heide, 2016). In addition, Ressler et al. (1992) found that sexual murderers are often raised in single-parent ($N = 33$; 36%) or two-parent ($N = 11$; 56%) households that operate from a patriarchal perspective, in which the paternal figure provides a stable, middle-class income ($N = 30$; 86%), whether through skilled or unskilled labor, while the maternal figure remains at home, caring for the family ($N = 16$; 52%). In spite of this perceived averageness, Ressler et al. (1992) found that the familial normativeness (e.g., financial well-being, marital stability, etc.) that characterizes these households is merely an idyllic facade.

Environmental characteristics. Despite the existence of various idyllic environmental characteristics (e.g., financial well-being, marital stability, etc.) within these households, many offenders report familial histories of instability ($N = 23$; 68%) that, in a significant number of cases, is caused by paternal departure prior to adolescence ($N = 17$; 47%) that results in a shift from a patriarchal familial structure to a matriarchal familial structure ($N = 21$; 66%; Burgess et al., 1986; Ressler et al., 1992). In addition to general paternal instability and absence, households of sexual murderers are also characterized by familial histories of psychological dysfunctions ($N = 16$; 53%), alcohol abuse ($N = 20$; 69%), drug abuse ($N = 9$; 33%), and criminality ($N = 16$; 53%), as well as childhood physical ($N = 13$; 42%), psychological ($N = 23$; 64%), and sexual ($N = 12$; 43%) abuse (Burgess et al., 1986; Ressler et al., 1992).

Further research supports Ressler et al.'s (1992) findings, indicating that sexual offenders, such as sexual murderers, are more likely to experience sexual abuse, physical abuse, verbal abuse, and emotional abuse than those in the general population (Levenson & Grady, 2016); as such findings demonstrate an overwhelming consensus for the presence of childhood trauma in sexual offenders, sexual murderers likely experience severe childhood trauma — such that the severity distinguishes sexual murderers from sexual offenders — often at the hands of a parent or other parental figure, that negatively impacts their ability to form meaningful parent-child attachments.

Attachment. Attachment, or the relationship between a parent (i.e., caregiver) and a child, is often viewed as the foundation of adulthood interpersonal interactions, specifically with regard to romantic (i.e., sexual) interactions (Ressler et al., 1992). While children that experience warm and nurturing environments form secure (i.e., meaningful) parent-child attachments, children that experience neglectful, as well as unpredictable, environments form insecure (i.e., socially distant, isolated, disengaged, etc.) parent-child attachments (Levenson & Grady, 2016).

Empirical research indicates that parenting style, perhaps more than any other factor, influences the formation of secure parent-child attachments (Steele & McKinney, 2019) and, as a result, the emotional development of the child. Parenting style — defined as an approach to or methodology of parenting that utilizes varying levels of control, authority, and care — consists of four sub-classifications (e.g., authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, neglecting), each of which has been associated with specific consequences on the affected child (Steele & McKinney, 2019). Authoritative parenting — a parenting style that is characterized by a balance between parental authority and child autonomy —, for instance, is associated with fewer adulthood mental health

problems (Steele & McKinney, 2019). Authoritarian, permissive, and neglecting parenting — parenting styles that are characterized by a dysfunctional balance between parental authority and child autonomy, such as a complete lack of parental authority — are associated with greater rates of adulthood mental health problems and substance abuse (Steele & McKinney, 2019). Empirical research, however, suggests that an authoritarian parenting style (i.e., absolute parental authority coupled with nonexistent child autonomy) is associated with the most disastrous effects on child development (Steele & McKinney, 2019), indicating that the lack of parental emotion (e.g., care, love, protection, etc.) and individual autonomy impacts the ability of a child to form appropriate parent-child attachment and, as such, future healthy interpersonal relationships.

Through interviews, as well as in-depth analyses of official records (e.g., prison records, criminal records, etc.), Ressler et al. (1992) examined the prevalence of such adverse parent-child attachment within a population of sexual murderers. Through this examination, Ressler et al. (1992) found that sexual murderers frequently exhibit insecure parent-child attachments and, as a result, form negative relationships with paternal figures ($N = 26$; 72%) and maternal figures ($N = 16$; 44%). In support of this contention, Meloy, Gacono, and Kenney (1994) also found that a significant percentage (89%) of sexual murderers exhibit a form of dysfunctional, or insecure, parent-child attachment, often as the result of dysfunctional (e.g., authoritarian) parenting styles, mental illness, substance abuse, criminality, and childhood abuse (e.g., physical, sexual) within their respective households (Levenson & Grady, 2016).

Insecure attachment — defined as a form of parent-child attachment that is characterized by negative interpersonal interactions, such as abuse (Ritblatt & Longstreth, 2019) — has been empirically associated with aggression, often as a result of an association between interpersonal

relationships and neglect, coercion, and isolation (Marcus & Kramer, 2001). In fact, Levenson and Grady (2016) found that insecure attachment is associated with sexual instability, as well as increased sexual aggression and a propensity to engage in domestic violence, suggesting that childhood trauma — a causal factor of insecure parent-child attachment — produces maladapted interpersonal skills (e.g., aggression, personal boundary violations, etc.) that are characterized by increased fight-or-flight arousal, as well as cognitive and emotional deficits.

Due to a reliance on maladapted interpersonal skills, Levenson and Grady (2016) suggest that sexual offenders, such as sexual murderers, lack appropriate coping mechanisms to address negative environmental characteristics in an emotionally acceptable manner; as a result, sexual offenders rely on aggression and violence to reduce arousal (i.e., anxiety, stress, etc.; Levenson & Grady, 2016). According to the concept of isomorphism — the tendency for sexual victims to reenact prior victimizations from the perspective of the perpetrator when triggered by certain environmental cues —, sexual offenders rely on a form of sexualized coping, suggesting that victims of sexual abuse may form a schema of environmental cues (e.g., relationship, setting, etc.) that necessitate sexual offending, as modeled by the prior victimization (Levenson & Grady, 2016). As a result, Levenson and Grady (2016) suggest that sexual aggression seeks to form interpersonal connection, thereby satisfying the offender's need for “intimacy, affection, power, or control” that has been absent within households characterized by a lack of these needs, indicating that sexual violence may simply be a substitution for social connection, as influenced by the perception of unattainability, or interpersonal intimacy.

Due to the presence of authoritarian, permissive, and neglecting parenting styles, insecure parent-child attachments, and other negative environmental stimuli (e.g., instability, child abuse),

a significant number of sexual offenders are removed from these environments and placed in state-run foster systems, incarcerated in juvenile detention centers, or involuntarily committed to psychiatric hospitals prior to adulthood (Ressler et al., 1992). These environments, however, also contain problematic authority-autonomy balances, as those placed within these environments continue to face high levels of guardian autonomy in conjunction with low levels of personal autonomy, suggesting that such placements, while good in intention, likely do little to reverse the consequences of negative environmental characteristics (e.g., insecure parent-child attachment, authoritarian parenting style, instability, etc.) experienced within the primary household; as a result, it is likely that such individuals will continue to rely upon the maladapted interpersonal skills and sexualized coping utilized within the primary household, thereby facilitating the general development from traumatized child to sexual murderer (Ressler et al., 1992).

The association between sexual murder and negative environmental characteristics (e.g., childhood abuse, insecure parent-child attachments, familial instability, etc.) suggests that sexual murderers often endure complex, unpleasant childhood experiences (Ressler et al., 1992) that may, through the formation of an insecure parent-child attachment (Levenson & Grady, 2016; Ressler et al., 1992) and, consequently, the reliance on maladjusted interpersonal skills and sexual coping (Levenson & Grady, 2016), impact future emotions, cognitions, and behaviors.

Behavioral characteristics. Due to the existence of shared environmental characteristics (e.g., childhood abuse, insecure parent-child attachment, etc.), it seems reasonable to expect that shared behavioral characteristics also exist within the sexual murderer population. Ressler et al.'s (1992) study supports this contention with the identification of various behavioral characteristics,

such as isolation ($N = 20$, 71%), that exist within the sample of sexual murderers at a greater rate than within the general population.

For instance, Ressler et al. (1992) found that sexual murderers, although intelligent, exhibit low levels of educational and occupational attainment, with the majority reporting unemployment ($N = 4$; 11%) or, at most, unsteady employment ($N = 24$; 69%), as well as a lack of secondary (i.e., high school) education ($N = 17$; 47%) or, at most, poor performance within a school environment ($N = 15$; 60%; Burgess et al., 1986). In fact, Levenson and Grady (2016) found that, within a population of 740 sexual offenders, merely 21 percent reported an income of greater than 50,000 dollars, while 41 percent reported an income of less than 20,000 dollars.

In addition to low levels of educational and occupational attainment, sexual offenders also exhibit a lack of relational success, with a significant amount reporting to have never been married (46%) or to have been divorced or separated (35%), suggesting that sexual murderers lack the interpersonal skills needed to maintain favorable educational, occupational, or relational success (Levenson & Grady, 2016). While the majority of sexual murderers are single at the time of the respective homicide[s], some sexual murderers, however, have intimate partners — short-term or long-term — that serve as a willing external participant with which to engage in perverse or deviant sexual acts; although such intimate partners are commonly exempt from the homicidal sexual fantasies of the sexual murderer, sexual murderers oftentimes rehearse sadistic sexual acts on or enlist the assistance of said intimate partners (e.g., wives, girlfriends, prostitutes, etc.) in the sexual homicide of a female stranger (Meloy, 2000).

With little-to-no educational, occupational, or relational success, sexual murderers seek financial, social, and personal success using alternative — often, criminal — methods. In fact,

Ressler et al. (1992) found that sexual murderers engage in various behavioral characteristics that are indicative of immorality, such as chronic lying ($N = 20$, 71%), as well as criminality, such as cruelty to others ($N = 15$, 54%), vandalism ($N = 15$, 58%), assault ($N = 9$, 38%), arson ($N = 14$, 56%), and theft ($N = 15$, 58%), throughout childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (Burgess et al., 1986). With such intense behavioral problems evident in childhood, adolescence, and early adulthood, sexual murderers exhibit a mean age of arrest between 24 and 34 (Chan & Heide, 2016), suggesting that the consequences of negative environmental characteristics (e.g., familial instability, insecure parent-child attachment, etc.) are evident early in, as well as throughout, an individual's life.

While the influence of negative environmental characteristics on various behavioral characteristics (e.g., educational, occupational, and relational success) has been empirically supported (Marcus & Kramer, 2001), empirical research often overlook the psychopathological implications that negative environmental characteristics may contain, suggesting that the influence of psychopathological characteristics may either facilitate or inhibit the effects of negative environmental characteristics (e.g., childhood abuse, insecure parent-child attachment, familial instability, etc.) on an individual's behavioral characteristics (e.g., occupational success, criminality, marital status, etc.).

Psychopathological characteristics. Empirical research suggests that nearly one-fourth of U.S. children experience a form of childhood abuse (e.g., physical abuse, psychological abuse, sexual abuse, neglect, etc.), as evidenced in the approximately 700,000 annual cases of childhood abuse reported to law enforcement (Peterson, Florence, & Klevens, 2018). Despite the relative regularity of negative environmental characteristics (e.g., childhood abuse) that are associated

with sexual murderers, sexual homicide remains a rare occurrence, suggesting that negative environmental characteristics are not, by themselves, causal factors of sexual homicide. Rather, empirical research suggests that negative environmental characteristics (e.g., childhood abuse, familial instability, insecure parent-child attachment) may be associated with negative behavioral characteristics (e.g., criminality, isolation, unemployment), as moderated by psychopathological characteristics, such as personality disorders and paraphilias (Beauregard & DeLisi, 2018).

Personality disorders. Personality disorders, as defined by the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.; *DSM-V*; American Psychiatric Association, 2013), are “enduring pattern[s] of inner experience[s] and behavior[s]” that deviate from conventional, or socially-acceptable, manifestations of experiential and behavioral patterns (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). These “enduring pattern[s] of inner experience[s] and behavior[s]” often influence the cognitive, affective, and interpersonal abilities of individuals, suggesting that the existence of negative environmental characteristics (e.g., childhood abuse, insecure parent-child attachment,.) may facilitate the formation of unconventional cognitive, interpersonal, affective, and behavioral patterns (i.e., personality disorders) that are associated with sexual homicide (American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

Psychopathy. Psychopathy — the psychological term for a group of personality traits that are characterized by significant antisocial, narcissistic, and affective tendencies (Hare, 2006) — has been historically viewed as a “primary underlying psychopatholog[y]” (Darjee, 2019) of violence and criminality (Porter & Woodworth, 2007), affecting approximately 15 percent of the U.S. correctional population, as compared to merely one percent of the U.S. general population (Hancock, Woodworth, & Porter, 2013).

Empirical research, in fact, suggests that the association between psychopathy and sexual homicide is even greater, with 20 to 50 percent (Darjee, 2019) of sexual murderers exhibiting sufficient diagnosable evidence of psychopathic tendencies, such as narcissism, restricted affect, a lack of empathy or guilt, callousness, criminality, a chronic use of manipulation and deception, and impulsivity (Burgess et al., 1986; Darjee, 2019; Hare, 2016). For instance, Darjee (2019), in an examination of 51 Caucasian sexual murderers, found that 24 percent ($N = 12$) of male sexual murderers met the diagnostic criteria — as determined by the *Psychopathy Checklist-Revised* (PCL-R; Hare, 2003) — for psychopathy. In spite of this empirical support (Darjee, 2019; Meloy, 2000; Porter, Woodworth, Earle, Drugge, & Boer, 2003), numerous empirical studies have also identified associations between sexual homicide and various other personality disorders, such as schizoid personality disorder, suggesting that the association between psychopathy and sexual homicide is, at best, inconclusive.

Other personality disorders. While psychopathy — the most extreme form of antisocial, narcissistic, and affective dysfunction — can be diagnosed within a proportion of the population of sexual murderers, empirical research suggests that various personality disorders, rather than psychopathy, may exhibit greater associations with sexual homicide (Beauregard & DeLisi, 2018; Darjee, 2019; Meloy et al., 1994).

In fact, Meloy et al. (1994) found that sexual murderers ($N = 18$) and psychopaths ($N = 23$) exhibited various differences, as evidenced in variations within Rorschach variables for interpersonal attachment and cognitive functioning, among others. For instance, Meloy et al. (1994) found that, unlike psychopaths, sexual murderers desired interpersonal connection, experienced obsessional (i.e., cyclical) thoughts, and had an active imagination that, oftentimes,

could not be separated from reality. As a result of this desire for interpersonal connection, Meloy et al. (1994) suggested that sexual murderers were more likely to perceive the victim's humanity and, therefore, less likely to exhibit "true" psychopathy (Hare, 2003); though, as opponents have suggested, this perception of the victim's humanity and subsequent victimization indicates that sexual murderers exhibit a severe disregard for humanity and, as a result, are more psychopathic (Darjee, 2019).

These opposing viewpoints on the prevalence of "true" psychopathy within sexual murderers may be the result of the utilization of various diagnostic criteria (e.g., *Psychopathy Checklist-Revised* or the Triarchic Model of Psychopathy). While the *Psychopathy Checklist-Revised* (PCL-R) — the most popular diagnostic criteria of psychopathy — conceptualizes psychopathy using common interpersonal, affective, lifestyle, and antisocial facets (e.g., lack of empathy, criminality, etc.) found within a significant proportion of psychopaths, opponents of the PCL-R suggest that such facets negate the presence of various other facets that are also found within a significant proportion of psychopaths, such as fearlessness (Sleep, Weiss, Lynam, & Miller, 2019). As a result, Sleep et al. (2019) propose that the Triarchic Model of Psychopathy (TriPM) better integrates all facets of psychopathy into reliable and valid diagnostic criteria, as the TriPM conceptualizes psychopathy using the overarching facets of boldness (e.g., emotional stability, narcissism), meanness (e.g., lack of empathy, exploitativeness, aggressiveness), and disinhibition (e.g., impulsivity).

In using such overarching facets, the TriPM incorporates the facets of the PCL-R, as well as facets related to developmental pathways (e.g., fearlessness, insecure attachment, etc.) and biological foundations (Sleep et al., 2019), to better explain the presence of wants for

interpersonal connection, obsessional thoughts, and imaginativeness — for instance, sexual murderers that experience insecure parent-child attachments desire, obsess over, and imagine forming a secure parent-child attachment (i.e., parent’s care, love, and protection) that manifests into a rage- and sexually-fueled quest for such attachment — within sexual murderers without discounting the presence of psychopathy or psychopathic traits (Sleep et al., 2019).

While it is reasonable to suggest that some sexual murderers may be “true” psychopaths, Darjee (2019) found that a significant amount of sexual murderers exhibited the less severe form of psychopathy: antisocial personality disorder (N = 32; 66.7%; Beauregard & DeLisi, 2018). In spite of the possible lack of “true” psychopathy within the sexual murderer population (Meloy et al., 1994), sexual murderers exhibit certain psychopathic features (e.g., lack of remorse or guilt, callousness, etc.) that facilitate the use of violence, though at a rate that fails to meet the diagnostic criteria for “true” psychopathy, as defined in the PCL-R (though, as previous discussion addresses, without consideration of the various other diagnostic criteria found within the TriPM; Darjee, 2019; Sleep et al., 2019). “True” [PCL-R] psychopathy, therefore, cannot be a primary motivation for sexual homicide, suggesting that alternate personality disorders may also be associated with the perpetration of sexual homicide.

Empirical research supports this contention. For instance, Darjee (2019) found that 90.2 percent of sexual murderers exhibit a (probable) personality disorder, such as paranoid (25%), schizoid (43.8%), obsessive-compulsive (39.2%), or narcissistic (66.7%) personality disorder. In an examination of 616 adult male sexual offenders, Beauregard and DeLisi (2018) found that sexual murderers tend to meet the diagnostic criteria for obsessive-compulsive (5.9%), schizoid (5.9%), avoidant (7.1%), paranoid (9.4%), dependent (16.5%), narcissistic (23.5%), or borderline

(24.7%) personality disorder. These findings suggest that sexual murderers may exhibit eclectic personality disturbances that encompass characteristics of psychopathy and antisocial personality disorder (e.g., callousness), as well as narcissistic (e.g., entitlement), borderline (e.g., instability), obsessive-compulsive (e.g., fantasy), and schizoid (e.g., emotional detachment) personality disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), indicating that sexual murderers are far more psychopathologically disturbed than the “true” [PCL-R] psychopath (Beauregard & DeLisi, 2018; Meloy, 2000).

Considering the increased likelihood of psychopathological disturbances within the sexual murderer population, it seems reasonable to expect that this increased likelihood would include other forms of psychopathological disturbances. (Darjee, 2019). Empirical research supports this contention, finding that individuals with psychopathological disturbances comprise a significant proportion of violent offenders, specifically with regard to violent sexual offenders (Chan & Beauregard, 2016). Due to this association between psychopathological disturbances and violent sexual offending, Chan and Beauregard (2016) found that, in addition to the presence of various personality disorders within sexual murderers, sexual murderers also exhibit greater rates of concurrent paraphilias and, as a result, deviant sexual fantasies that “influence, induce, or motivate violent and/or deviant sexual conducts, [as well as] subsequent decisions made during the offending process” (Chan & Beauregard, 2016, pg. 2261).

Paraphilic disorders. Paraphilias, as defined by the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.; *DSM-V*; American Psychiatric Association, 2013), are “intense and persistent sexual interest[s]” to socially-unacceptable stimuli (e.g., non-consenting individuals, asphyxiation, etc.; American Psychiatric Association, 2013). The socially-unacceptable nature of

these “intense and persistent sexual interest[s]” often inhibit individuals’ abilities to engage in consensual sexual relationships and, therefore, result in increased sexual frustration, as well as social isolation (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), that may, eventually, lead to the “acting out” of the respective paraphilias on a non-consenting individual, as is often the case in sexual homicide.

Empirical research suggests that sexual murderers exhibit high rates of paraphilias and paraphilic disorders (79%), such as fetishism, exhibitionism, and voyeurism (Kerr et al., 2013), as well as paraphilia-related disorders (79%), such as compulsive masturbation, telephone sex addiction, and sexual promiscuity (Briken et al., 2006). While sexual murderers tend to exhibit a varied amount of and type of paraphilias, paraphilic disorders, and paraphilia-related disorders (Briken et al., 2006; Kerr et al., 2013), empirical research suggests that sexual sadism, more than any other such sexual interest, may be used to explain the sexual gratification achieved through the perpetration of sexual homicide (Stefanska, Nitschke, Carter, & Mokros, 2019).

Sexual sadism. Sexual sadism — defined as “recurrent and intense sexual arousal from the physical or psychological suffering of another person, as manifested by fantasies, urges, or behaviors” (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Darjee, 2019) — has been historically viewed as another “primary underlying psychopatholog[y]” of sexual homicide (Darjee, 2019), as evidenced in the empirical association between sexual sadism and various personality and paraphilic disorders, social isolation, psychopathic traits (e.g., callousness), sexual inadequacy, and various offense and offender characteristics of sexual homicide, among others (Darjee, 2019; Hill, Habermann, Berner, & Briken, 2007). The sexual interest in pain, aggression, violence, and suffering associated with sexual sadism indicates that such individuals have difficulty achieving

sexual gratification within “normal” relationships and sexual activities and, as such, prime the sexual offender to engage in sexually-related violence in order to achieve gratification.

While the prevalence of sexual sadism within the general population is estimated to be approximately two percent, empirical research supports the contention that sexual sadism is a “primary underlying psychopatholog[y]” (Darjee, 2019) of sexual homicide, as evidenced in the statistical finding that 25 to 75 percent of sexual murderers meet the diagnostic criteria for sexual sadism (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Burgess et al., 1986; Darjee, 2019; Langevin, 2003). Due to the considerable prevalence of sexual sadism (25-75%; American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Burgess et al., 1986; Darjee, 2019; Langevin, 2003), as well as antisocial or psychopathic traits (20-50%; Darjee, 2019) within the sexual murderer population, Darjee (2019) posits that sexual sadism and psychopathy are independent concepts that interact with each other, as well as numerous other offender characteristics, to disinhibit the perpetration of various forms of sexual violence, such as sexual homicide. The individualistic combinations of and interactions between environmental characteristics (e.g., insecure parent-child attachment, childhood abuse) and psychopathological characteristics (e.g., psychopathy, paraphilic disorders) manifest into individualistic behavioral characteristics (e.g., ritualism), suggesting that the perpetrators of various forms of sexual violence differ in the composition and structure of these environmental and psychopathological combinations, as well as the behavioral manifestations of such personal combinations (Carter et al., 2017; Chan & Heide, 2016; James and Proulx, 2014).

Differentiating Between Non-Homicidal and Homicidal Sexual Offenders

Due to the existence of commonplace environmental, psychopathological, and behavioral characteristics within the sexual murderer population, as well as typical pre-, crime, and post-

crime characteristics within instances of sexual homicide, it seems reasonable to expect that other forms of sexual offending (e.g., rape) display common offense and offender characteristics that differentiate the respective form of sexual offending from sexual homicide. Using this premise as a foundation for an exploratory examination into offense and offender characteristics of non-homicidal sexual offenders and sexual murderers, Chan and Heide (2016) meta-analyzed 17 peer-reviewed articles, each of which examined offender characteristics, as well as pre-, crime, and post-crime offense characteristics, of homicidal and non-homicidal sexual offenders.

According to Chan and Heide (2016), homicidal and non-homicidal sexual offenders exhibit differing offender characteristics. For instance, homicidal sexual offenders (HSOs; $M = 30$), or sexual murderers, tend to be significantly older than non-homicidal sexual offenders (NHSOs; $M = 25.9$), or rapists, though these results varied across studies (Chan & Heide, 2016). HSOs also tend to have significantly higher intelligences, as measured by intelligence quotients (IQs), than NHSOs. Chan and Heide (2016) also found that HSOs experience childhood trauma, such as physical and sexual abuse, insecure parent-child attachments, and paternal absence, at higher rates than NHSOs, as well as increased rates of maladaptive interpersonal skills (e.g., antisocial personality disorder, psychopathy, recklessness, deception), sexual deviance (e.g., sexual sadism, paraphilic disorders), and behavioral problems (e.g., cruelty toward animals; Chan & Heide, 2016; Chopin & Beauregard, 2019). As a result, HSOs tend to engage in fewer intimate (i.e., sexual or romantic) relationships than NHSOs and, consequently, are more likely to live alone and are less likely to be married (Chan & Heide, 2016).

Chan and Heide (2016) also found that HSOs and NHSOs differ in pre-crime motivation, execution of the sexual offense, and post-crime behaviors, such as those meant to avoid detection

and apprehension. In regard to pre-crime differences, Chan and Heide (2016) found that HSOs exhibit increased rates of sexually deviant fantasies (i.e., fantasies involving rape or torture) and are more likely to satisfy these fantasies through the enactment of such fantasies, often through the criminal perpetration of rape or sexual homicide. In order to satisfy these fantasies, HSOs tend to target victims that are strangers, that are less conventionally attractive, and that live alone (Chan & Heide, 2016), suggesting that such offenders offend against low-risk populations (e.g., “easier” populations, such as prostitutes) in which disappearances often go unnoticed, possibly as a result of severe sexual inadequacy. Furthermore, HSOs typically report sexual gratification and anger as primary motivations for sexual offending at greater rates than NHSOs, especially when accompanied by feelings of humiliation (Chan & Heide, 2016).

During the perpetration of the respective sexual offenses, HSOs are more likely to use items found at the scene (e.g., rope, electrical cord, knives) to perpetrate the criminal offense, suggesting that HSOs are less prepared and, therefore, tend to engage in less premeditation than NHSOs (Chan & Heide, 2016); despite this finding, empirical research indicates that a small subcategory of HSOs engage in extensive premeditation and planning (Ressler et al., 1986), suggesting that, much like HSOs and NHSOs, HSOs exhibit differing behavioral manifestations of environmental and psychopathological characteristics and, therefore, perpetrate unique forms of sexual homicide. Furthermore, HSOs tend to engage in torture, mutilation, and other forms of deviant sexual behaviors not typically exhibited by NHSOs (e.g., oral, anal, and vaginal sexual intercourse; Chan & Heide, 2016), indicating that HSOs obtain sexual gratification through unconventional methods that may be indiscernible to the untrained eye. These unconventional methods for achieving sexual gratification require a significant amount of time spend with the

victim (Chan & Heide, 2016), suggesting that homicidal sexual offenders perpetrate crimes in locations where disturbance is less likely, such as secluded or private areas (e.g., residence, personal vehicles, hiking trails, etc.).

Following the perpetration of the respective sexual offenses, HSOs also engage in more avoidant behaviors, such as the use of forensically-aware behaviors (e.g., use of condoms and gloves, etc.), the disposal of the victim's body, and the removal of forensic evidence (e.g., DNA, fingerprints, etc.; Chan & Heide, 2016). Due to the previous finding that NHSOs tend to engage in more planning and premeditation, it is unreasonable to propose that such increased rates of avoidant behaviors by HSOs stems from premeditation or planning; rather, such behaviors may be the result of feelings of shame or humiliation regarding the bizarre and deviant content of the sexual offenses or, possibly, the existence of an intense desire to persist in the perpetration of sexual offenses, as fantasies — specifically, with regard to the greater amount of fantastical content in HSOs (Chan & Heide, 2016) — can never definitively be attained and, therefore, can never be absolutely satisfied.

In a conclusive examination of the different offender and pre-, crime, and post-crime offense characteristics between HSOs and NHSOs, it is evident that HSOs experience far greater childhood trauma that, as a result, manifests into sexual deviance, a reliance on fantastical sexual stimuli, and an intense desire to conceal the content of such deviant sexual interests (Chan & Heide, 2016). Due to the existence of differing offender and pre-, crime, and post-crime offense characteristics between HSOs and NHSOs (Chan & Heide, 2016) it is reasonable to expect that numerous additional differentiations may be identified, thereby providing further inclusionary

and exclusionary criteria relevant to the classification of instances of homicide by law enforcement as sexually-motivated.

Differentiating Between Non-Sexual and Sexual Murderers

In order to examine the differences between non-sexual and sexual murderers, Carter et al. (2017) conducted an in-depth examination of 65 sexual homicides, as classified by the Ressler et al. (1992) criteria and by post-crime admissions by the convicted perpetrator, and 64 matched (i.e., similar offense and offender characteristics) non-sexual homicides. With this comparative analysis, Carter et al. (2017) found that the majority of sexual murderers (50.2%) had at least one prior appearance (i.e., criminal involvement that resulted in some form of legal action) for a sexually-related offense (e.g., rape, theft of women's undergarments, aggravated assault, etc.), as compared to merely 14.1 percent of non-sexual murderers (Carter et al., 2017).

Such findings indicate that sexual murderers experience greater rates of sexual deviancy throughout the lifespan that, eventually, manifest in the application of such sexual deviancy on an external individual (Carter et al., 2017). According to Carter et al. (2017), sexual murderers tend to enact such sexually deviant behaviors upon strangers while, on the contrary, non-sexual murderers tend to enact such sexually deviant behaviors upon acquaintances, friends, or family, indicating that non-sexual murderers seek the comfort of known victims while sexual murderers seek the concealment of deviant sexual interests from known victims, as well as the avoidance of detection (Carter et al., 2017).

Furthermore, Carter et al. (2017) found that sexual murderers are less likely to both bring and utilize weapons (e.g., gun, knife, etc) than non-sexual murderers, instead opting for the use of various methods of injurious behaviors (e.g., stabbing, blunt force trauma, etc.) that contribute

to the cumulative homicidal climax. Asphyxiation, perhaps more than any other such behaviors, is utilized by sexual murderers to inflict significant trauma upon the victim, with nearly three-quarters of examined sexual homicides containing evidence of asphyxiation and strangulation (Carter et al., 2017). Sexual murderers also exhibit greater rates of bondage, indicating that such homicides contain aspects of deviant sexual interests (e.g., autoerotic asphyxiation, BDSM, etc.) that are the external manifestations of internal paraphilia-related and paraphilic disorders (Carter et al., 2017). In an attempt to explain the use of various methods of injurious behaviors, Chopin and Beauregard (2019) posited that sexual murderers exhibit more psychopathic, antisocial, and sadistic tendencies than non-sexual murderers and, therefore, are able to depersonalize the victim and the victim's suffering into sexual-arousing stimuli, rather than personalizable human pain. In addition to such depersonalization, Chopin and Beauregard (2019) also found that, as a result of increased rates of psychopathy and, consequently, manipulative ability, sexual murderers are more likely to perpetrate crimes with a co-offender, oftentimes an intimate partner, that seeks to fulfill the offender's sexual needs while, at the same time, maintaining the offender's favor and avoiding a similar fate (Chopin & Beauregard, 2019).

In a conclusive examination of the different offender and pre-, crime, and post-crime offense characteristics between non-sexual and sexual murderers, it is evident that sexually-motivated murderers exhibit greater rates of sexual deviancy throughout the lifespan, as well as subsequent sadistic behaviors (e.g., asphyxiation) associated with such sexual deviant interests (Carter et al., 2017; Chopin & Beauregard, 2019). Due to the existence of differing offender and pre-, crime, and post-crime offense characteristics between non-sexual and sexual murderers, as well as HSOs and NHSOs (Chan & Heide, 2016), it is reasonable to expect such differences may

also be evident within instances of sexual homicide, suggesting that various sub-classifications of sexual homicide, much like homicide, exist.

Differentiating Between Nonserial and Serial Murderers

While the majority of the previously-discussed empirical research examines the various characteristics of convicted sexual murderers, such empirical research fails to address the notion that various categories of sexual homicide and, as a result, various categories of sexual murderers exist. In order to address this notion, James and Proulx (2014) sought to differentiate between the characteristics of nonserial and serial sexual murderers by comparing the offense and offender characteristics of 1,660 nonserial sexual murderers and 76 serial sexual murderers.

According to James and Proulx (2014), nonserial sexual murderers are characterized by an intense want of power, coupled with academic, occupational, social, and sexual ineptness, as well as emotional apathy, narcissism, erraticism, aggression, and manipulation. Consequently, nonserial sexual murderers often engage in reactive criminality, in which such individuals react impulsively to perceived slights (i.e., offenses), indicating that nonserial sexual murderers kill in order to obtain retribution, to increase personal power, or to maintain personal control, rather than to obtain sexual gratification (James & Proulx, 2014; James & Proulx, 2016). In fact, Darjee (2019) found that sadistic, psychopathic sexual murderers are relatively rare, with a prevalence rate of approximately five to 20 percent, indicating that personality disorders (e.g., psychopathy and narcissism), rather than paraphilic disorders (e.g., sexual sadism) have greater impact on the majority of sexual homicides. Empirical associations between psychopathic traits, sexual sadism, and sexual homicide, however, indicate that sexual homicide exhibits motivational similarities of power, control, domination, humiliation, and aggression, among others; variations within sexual

homicide may, therefore, stem simply from varied balances in sexually sadistic and psychopathic motivations (James & Proulx, 2014).

On the other hand, James and Proulx (2014) found that serial sexual murderers tend to experience high rates of social inadequacy, as evidenced in high levels of solitude and isolation, low self-esteem, and a fear of public embarrassment, that inhibit their ability to form meaningful intimate (i.e., romantic or sexual) relationships; as a result, sexual murderers rely upon fantasy — often, such fantasies include sexually deviant or sadistic themes, as many sexual murderers exhibit a hatred toward women that stems from insecure parent-child attachment and adulthood rejection — for the obtention of sexual gratification (James & Proulx, 2014).

In addition to social inadequacy, serial sexual murderers exhibit striking violence and manipulateness, thereby increasing both social and relational solitude (James & Proulx, 2014). As a result of this isolation, numerous serial sexual murderers rely upon substances (e.g., drugs, alcohol) as self-medication for emotional turmoil, which, in turn, inhibit sexual performance and increase sexual inadequacy (James & Proulx, 2014). James and Proulx (2014) also found that serial homicides are commonly planned, with carefully selected victims (e.g., Caucasian females with blonde hair in their late-20s) and geographical locations (e.g., private residences within a certain town, city, or county), indicating that serial sexual murderers suffer from a heightened influencing effect of sexually deviant fantasies on behavioral characteristics.

The presence of such fantasy-related behavioral influences indicates that serial sexual homicide is the result of a cyclical process, through which serial sexual murderers rely upon sexually deviant (e.g., sadistic) fantasies to obtain sexual gratification, as “real world” intimate relationships are inhibited by the serial sexual offender’s internalized sexual inadequacy (James

& Proulx, 2014); sexually deviant fantasies are then reinforced through masturbation, causing the serial sexual offender to become habituated to such fantasies and, as a result, require increased stimulation, such as the execution of such fantasies upon an external party (James & Proulx, 2014). Due to the influence of external circumstances, however, the execution of such fantasies can never equal the fantasy, resulting in the eventual recidivism of the offender and, as a result, the perpetration of serial sexual murder (James & Proulx, 2014).

In an attempt to better formulate the cyclical developmental process of sexual homicide — specifically, serial sexual homicide —, numerous motivational models have been proposed to explain the influence of offender characteristics (e.g., insecure parent-child attachment, negative environmental characteristics, etc.) on the pre-, crime, and post-crime offense characteristics.

Motivational Models of Sexual Homicide

The Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide. Empirical research, through the increased understanding of numerous offense and offender characteristics, is able to consolidate such information and, consequently, to provide a comprehensive motivational model of sexual homicide, as related to the development of sexual murderers (Burgess et al., 1986). This motivational model (i.e., explanation of) — termed the Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide — identifies five elements of influential development that are present within the majority of sexual murderers: (1) ineffective social environment, (2) formative events, (3) patterned responses, (4) actions toward others, and (5) feedback filter.

Ineffective social environment. According to the Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide, the development of a sexual murderer begins at a young age, often with the failure of the child to form a secure parent-child attachment to at least one parental figure (Burgess et al.,

1986). As a result of this insecure parent-child attachment, the child also lacks the ability to form meaningful social platonic, romantic, or sexual relationships, resulting in intense social isolation (Burgess et al., 1986). During this childhood isolation, sexual murderers often become victims of physical or sexual abuse, thereby leading to the juxtaposition of sexuality and aggression; while numerous children are the victims of such abuse, such children, without the existence of meaningful social relationships, are unable to resolve such trauma (Burgess et al., 1986).

By not resolving such trauma, the child internalizes the trauma, as evidenced in increased social withdrawal, and externalizes the trauma, as evidenced in increased aggressive behaviors (Burgess et al., 1986). According to Burgess et al. (1986), such internalizing and externalizing behaviors are exacerbated by the absence of platonic and, especially, familial interactions, as the family structure of such a child is often neglectful. For instance, Burgess et al. (1986) states that the child, as a result of such neglectful familial structure, is often ignored; such parental figures even rationalize or normalize the negative behaviors or thoughts of the child, inappropriately placing adult expectations upon the child to “get over it.” As such, the child not only experiences a developmental (i.e., attachment) failure, but also an interpersonal failure (e.g., lack of parental care; Burgess et al., 1986).

The insecure parent-child attachments and the subsequent social isolation formed at this time encourages reliance upon fantasy, as the child is unable to experience social interaction in places other than his mind (Burgess et al., 1986). While such a reliance, in some instances, may have positive consequences (e.g., fantastical content consists of positive themes, such as music, art, or other forms of creativity), the fantastical content of such a child often consists of negative

themes, such as the externalization of trauma through manipulation, entitlement, aggression, and violence (Burgess et al., 1986).

Formative events. In addition to an inability to form secure parent-child attachments, as well as meaningful social relationships, sexual murderers also experience childhood physical or sexual abuse, with the resultant trauma typically being overlooked or ignored (Burgess et al., 1986). Children, in order to cope with such trauma without assistance from parental figures, form a fantastical world with which to address such trauma; however, without guidance, the “coping” methods of such children often include the enactment of such fantasies — which, in most cases, include aspects of their own victimizations — on other children, as evidenced in the presence of obsessive play themes associated with physical or sexual trauma (Burgess et al., 1986). In fact, Kerr et al. (2013) suggest that early sexual aggression is established within the child’s play (e.g., placing objects into bodily cavities) and is, then, reinforced through obsessive play with other children (e.g., application of personal activities, such as the placing of objects into bodily cavities, within an interpersonal environment).

Patterned responses. As a result of this trauma and subsequent lack of secure parent-child attachment, critical personality traits (e.g., isolation, rebelliousness, aggressiveness, deception, entitlement) emerge within the child (Burgess et al., 1986); without the presence of meaningful interpersonal interactions, the formation of such critical personality traits remain unchallenged and, as a result, flourish into disordered cognitive patterns aimed at the limitation of anxiety or other vulnerable emotions (i.e., self-preservation; Burgess et al., 1986). In an attempt to better understand the cognitive patterns of such children, Burgess et al. (1986) examined the content of such patterns, which included fixed, negative, and repetitive fantasies,

daydreams, nightmares, and internal cause-and-effect dialogue, many of which centered around developmentally inappropriate sexual conduct (e.g., rape; Burgess et al., 1986; Kerr et al., 2013).

Actions toward others. With little meaningful relationships or social interactions, sexual murderers tend to act only in regard for themselves and their personal interests, rather than others (Burgess et al., 1986). For instance, Burgess et al. (1986) found that a significant proportion of sexual murderers engage in cruelty toward animals, often as a result of a personal interest in the anatomy of such animals; such violent actions perpetrated against animals are reinforced through the absence of punishment (Burgess et al., 1986). Without the fear of negative consequences (i.e., punishment), sexual murderers learn that violence does not necessitate punishment and, as such, is not necessarily “wrong” and is an act that they can “get away with” (Burgess et al., 1986; Kerr, Beech, & Murphy, 2013). The perpetration of such violent behavior isolates sexual murderers even more, as other children tend to view such a child as “weird,” thereby inhibiting the child’s ability to develop empathy, to control impulses, and to resolve conflicts (Burgess et al., 1986).

Feedback filter. Sexual murderers are often aware of their long-standing preoccupation with and preference for a highly active fantasy life, especially with regard to fantasies associated with violent sexualization (e.g., fetishes, such as high heels, underwear, and rope; Burgess et al., 1986). Sexual murderers, in justifying the reliance upon fantasy, claim that the world is unjust and, as such, fails to provide what is entitled to them; as such, the reliance upon fantasy provides an escape from and control over such injustice, thereby allowing the sexual murderer to express vulnerable emotions (e.g., fear, anger) or interests (e.g., autoerotic asphyxiation; Burgess et al., 1986).

Within such fantasies, sexual murderers define the relational, paraphilic, situational, self-perceptual, and demographic constraints of such fantasies, suggesting that such fantasies cannot be fulfilled without the satisfaction of each domain (Burgess et al., 1986). For instance, a sexual murderer may fantasize about raping and torturing a blonde female neighbor as her husband is at the grocery store. As the sexual murderer desensitizes himself to this stimuli through compulsive masturbation, the sexual murderer requires increased arousal to achieve the same level of sexual gratification (Burgess et al., 1986); as a result, the sexual murderer engages in “behavioral tryouts” (e.g., breaking-and-entering into the woman’s house) that precipitate and, eventually, facilitate the perpetration of sexual homicide (Burgess et al., 1986). Prior to the sexual homicide, such fantasies typically involve homicide, while fantasies following the sexual homicide often involve the perfection of the fantasized homicide, indicating that such “behavioral tryouts” serve as a learning curve by which the sexual murderer hopes to perfect the external manifestation of the fantasy (Burgess et al., 1986).

While the Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide compiles offender and pre-, crime, and post-crime offense characteristics into a comprehensive explanation of the development of sexual murderers, Burgess et al. (1986) overlooks the biological, psychological, and cultural factors that influence the development of sexual murderers; the Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide, therefore, solely seeks to explain the development of sexual murderers, as influenced by the association between violence and sexual gratification, often as the result of childhood trauma, a lack of meaningful social relationships, and a reliance upon fantasy (i.e., social learning; Burgess et al., 1986).

Incentive-Motivation Model. As a result of such limitations of the Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide, Toates et al. (2017) proposed the use of an incentive-motivational model of sexual homicide, which seeks to address all components (e.g., biological, psychological, and cultural facets that are overlooked within the Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide) of sexual homicide, for understanding the perpetration of sexual violence.

According to Toates et al. (2017), the brain consists of two systems — an unconscious system (System 1) and a conscious system (System 2) — that interact, such that System 2 (i.e., a conscious weighing of positive and negative consequences) inhibits System 1 from “controlling” behavior, thereby inhibiting the impulsiveness of human behavior; however, this method may be overridden, often as a result of motivational influence, to allow System 1 to maintain control of certain behaviors (i.e., conscious reflection of System 2 fails to inhibit, but rather facilitates, the reliance upon impulsivity; Toates et al., 2017).

As traumatized children, sexual murderers form modes (i.e., neural processes) that affect the processing of and response to recurring negative stimuli; in the case of such trauma, sexual murderers form modes to process and cope with sexual victimization that include the external manifestation of victimization, as well as the formation of deviant sexual interests associated with the victimization (i.e. high heels) and the fusion of sex and violence experienced as a child (i.e., sexual coping; Toates et al., 2017). The external manifestation of such victimization, as well as the formation of deviant sexual interests, suggests that the conscious inhibition of System 1 by System 2 is compromised at a young age within the sexual murderer population, often as a result of the formation of abnormal modal processing of sexual victimization (Toates et al., 2017).

According to the incentive-motivation model of sexual homicide, such a failure of the inhibitory effects of System 2 is often the result of motivational influence (i.e., personal desire to engage in a specific action, often as a result of sexual desire, sensation-seeking, or need for power, control, and dominance); the motivated sexual murderer, then, lacks the ability to reach appropriate, socially-acceptable conclusions to the conscious reflection (i.e., risk versus benefit analysis) of System 2 (Smid & Wever, 2018; Toates et al., 2017).

Toates et al. (2017) suggest that such motivation is aroused by the existence of a certain incentive stimuli (e.g., suitable victim) associated with the personal desire to engage in a specific action, such that the possibility of the corresponding behavioral engagement outweighs the risk associated with conscious disinhibition. Interestingly, within sexual murderers, such motivation is often generated by cognitive representations (i.e., fantasies) of such incentive stimuli that, as illustrated within empirical research, produce similar brain activity to the physical presentation (i.e., immediate availability) of such incentive stimuli (Toates et al., 2017).

More interestingly, Kerr et al. (2013) suggests that, through the excitation transfer theory, incentive stimuli may be processed simultaneously, such that an emotional trigger (e.g., anger) becomes associated with sexual arousal despite being unrelated to the actual cause of the sexual arousal (e.g., attractive individual); consequently, a reciprocal association between the unrelated stimuli (e.g., anger and sexual arousal), such that anger triggers sexual arousal and sexual arousal triggers anger (Smid & Wever, 2018; Toates et al., 2017). The prevalence of such simultaneous processing and reciprocal association between such stimuli indicates that a neural foundation for such an association exists; empirical research, in fact, suggests that, as aggression and sexual arousal are both processed within the limbic structures (i.e., hippocampus, hypothalamus, and

amygdala) of the brain, neural activation of such stimuli become unified, such that activation of one produces activation of the other (Kerr et al., 2013).

In addition to providing incentive stimuli (i.e., suitable victim), fantasies allow sexual murderers to consciously elaborate upon such incentive stimuli, forming detailed scenarios that may be used to relive prior victimizations, expand the scope of sexual deviancy (i.e., discover new sexual possibilities, such as asphyxiation, bondage, etc.), and plan future actions (Toates et al., 2017). Toates et al. (2017) claims that such fantasies allow sexual murderers to “practice” future perpetrations and, most importantly, experience the sexual gratification (e.g., release of dopamine) associated with the successful completion of such perpetrations; as sexual murderers are able to imagine the benefits of disinhibition (e.g., pleasurable physical sensations and the elimination of aversive emotions, such as frustration, inadequacy, and hatred toward women), disinhibition becomes harder to maintain (Toates et al., 2017).

By the time the sexual murderer is confronted with a suitable physical victim, the sexual murderer has lived and relived fantastical content hundreds, if not thousands, of times; the sexual murderer, as a result, has become habituated to the gratification provided by the fantasies and, as a result, desires the expected gratification associated with the perpetration of the fantasy (Toates et al., 2017). Accordingly, sexual murderers are more likely to engage in disinhibition — in the form of temporary intoxication or, more often, as a result of psychopathic traits or full-blown psychopathy that constitute an unwillingness to inhibit — and, as a result, to perpetrate sexual homicide (Toates et al., 2017; Smid & Wever, 2018).

While disinhibition facilitates the perpetration of sexual homicide by authorizing the use of impulsive, risk-associated behaviors, inhibition also facilitates such perpetration within sexual

murderers, as well (Kerr et al., 2013). Kerr et al. (2013) suggests that a reliance upon inhibition, actually, promotes the formation of an over-controlled individual that either internalizes negative emotions or externalizes negative emotions in inappropriate methods; such internalization and poor emotional expression creates emotional tension that, eventually, results in the emotional “snap” of anger, aggression, and violence that utilizes the internalized or poorly controlled sexual deviancy upon an external individual (i.e., sexual homicide; Kerr et al., 2013).

In an attempt to consolidate Toates et al.’s (2017) and Kerr et al.’s (2013) findings, Smid and Wever (2018) compiled a comprehensive cyclical explanation, including novel terminology, that better explains the repetitive process of sexual homicide. Sexual murderers, firstly, perceive an incentive stimulus — either real or imagined — that produces unconscious sexual arousal, as well as a secondary emotional stimulus (e.g., anger); the secondary emotional stimulus is, then, perceived as the direct cause of the unconscious sexual arousal, causing the incentive stimulus and aggression to fuse into one comprehensive stimulus (Smid & Wever, 2018). The unconscious arousal is, eventually, consciously recognized (i.e., liked), causing the comprehensive stimulus (i.e., aggression and suitable victim) to become included within sexual fantasies (Smid & Wever, 2018). Sexual murderers, upon this inclusion, begin to desire (i.e., want) this comprehensive stimulus; as “wanting” increases, the sexual murderer engages in disinhibition, allowing himself to be sexually gratified (i.e., masturbate) to the fantasy (Smid & Wever, 2018). As the sexual murderer becomes habituated to the imagined comprehensive stimulus, the sexual murderer engages in disinhibition, searching for and approaching a “real” incentive stimulus in the conditioned emotional state (e.g., anger) and, eventually, achieving sexual gratification with the perpetration of sexual homicide in a real, rather than imagined, setting (Smid & Wever, 2018).

With the introduction of such models into sexual homicide academia, researchers, as well as law enforcement, are able to better understand the basic development of sexual homicide and sexual murderers (Burgess et al., 1986). This increased understanding allows further models of sexual homicide and sexual murderers to be developed, such as crime typologies, that add to the understanding of sexual homicide and improve the ability of law enforcement to accurately identify instances of sexual homicide, as well as possible perpetrators of such homicides.

Typologies of Sexual Homicide

In an attempt to better understand the various differences within the sexual murderer population, empirical researchers seek to identify typologies (i.e., classification systems) of various types of sexual murderers (Kerr et al., 2013). Numerous proposed typologies exist — some, more popular than others —, each of which relies upon various forms of data, such as offense characteristics (i.e., pragmatic), clinical diagnoses (i.e., clinical), theories (i.e., theory-led), and statistics (i.e., statistical; Kerr et al., 2013). Increased understanding of such differences allows law enforcement to better recognize instances of sexual homicide, taking into account the spectrum of offense and offender characteristics present within instances of sexual homicide.

Anger vs. Sadistic. Through the pragmatic examination of the offense characteristics of 36 sexual murderers, Beauregard and Proulx (2002) found that sexual murderers exhibited two dichotomous classifications: anger (56%) and sadistic (44%).

Beauregard and Proulx (2002) found that “anger” sexual murderers, contrary to various preconceptions about sexually-motivated murder, do not exhibit the characteristic brutality or conscious premeditation of sexual homicide. Rather, “anger” sexual murderers are spontaneous and impulsive, indicating that the perpetration of “anger” sexual homicide is an unplanned result

of an intense emotional reaction (e.g., anger) to a stimuli, rather than a planned predatory action (Beauregard & Proulx, 2002). As a result, “anger” sexual homicide is short-lived and, therefore, lacks the components associated with a significant time commitment (e.g., ritualism, bondage, torture; Beauregard & Proulx, 2002). Due to the impulsive nature of “anger” sexual homicides, “anger” murderers lack forensic awareness and, therefore, make little-to-no attempt to avoid apprehension (e.g., condom usage, DNA removal, etc.); in fact, “anger” sexual murderers frequently “turn themselves in” and confess to law enforcement of their own volition, indicating that “anger” sexual murderers are able to feel remorse and believe themselves to be criminally liable (Beauregard & Proulx, 2002).

Sadistic sexual murderers, on the other hand, exhibit the characteristic brutality of and conscious premeditation of stereotypical sexual homicide, as evidenced in the identification of an intended victim and the presence of components associated with a significant time commitment (e.g., ritualism; Beauregard & Proulx, 2002). In the absence of an emotional trigger (e.g., anger), sadistic sexual murderers report that long-term isolation and romantic rejection, as well as the subsequent compulsive sexual fantasies experienced to replace such relationships, trigger the perpetration of sexual homicide (Beauregard & Proulx, 2002). Due to such planfulness, sadistic sexual murderers exhibit greater forensic awareness of “anger” sexual murderers and, therefore, frequently engage in avoidance behaviors aimed at preventing apprehension (e.g., destruction of evidence, disposal of victim’s body, etc.; Beauregard & Proulx, 2002). The use of such forensic countermeasures indicates that sadistic sexual murderers lack appropriate remorse or personal responsibility for the perpetration of sexual homicide; as such, sadistic sexual offenders are much

more difficult to identify and, therefore, are more likely to perpetrate multiple sexual homicides prior to apprehension (Beauregard & Proulx, 2002).

These findings suggest that sexual homicide is perpetrated by two dichotomous offenders that exhibit differing offense and offender characteristics (Beauregard & Proulx, 2002); “anger” sexual murderers are characterized by acute emotional reactions — specifically, anger — toward women while sadistic sexual murderers are characterized by perverse sexual desires (Beauregard & Proulx, 2002).

Disorganized vs. Organized. Perhaps the most well-known typology of sexual homicide was proposed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Behavioral Science Unit (Ressler et al., 1986). Through the pragmatic examination of the offense characteristics of 36 sexual murderers, Ressler et al. (1986) found that sexual murderers exhibited, much like Beauregard and Proulx (2002) suggested, two dichotomous classifications: disorganized and organized.

Ressler et al. (1986) found that disorganized sexual murderers exhibit below-average intelligence and are often victims of childhood abuse (e.g., physical, emotional, verbal, sexual, etc.) that result in the development of severe social and sexual inadequacy and isolation. As such, disorganized sexual murderers have few, if any, intimate (i.e., romantic or sexual) relationships (Mjanes, Beauregard, & Martineau, 2017; Ressler et al., 1986); such social and sexual inadequacy manifest in the lack of verbal communication and the presence of necrophilia, mutilation, and overkill within instances of disorganized sexual homicide (Chan & Heide, 2009; Mjanes et al., 2017; Ressler et al., 1986). Ressler et al. (1986) also found that disorganized sexual murderers are impulsive, with little evidence of premeditation or of prior identification of an intended victim (Mjanes et al., 2017); as such, disorganized sexual murderers perpetrate

sexual homicide within walking distance to their home, workplace, or other meaningful geographical location, utilize a blitz-style attack, and are, in most cases, somehow acquainted with the victim (Chan & Heide, 2009; Mjanes et al., 2017; Ressler et al., 1986). Due to this acquaintanceship, disorganized sexual murderers rely on depersonalization to perpetrate the homicide and, consequently, report feelings of confusion following the offense (Chan & Heide, 2009). Due to the impulsivity of disorganized sexual homicide, as well as the personal relationship between the victim and the sexual murderer, disorganized sexual murderers lack forensic awareness and, as a result, engage in little-to-no forensic countermeasures, such as the destruction of forensic evidence; consequently, disorganized sexual murderers are identified relatively easily (Chan & Heide, 2009; Ressler et al., 1986).

Organized sexual murderers, on the other hand, exhibit little-to-no social or sexual impairment and are, rather, highly functional within society, oftentimes exhibiting above-average intelligence, emotional intelligence, sexual confidence, and skilled occupational talents; despite this relative functionality, organized sexual murderers are often overqualified for the numerous — and, often, unsteady — jobs that they possess (Ressler et al., 1986). Prior to the perpetration of sexual homicide, organized sexual murderers often experience a precipitating external trigger, such as the loss of a job or a romantic rejection (Ressler et al., 1986). Much like sadistic sexual murderers, organized sexual murderers engage in premeditation and, as in stereotypical sexual homicide, personalization of the victim and sexually sadistic acts, such as bondage (Chan & Heide, 2009; Ressler et al., 1986). In order to make the perpetration of sexual homicide easier, organized sexual murderers pre-select intended victims that can be easily manipulated and controlled (e.g., young women, prostitutes) and that fulfill the fantastical requirements (e.g.,

brunette, short hair, etc.); interestingly, numerous organized sexual murderers instruct their victims (e.g., lie on your back”) on how to best fulfill these fantastical requirements (Mjanec et al., 2017). Moreover, organized sexual murderers often remove “trophies” or “souvenirs” from the crime scene, allowing them to relive the perpetrated homicide at a later date (Mjanec et al., 2017). Due to the planfulness of organized sexual homicide, organized sexual murderers engage in numerous forensic countermeasures, such as the disposal of the victim’s body and the destruction of forensic evidence (Ressler et al., 1986).

These findings suggest that sexual homicide is perpetrated by two dichotomous offenders that exhibit differing offense and offender characteristics (Ressler et al., 1986); disorganized sexual offenders are, much like “anger” sexual murderers” characterized by sexual inadequacy and impulsivity while organized sexual murderers are characterized by premeditated, perverse sexual desires (Chan & Heide, 2009; Mjanec et al., 2017; Ressler et al., 1986).

Impulsive vs. Ritualistic. While the previous organized-disorganized typology of sexual homicide is the most prevalent sexual homicide typology, Hazelwood and Warren (2000) — one of which was, in addition to Ressler et al. (1986), a member of the FBI’s Behavioral Science Unit — proposed an alternative typology: impulsive versus ritualistic.

According to Hazelwood and Warren (2000), impulsive sexual murderers — similarly to nonserial, “anger,” and disorganized sexual murderers — perpetrate sexual homicide as the result of intense emotional reactions (e.g., hatred toward women, as evidenced in a desire to control and physically harm women) to stimuli (e.g., rejection) and, therefore, are less likely to engage in avoidant behaviors, such as the disposal of the victim’s body; as a result, impulsive sexual

murderers, though more common, are more easily identified and, therefore, are responsible for fewer sexual homicides than ritualistic sexual murderers (Hazelwood & Warren, 2000).

Ritualistic sexual murderers, on the other hand are, like serial, organized, and sadistic sexual murderers, far less common (Hazelwood & Warren, 2000). Ritualistic sexual murderers often engage in sophisticated premeditation (e.g, identification of intended victims), indicating that such sexual murderers desire complete control; such a desire is evidenced in the provision of victim scripts, as well as the presence of obsessive fantasies, many of which are characterized by various paraphilias (Hazelwood & Warren, 2000). Due to the presence of such fantasies, ritualistic sexual murderers often rehearse these fantasies with inanimate objects (e.g., blow-up dolls) and human partners, paid or consensual; these fantasies are also visible in the extensive collection of themed pornography, such as BDSM (Hazelwood & Warren, 2000). While such sexual murderers are incredibly sophisticated, such sexual murderers are frequently narcissistic and have little criminal history, if any, suggesting that such sexual murderers engage in forensic countermeasures that reduce the likelihood of apprehension (Hazelwood & Warren, 2000); as a result, such sexual murderers are less likely to be identified or arrested, suggesting that ritualistic sexual murderers, in spite of their decreased prevalence, perpetrate far more sexual homicides than their less criminally-sophisticated counterparts (Hazelwood & Warren, 2000).

Catathymic vs. Compulsive. One of the most recent typologies of sexual homicide was proposed by Schlesinger (2007), which identified two dichotomous sexual murderers: catathymic and compulsive which, through further analysis, can be divided into acute catathymic, chronic catathymic, planned compulsive, and unplanned compulsive facets.

According to Schlesinger (2007), acute catathymic sexual murderers experience physical, verbal, emotional, or sexual abuse as a child and, as a result, exhibit increased hostility toward women, as evidenced in the immense overkill visible within acute catathymic sexual homicides; this hostility, as proposed by Schlesinger (2007), stems from an insecure maternal attachment. As a result, acute catathymic sexual homicide, as characterized by impulsive emotional reactions to stimuli, is believed to represent the occurrence of fantasy matricide.

Contrary to acute catathymic sexual homicide, chronic catathymic sexual homicide contains slight premeditation, often as the result of an experienced tension (e.g., self-perceived inadequacy, severe depression; Schlesinger, 2007). Upon the release of such tension through the perpetration of sexual homicide — though, without evidence of any visible sexual component — chronic catathymic sexual murderers tend to commit suicide (Schlesinger, 2007).

Compulsive sexual homicide — whether planned or unplanned — consists of the juxtaposition of aggression and sexuality within a fantastical content, often evidenced through the presence of ritualism within the respective crime scene (Schlesinger, 2007); such instances of sexual homicide are either planned (i.e., premeditated) or unplanned (Chan & Heide, 2009; Schlesinger, 2007), though planned compulsive sexual homicide tends to contain greater rates of sadism and ritualism than its unplanned counterpart.

Sexualized vs. Grievance vs. Rape. While the previously-discussed typologies all consisted of a dichotomous view of sexual homicide that consists of an impulsive, emotionally reactive sexual murderer (e.g., “anger,” disorganized, impulsive, etc.) versus a criminally sophisticated, sexually deviant sexual murderer (e.g., sadistic, organized, ritualistic, etc.), Higgs, Carter, Tully, and Browne (2017) posit that a dichotomous typology of sexual homicide lacks

adequate differentiation between the numerous sub-classifications of sexual homicide. Through the meta-analysis of various empirical articles, Higgs et al. (2017), therefore, posited that a trichotomous typology of sexual homicide better differentiates between the numerous sub-classifications of sexual homicide.

Sexualized murder — the first facet of Higgs et al.'s (2017) trichotomous typology — is characterized by deviant, sadistic sexual fantasies that are facilitated, prior to the perpetration of sexual homicide, through pornography and sexual contact with prostitutes. As sexualized sexual murderers become habituated to such pornographic or prostitute-related stimuli, such sexualized sexual murderers begin to plan the perpetration of sexual homicide as a means to obtain sexual gratification (Higgs et al., 2017). Much like sadistic, organized, and ritualistic sexual murderers, sexualized sexual murderers tend to target pre-identified strangers and engage in mutilation, the insertion of foreign objects, strangulation, and necrophilic behaviors (Higgs et al., 2017).

Grievance murder, on the other hand, is characterized by an impulsive, emotional reaction to stimuli (e.g., rejection), as often occurs with aggressive responses to rejection (e.g., withdrawn consent) within consensual sexual activity (Higgs et al., 2017); such sexual homicide is, therefore, characterized by impulsivity, the use of intoxicating substances, the presence of a known victim, overkill, and a lack of deviant sexual fantasies (Higgs et al., 2017).

In addition to this common dichotomous view of sexual homicide, Higgs et al. (2017) proposed the existence of an additional facet: rape murder. Despite not being associated with any deviant sexual interests or impulsive, emotional reactions to sexually-related rejection, Higgs et al. (2017) posits that rape murder, or an instrumental murder (i.e., murder that seeks to facilitate the perpetration of another criminal act, such as through the elimination of a potential witness)

that follows sexual assault, should be included within typologies of sexual homicide, such that rape murder serves to facilitate the perpetration of sexually-related crimes.

Power-Assertive vs. Power-Reassurance vs. Anger-Retaliatory vs. Anger-Excitation.

While Higgs et al. (2017) posit that a trichotomous typology of sexual homicide better differentiates between the numerous sub-classifications of sexual homicide, Keppel and Walter (1999) posit that a tetrachotomous typology — as introduced by Groth, Burgess, and Holmstrom (1977) for the classification of rapists — is warranted.

According to Keppel and Walter (1999), power-assertive sexual murderers premeditate the perpetration of rape; however, the perpetration of sexual homicide is an impulsive emotional reaction to the threatened loss of control, rather than a premeditated criminal act, indicating that the power-assertive sexual murderer is motivated by the obtention of power, dominance, and control within an instance of homicidal sexual assault, rather than through the juxtaposition of homicide and sexual gratification (Keppel & Walter, 1999).

Much like power-assertive sexual murders, power-reassurance murderers also plan the perpetration of rape, but not the perpetration of sexual homicide (Keppel & Walter, 1999). In spite of this similarity, power-reassurance murderers are motivated by the enactment of sexually-motivated fantasies and, consequently, the reassurance of sexual adequacy, rather than the simple obtention of power, dominance, and control; as such, power-reassurance sexual homicide occurs in response to perceived threats to such sexual adequacy, such as rejection, followed by post-mortem mutilation (Keppel & Walter, 1999).

Unlike both power-assertive and power-reassurance sexual murderers, anger-retaliatory sexual murderers are motivated by an intense hatred toward women, rather than sexual- or

power-related fantasies (Keppel & Walter, 1999); due to this revenge-oriented motivation, such sexual homicides are often precipitated by criticism from an authoritative woman (e.g., boss) and contain evidence of premeditation and overkill (Keppel & Walter, 1999).

Anger-excitation sexual murderers, much like anger-retaliatory sexual murderers, engage in premeditation (Keppel & Walter, 1999). Such sexual murderers, however, are motivated by the presence of pervasive, deviant sexual fantasies; as a result, anger-excitation sexual homicides are characterized by ritualistic elements, such as the removal of “trophies” or “souvenirs” or the presence of foreign object insertion (Keppel & Walter, 1999).

Angry vs. Situational-Precipitated vs. Sadistic vs. Predatory. Similarly to Keppel and Walter (1999), Healey, Beauregard, Beech, and Vettor (2016), through an examination of 342 convicted violent sexual offenders (e.g., rapists, sexual murderers), proposed a tetrachotomous typology of sexual homicide: angry, situational-precipitated, sadistic, and predatory.

A significant proportion of violent sexual offenders (44%) may be classified as angry sexual offenders, or sexual offenders that are motivated by the infliction of humiliation, rather than the obtention of sexual gratification, upon a known victim, indicating that such offenders seek revenge — true or symbolic — upon said victims (Healey et al., 2016). Despite the presence of revenge-oriented motivation, such offenders typically do not commit homicide, ceasing criminal action prior to the perpetration of such homicide (Healey et al., 2016).

A significant proportion of violent sexual offenders (29%) may also be classified as situational-precipitated sexual offenders (Healey et al., 2016). Situational-precipitated sexual offenders typically engage in premeditation, substance abuse, and humiliation and often target known victims that verbally and physically resist the assault (Healey et al., 2016). Due to the

presence of a weapon, victim resistance, and humiliation-related motivation, situational-precipitated sexual offenders tend to commit homicide (Healey et al., 2016).

Sadistic sexual offenders, which account for 18 percent of violent sexual offenders, are characterized by premeditation, victim resistance, substance use, the presence of a weapon, and a desire to humiliate said victims (Healey et al., 2016). Despite being non-homicidal violent sexual offenders, sadistic sexual offenders are the most sexually-motivated violent sexual offenders; however, sadistic sexual offenders, as defined by Healey et al. (2016), differ from the previously-defined sadistic sexual murderers, such that said sadistic sexual murderers target known victims, rather than strangers.

Lastly, Healey et al. (2016) identified the rare (9%) predatory sexual offenders, which are characterized by premeditation, victim resistance, mutilation, and the presence of a multitude of sexually deviant behaviors. Predatory sexual offenders are, therefore, the most lethal of the violent sexual offender typology and, as such, mimic the sadistic, organized, and ritualistic offenders of the previous typologies (Healey et al., 2016).

While such sexual homicide typologies (e.g., organized vs. disorganized, impulsive vs. ritualistic, etc.) adequately explain the motivational foundation of and characteristics of sexual homicide and sexual murderers, numerous additional typologies exist (Higgs et al., 2017), indicating that a complete, widely-accepted typology of sexual homicide has yet to be obtained. Such typologies, in fact, focus solely upon acts perpetrated by a sexually deviant individual and ignore those perpetrated by proxy at the instruction of a sexually deviant individual, such as a charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults. By examining and proposing a typology that contains instances of sexual homicide by proxy (i.e., cultic sexual homicide), law enforcement

may be better able to both recognize and identify instances of sexual homicide that have been historically misattributed to individualistic motivations, thereby facilitating the investigative abilities of law enforcement and increasing homicidal clearance rates.

Review of Literature for Religious Cults

An Overview of Religious Cults

Religious cults — defined as groups of individuals that fail to adhere to socially-accepted religions — are relatively rare in the United States of America, yet the exact prevalence of such groups is unknown (Melton, 1986). During the counterculture movement of the late-1960s and 1970s, religious cults emerged from the shadows and monopolized media coverage for years due to accusations of brainwashing, sexual abuse, and violence; as a result of such media coverage, empirical researchers introduced the following term to describe religious groups that adhered to such manipulative, secretive, and criminal actions: destructive religious cults (Melton, 1986).

One of the first modern cases of a destructive religious cult captured news attention on August 9, 1969 with the brutal murders of Sharon Tate, a well-known actress, as well as four of her close friends, a teenage boy, and an unborn baby (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974). These murders, committed by the Manson Family — a destructive religious cult led by Charles Manson —, culminated in over 100 stab wounds and multiple gunshot wounds, as well as significant blunt force trauma (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974). The Tate Murders and Manson's Family are not alone in their fatal culminations, as numerous additional destructive religious cults have reached similar climaxes (e.g., Jim Jones, the Peoples Temple, and mass murder-suicide); in order to understand such catastrophic culminations, it is necessary to further examine destructive religious cults, the

followers of destructive religious cults, and the charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, as well as the motivations behind such cataclysmic culminations (Melton, 1986).

Despite being attributed to Manson's Helter Skelter philosophy — a philosophy that such murders would facilitate the commencement of an inevitable race war and, as a result, solidify the Manson's superiority and authority over society, as a whole —, the Tate Murders, as well as the subsequent LaBianca murders, exhibit similar characteristics (e.g., overkill, bondage, etc.) to those of sexual homicide (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974), indicating that the historically-accepted individualistic motivations of the catastrophic culminations (e.g., homicide, mass suicide) of destructive religious cults may be theoretically flawed in their neglect of such similar offense and offender characteristics and, consequently, of the existence of a possible universal motivation for such fatal culminations. Further examination into the shared offense and offender characteristics of destructive religious cults, as well as both followers of and charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, provides increased insight into and support of the proposed sexual motivation of cultic violence (Galanter, 1999; Melton, 1986) and, as a result, improves the investigative ability of law enforcement to identify instances of cultic sexual homicide.

Characteristics of Destructive Religious Cults

In spite of the fact that destructive religious cults, much like socially-accepted religions, have contrasting beliefs and fundamental principles that differentiate one religious movement from another, destructive religious cults also exhibit similar foundational structures (Melton, 1986). Destructive religious cults, for instance, are highly secretive groups that are systemically patriarchal; as a result, only the higher echelons — which are solely comprised of males — of cultic society are privy to all cult information (Melton, 1986). Members in the lower echelons

(i.e., followers), in addition, are forbidden from forming independent, rational thoughts and, as such, are required to adhere to the group's philosophies and doctrines; this absolute adherence provides, when mixed with a high degree of both geographic and relational isolation, charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults with unquestionable authority (Melton, 1986), suggesting that the perpetrating individuals (i.e., followers) of the cataclysmic culminations are not aware of the underlying motivations of such actions, other than those motivations provided by charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, themselves. Such unquestionable authority is pervasive within cultic life, with charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults making every decision, including marriage, for each member (Melton, 1986). Members (i.e., followers), in fact, are often required to donate all material wealth to the destructive religious cult upon conversion (Melton, 1986).

In addition to the existence of unquestionable authority of the charismatic leader of the destructive religious cult, destructive religious cults are also characterized by apocalyptic beliefs (Melton, 1986); oftentimes, such destructive religious cults view themselves as the sole survivors of the expected apocalypse, thereby highlighting the perceived superiority of the cult within the minds of its members (Melton, 1986). Melton's (1986) observations illustrate the psychological pressures that members of destructive religious cults face every day; these intense psychological pressures can, if introduced concurrently with specific external circumstances, create cataclysmic reactions that result in violence within the cult, as evidenced within Jim Jones' Peoples Temple, or violence toward others, as evidenced within Manson's Family (Melton, 1986).

Following Melton's (1986) observations, Galanter (1999) analyzed the characteristics of the Divine Light Mission and the Unification Church, leading to the identification of four main

psychological traits that are pervasive within such destructive religious cults: shared ideology, prominent social cohesiveness, required behavioral norms, and a charismatic leader.

According to Galanter (1999), shared ideology is formed as a direct result of both geographical and relational isolation; by moving to a geographically isolated area and severing all relational (e.g., familial, platonic) ties, confirmation bias — the tendency for individuals to reject or, in this case, avoid all information that fails to affirm held beliefs — is established and, as a result, shared ideology is seen as correct (Galanter, 1999). Due to the communal nature of shared ideology, members of destructive religious cults feel emotionally connected with other members and, as a result, are willing to engage in personal sacrifice (e.g., donation of all material wealth to the cult) for the “good of the cult” (Galanter, 1999).

Social cohesiveness — the social demand of group membership — creates dependent relationships within members of destructive religious cults, with the charismatic leaders of the destructive religious cult, and with the destructive religious cult, itself (Galanter, 1999); as a result of the formation of such interpersonal relationships, members of destructive religious cults exhibit an us-versus-them mentality, in which members of destructive religious cults identify more with unknown members of the destructive religious cult than with well-known intimately-acquainted nonmembers, such as family and friends (Galanter, 1999).

In addition to shared ideology and social cohesiveness, required behavioral norms (e.g., attendance at meetings) limit the amount of available time to be spent with non-members and upon non-cult-related activities (Galanter, 1999); consequently, required behavioral norms increase the isolation of and us-versus-them mentality of destructive religious cults, such that required behavioral norms obligate members of destructive religious cults to spend exorbitant

amounts of time with other members of destructive religious cults and with the various beliefs and fundamental doctrines that characterize the respective destructive religious cult (Galanter, 1999).

Lastly, Galanter (1999) posits that charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults utilize the combination of such traits (i.e., shared ideology, social cohesiveness, and required behavioral norms) to establish unquestionable authority; in other words, charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults foster a sense of dependence upon the destructive religious cult, thereby creating members (i.e., followers) that are wholly self-sacrificial (Galanter, 1999). Galanter (1999) posits, however, that the presence of shared ideology, social cohesiveness, and required behavioral norms are not sufficient criteria for resultant cataclysmic culminations; rather, Galanter (1999) posits that such criteria are necessary for the priming of members of destructive religious cults into pawns — and, eventually, murderers — for use by the charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, indicating that the perpetration of sexual homicide by such members is the direct result of the manipulation of such members into self-sacrificial beings that are willing to, at the instruction of the charismatic leader of the respective destructive religious cult, perpetrate such atrocities for the “good of the cult” (Galanter, 1999).

Characteristics of Charismatic Leaders of Destructive Religious Cults

Destructive religious cults are distinguished by, perhaps more than numerous other characteristics (e.g., apocalyptic beliefs), the utilization of charismatic leadership (Galanter, 1999); charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults often, in fact, overshadow and, even, come to represent and symbolize destructive religious cults within academic literature and media coverage (e.g., Manson’s Family, Jones’ Peoples Temple, etc.; Navarro & Poynter, 2014).

The transposition of charismatic leadership into symbolic representations of destructive religious cults indicates that, much like the within the academic realm, charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults are transposed into symbolic representations of “God” by members of destructive religious cults (Galanter, 1999; Navarro & Poynter, 2014); such transposition suggests that, to members of destructive religious cults, charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults are apotheosized into God-like figures or divine prophets (Galanter, 1999; Navarro & Poynter, 2014).

Despite the fact that academic literature, mass media, and members of the respective destructive religious cult view charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults as symbolically-representative of a societally-unacceptable religion (i.e., cult) or of “God,” charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults view themselves as “God,” rather than a symbolic representation of “God” (Navarro & Poynter, 2014); this self-prescribed divinity suggests that such charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults exhibit narcissistic personality disorder — a personality disorder that is characterized by grandiosity, superiority, entitlement, and exploitativeness (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) — and, consequently, antisocial (i.e., psychopathic) traits (Burke, 2006).

Charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, as a consequence of such narcissism, often experience fantasies related to the obtention of absolute control within a cultic setting (i.e., arranged marriages, use of public humiliation, required donation of material wealth; Navarro & Poynter, 2014); interestingly, such charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults often demand the sexual submission of cultic members, indicating that such control-themed fantastical content includes a sexual facet (Navarro & Poynter, 2014). When faced with the loss of such control (i.e.,

rejection), charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults respond aggressively (i.e., violently; Navarro & Poynter, 2014). The cumulative effect of such characteristics indicate that destructive religious cults are, most likely, formed solely for the personal gratification of the respective charismatic leader; as such, it is reasonable to expect that this personal gratification consists of the fulfillment of control-related fantastical content (e.g., sexual submission) or the retaliation for a perceived loss of such control (i.e., rejection; Navarro & Poynter, 2014), both of which have been empirically-associated with the perpetration of sexual homicide.

Characteristics of Members of Destructive Religious Cults

While structural (e.g., patriarchal) and leadership-related characteristics interact to facilitate the perpetration of cataclysmic culminations, the perpetration of such cataclysmic culminations would not be possible without the existence of willing perpetrators (i.e., members or followers; Dawson, 1998); such willingness is often the result of a combination of shared characteristics that prime an individual for cultic membership.

Dawson (1998) found that, for instance, members of destructive religious cults are predominantly educated, young adults from financially stable, traditional families. Consequently, such members are often perfectionistic young adults that were sheltered throughout the lifespan, resulting in significant restrictions to psychological and social development; upon graduation from high school and college, such young adults typically rely upon destructive religious cults to fulfill desires for such social development (i.e., formation of meaningful social relationships), as well as the associated love, acceptance, and purpose that accompanies such social development (Dawson, 1998). Such young adults, upon conversion, experience markedly decreased stress levels that remain low throughout cultic involvement (Galanter, 1999), indicating that members

of destructive religious cults frequently convert for reasons other than belief in the respective religious doctrine; rather, empirical research suggests that the majority of members of destructive religious cults convert as a direct result of a current member exhibiting kindness, affection, or love (Dawson, 1998; Galanter, 1999).

Recruitment and Brainwashing

While both societally-acceptable and societally-unacceptable religions utilize kindness, affection, and love to recruit possible members, such kindness, affection, and love — termed “love bombing” (Dawson, 1998) — utilized within the recruitment tactics of destructive religious cults are believed to be deceptive (Robbins, 1984).

Nonmembers’ initial introduction into destructive religious cults is, oftentimes, the result of both targeting and coercion, in which trained members of destructive religious cults identify susceptible individuals and, using this susceptibility, manipulate such individuals into conversion (Robbins, 1984). Destructive religious cults, for instance, utilize “heavenly deception,” in which members of destructive religious cults consciously lie about the respective destructive religious cult’s activities (e.g., misrepresenting the activities of the cult to include activities of interest to the potential member, such as claiming that the destructive religious cult engages in philanthropy work; Robbins, 1984). Destructive religious cults, in addition, utilize “flirty fishing,” in which members of destructive religious cults provide sexual favors (e.g., oral sex) in exchange for conversion (Scotland, 1987).

Following such an initial introduction, prospective members that exhibit interest in destructive religious cults are required to complete an indoctrination course, which consists of meetings, lengthy prayer sessions, and, often, an aspect of confession that provides the upper

echelons (i.e., charismatic leaders of the respective destructive religious cult) with psychological ammunition regarding said prospective members' pasts (Dawson, 1998). In addition to such physical and psychological exhaustion, indoctrination also consists of sensory deprivation, in which prospective members are denied both adequate food and sleep; such sensory deprivation creates an ideal mental state for the introduction of hypnotic states (e.g., meditation) that limit the ability of prospective members to consciously challenge such indoctrination (Dawson, 1998).

Upon the completion of indoctrination, as indicated by the acceptance of the fundamental cultic doctrines and the unquestionable authority of charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, nonmembers are given different names, instructed to alter their physical appearances, and are forced to surrender all material possessions to the destructive religious cult (Dawson, 1998; Sirkin, 1990); such communal living is empirically associated with conformity and, therefore, an us-versus-them mentality and a willingness to sacrifice for the commune (Dawson, 1998; Sirkin, 1990). With a new name and a new physical appearance, prospective converts become successful converts and are, therefore, inducted into the shared ideology and social cohesiveness that characterizes destructive religious cults (Dawson, 1998; Sirkin, 1990), indicating that, with such conversion, prospective members surrender the capability to consciously scrutinize destructive religious cults and, consequently, gain the capability to perpetrate cataclysmic culminations, such as sexual homicide, at the unquestionable instruction of charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults (Dawson, 1998; Sirkin, 1990).

Sexual Abuse in Destructive Religious Cults

Destructive religious cults, as previously mentioned, are characterized by patriarchal social systems that are headed by charismatic male leaders; such patriarchal systems, coupled

with such charismatic leaders' control-related sexual and nonsexual fantasies, present an ideal foundation for the formation of sexual abuse (Dayan, 2018).

Despite the fact that numerous religious doctrines (e.g., Islam) view women as second-class individuals, destructive religious cults utilize such doctrines to affirm cultic structure and to facilitate the fulfillment of charismatic leaders' control-related sexual and nonsexual fantasies (Dayan, 2018). Through the use of such doctrines and the subsequent exploitation of femininity, female members of destructive religious cults internalize such doctrines and, as a result, embrace the submissive, second-class role of women within destructive religious cults (Dayan, 2018).

While the internalization of such doctrines and the subsequent submission of female members of destructive religious cults illustrate the effects of charismatic leaders' control-related fantasies upon female members of destructive religious cults, Dayan (2018) posits that absolute control occurs — as, arguably, no greater control over women exists than sexual control — only with the existence of sexually-related control. Female (and, in some cases, male) members of destructive religious cults are, consequently, often publicly (i.e., in front of other members of the respective destructive religious cult) sexually assaulted (Dayan, 2018), thereby affirming the sexual prowess of the respective charismatic leader; such a public assault, in some instances, is carried out upon a married woman (i.e., in front of a husband and, possibly, a child), thereby affirming the dominance of the respective charismatic leader over the entire congregation (Dayan, 2018). In addition, such instances of sexual assault often include evidence of various sexual perversions, such as forced sodomy, BDSM, and mutilation (Dayan, 2018).

In addition to the absolute control exhibited over personal sexual partners (e.g., coerced sexual activities between the respective charismatic leader and a targeted member, often through

public sexual assault), charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults also exhibit absolute control over the sexual activity of the congregation, as evidenced in the use of the previously-discussed recruitment tactic of “flirty fishing,” in which charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults instruct female members to sexually coerce male nonmembers into conversion (i.e., promising sexual favors in exchange for conversion; Dayan, 2018).

While nonmembers may view these actions as appalling, female members of destructive religious cults often view such sexual control and sexual abuse as a sign of “God’s” favor and, therefore, an experience to be desired (Dayan, 2018). This desire, however, limits the fantastical effectiveness of such within-cult sexual assault, as the existence of a willing sexual partner limits the ability of the respective charismatic leader to attain the aggressive, sexually-deviant power necessary for the obtention of control- and power-related sexual gratification (e.g., association between willingness and a lack of resistance); as a result, the obtention of sexual gratification requires the introduction of stimuli that must be more arousing than that of the habituated sexual assault, such as sexual homicide.

Violence in Destructive Religious Cults

In an attempt to identify the various factors of destructive religious cults that facilitate the perpetration of associated climactic cataclysmic culminations, Hume (1996) examined numerous destructive religious cults for shared characteristics (e.g., structural, doctrine-related, behavioral) characteristics that are associated with the promotion of violence within a cultic setting.

Through such analysis, Hume (1996) identified various “danger markers,” or shared characteristics, that promote violence (i.e., climactic cataclysmic culminations) within a cultic setting. Charismatic leadership, perhaps more than any other characteristic, is associated with the

perpetration of violence, often as a direct result of such leaderships' advocacy for violence; cultic violence, therefore, originates from the charismatic leader of the respective destructive religious cult, himself (Hume, 1996).

The direct relationship between charismatic leadership and cultic violence is facilitated through and supported by various aspects of cultic structure. Hume (1996) emphasizes, for instance, the importance of social isolation (e.g., formation of compounds) on the formation of confirmation bias, the increase in charismatic authority, and, consequently, the rationalization of cultic violence. The subsequent formation of an us-versus-them philosophy promotes violence, as well, especially when considering resistance to law enforcement investigations or hate crimes against the outgroup (Hume, 1996). The existence of an us-versus-them philosophy suggests that violent destructive religious cults exhibit a familial structure, in which the in-group replaces and becomes a symbolic family; this familial relationship, much like in modern society, outweighs external relationships and, consequently, creates a self-sacrificial willingness to engage in behaviors, such as violence, that benefit the familial destructive religious cult (Hume, 1996). The exhibited familial structure mirrors that of a traditional familial structure, in which the "family" is led by a patriarchal leader that demands respect and obedience; however, such obedience is demanded, not as the result of societal mores of patriarchal leadership, but as the result of the self-prescribed divinity of the male charismatic leader (i.e., patriarch; Hume, 1996); such self-prescribed divinity suggests that charismatic leaders of violent destructive religious cults view themselves as "above the law" and, as a result, are more willing to engage in illegal behaviors.

In addition to shared structural characteristics, violent destructive religious cults also exhibit shared doctrine-related and behavioral characteristics that promote the perpetration of

violent cataclysmic culminations. For example, Hume (1996) states that sexual abuse is a high correlate of cultic violence, suggesting that internal violence is predictive of external violence. Hume (1996) also states that the presence of an apocalyptic belief structure is essential to the formation of cultic violence, suggesting that such a belief structure occurs solely as a way for the charismatic leader of the respective destructive religious cult to convince the congregation to accept plausible or imminent death, to obtain weapons, and to perpetrate a violent cataclysmic culmination (Hume, 1996).

With the identification of such “danger markers,” Hume (1996) provides a model that can be used to assess the dangerousness of contemporary destructive religious cults that have not yet perpetrated a violent cataclysmic act, such as the perpetration of the Tate and LaBianca murders by Manson’s Family or the perpetration of the “Jonestown Massacre” by Jones’ Peoples Temple. Hume’s (1996) findings, however, fail to identify motivational evidence — whether individual or universal — for the perpetration of such violence

While such violence has been historically attributed to individual motivations (e.g., Manson’s Helter Skelter philosophy; Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974), identified characteristics of destructive religious cults and, specifically, charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults mirror those of sexual homicide and sexual murderers, respectively (Dayan, 2018; Darjee, 2019; Galanter, 1999; James & Proulx, 2014); as such, it is reasonable to conclude that, in consideration of such similarities between sexual homicide and cultic violence, cultic violence may be sexually-motivated. While it is unreasonable to expect that each perpetrating member of such destructive religious cults exhibits sexual motivation, it is reasonable to assume that, as charismatic leaders dictate the actions of such destructive religious cults (Galanter, 1999), the

propensity for violence lies within the charismatic leader, himself; such additional “danger markers” are merely characteristics imposed by such charismatic leadership for the facilitation of the perpetration of personal violent desires, specifically with regard to such desires related to power, control, and sexual gratification.

Further research must, therefore, consider the existence of a universal motivation for cultic violence — specifically, with regard to the shared offense and offender characteristics of cultic violence and sexual homicide —, as exhibited solely by the charismatic leader of the respective destructive religious cult. However, little-to-no such empirical research exists, thereby necessitating the use of in-depth comparative analyses of destructive religious cults, charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, and cultic violence —for instance, Manson’s Family and the Tate and LaBianca murders, as well as Jones’ Peoples Temple and the “Jonestown Massacre” — to sexual homicide.

The Perpetration of Homicide by Destructive Religious Cults: A Case Study

The Family and the Tate/LaBianca Slayings

On August 9th, 1969, Winifred Chapman reported to work, arriving at 10050 Cielo Drive — a residence in the affluent area of Beverly Hills, California — at approximately 8 A.M.; upon entering the residence, however, Ms. Chapman discovered numerous pools of blood and, visible through an open door, a corpse on the front lawn (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974).

Arriving at the scene, Officers DeRosa, Whisenhunt, and Burbridge of the Los Angeles Police Department (L.A.P.D.) discovered the gruesome extent of such carnage; Steven Parent, an 18-year-old, was found slumped inside his vehicle, the recipient of four bullet wounds. Wojciech (Voytek) Frykowski, a 32-year-old actor, was found approximately 20 feet from the front door,

lying on his side, the recipient of two bullet wounds, thirteen instances of blunt force trauma to the head, and fifty-one stab wounds (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974). Abigail Folger, the 25-year-old heiress to the Folger coffee fortune, was found approximately 25 feet from Mr. Frykowski in the prone position, the recipient of twenty-eight stab wounds (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974). Jay Sebring, the 35-year-old internationally-known hair stylist, was found, lying on his side, with a towel tossed over his head, the recipient of one bullet wound and seven stab wounds; a three-strand rope was wrapped around Mr. Sebring's neck, the other end of which was thrown over a ceiling beam and wrapped around the neck of Sharon Polanski — also known as Sharon Tate —, a 26-year-old actress and soon-to-be mother, who was found merely feet from Mr. Sebring, the recipient of sixteen stab wounds (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974).

Concerned with the public reaction to the murders of such high-profile individuals, L.A.P.D. began to vigorously investigate the murders, collecting countless evidentiary exhibits (e.g., blood samples, fingerprints, witness statements, etc.) and, eventually, arresting the 19-year-old caretaker of 10050 Cielo Drive, William Garretson (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974).

On August 10th, however, Frank Struthers, Suzanne Struthers, and Joe Dorgan arrived at 3301 Waverly Drive — Frank and Suzanne's parents' house — at approximately 9 P.M. Sensing something amiss, Frank, Suzanne, and Joe entered the residence, finding Leno LaBianca in the supine position in the living room, with his hands bound behind his back, his face covered with a pillowcase, and a cord wrapped around his neck; Mr. LaBianca, a 44-year-old businessman, had been stabbed twelve times with a knife and fourteen times with a double-tined fork, which had been left protruding from his stomach next to the word “war” that had been carved into his flesh (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974). Rosemary LaBianca, a 38-year-old businesswoman, was found in the

prone position with, much like Mr. LaBianca, her face covered with a pillowcase and a cord wrapped around her neck; Mrs. LaBianca had been stabbed forty-one times (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974).

Despite similarities between the Tate and LaBianca murders (e.g., “pig” and “death to pigs” written, in blood, on the walls of both residences), L.A.P.D. failed to connect the two cases until Susan Atkins, a member of a commune, or cult, that resided at Spahn Ranch — a ranch located on the outskirts of Los Angeles —, admitted to involvement in the murders (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974). Ms. Atkins’ admission, in conjunction with corroborating circumstantial, physical, and eyewitness evidence, indicated that Ms. Atkins’ cult — known as the Family — perpetrated the Tate-LaBianca slayings at the instruction of Charles Manson, the charismatic leader of the Family, for the purpose of inciting “Helter Skelter,” a race war that would, eventually, secure Manson’s leadership on a larger, national scale (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974).

On January 25th, 1971, Charles Manson, Patricia Krenwinkel, Leslie Van Houten, and Susan Atkins were convicted — in addition to Charles “Tex” Watson, who was tried separately at a later date — of the Tate-LaBianca murders on the basis of the “Helter Skelter” motive (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974). Despite the wide-spread acceptance of the “Helter Skelter” motive, such instances of cultic violence exhibit strikingly similar offense and offender characteristics with instances of sexual homicide, indicating that the “Helter Skelter” motivation — and individualized motivations for cultic violence, in general — may be an incomplete explanation for the perpetration of cultic violence, such as the Tate-LaBianca murders.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Participants

A convenience sample of one male charismatic leader, as well as the corresponding destructive religious cult — Charles Manson and the Family — was obtained for the current study. The sole participant — Charles Manson — was a heterosexual, divorced, European-American male who, at the time of the Tate/LaBianca murders, was 34-years-old.

Participation was limited to charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults that were both conceived, and, in addition, had perpetrated at least one homicidal act within the U.S. Additionally, charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults that contained, at their peak, fewer than ten members were excluded from the current study.

Design

The current study utilized a historical analysis design to examine similarities in offense and offender characteristics between a singular case study of a charismatic leader of a destructive religious cult and empirically-supported characteristics of sexual murderers, as well as between instances of cultic violence attributed to such a charismatic leader and empirically-supported characteristics of sexual homicide.

Archival data, such as published biographical novels (e.g., *Manson: The Life and Times of Charles Manson* by Jeff Guinn), as well as publicly available — specifically, obtained from the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Vault (i.e., Freedom of Information Act, or FOIA, library) — documents, videotaped interviews, and audio recordings, among others, were analyzed for the

presence of empirically-supported characteristics that are attributed to sexual murderers (e.g., behaviors associated with the humiliation of another individual).

Procedure

In order to analyze such archival data for the presence of empirically-supported, sexual homicide-related characteristics, common empirically-supported characteristics (e.g., control-related desires) — as identified in various empirical articles and nonfiction literature, such as the widely accepted *Sexual Homicide: Patterns and Motives*, written by Ressler, Burgess, and Douglas of the Federal Bureau of Investigation — were organized into a preliminary checklist of components and sub-components of behaviors that illustrate such characteristics.

Within this preliminary checklist, empirically-supported characteristics were separated into two general categories: offense and offender characteristics. Offense characteristics were further narrowed to include pre-crime, crime, and post-crime characteristics, while offender characteristics were further narrowed to include biographical, environmental, behavioral, and psychopathological characteristics. Each category was further narrowed to include items specific to that characteristic, such as intentional planning.

Following the creation of the preliminary checklist (see Appendix A), Manson's archival data was examined independently for the presence of such identified characteristics. For each identified component and sub-component within the preliminary checklist, items were coded according to whether or not said component was (0) *not present* or (1) *present*, resulting in the completion of a consolidated, final checklist. Higher scores, in summing the finalized checklist, indicate that Charles Manson, as well as the Manson Family, exhibit similar offense and offender characteristics, indicating that Charles Manson — and, possibly, charismatic leaders of

destructive religious cults, as a whole — may be sexually-motivated, rather than motivated by an individualistic “Helter Skelter” motive.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

It was hypothesized that numerous similarities will exist between offense and offender characteristics of sexual homicide and cultic violence, as well as between sexual murderers and charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults. The in-depth examination of such offense and offender characteristics with regard to Charles Manson and the Manson Family supported this contention, with a score of fifteen on the finalized checklist; with only sixteen possible points, Charles Manson and the Manson Family exhibited 93.7% of the identified sexual homicide-related characteristics.

It was also hypothesized that cultic violence will be sexually motivated. Despite the absence of an admittance of or confirmation of sexual motivation within the Tate/LaBianca murders by Charles Manson or a member of the Manson Family, the sheer extent to which such similarities were found to exist supported this contention.

Results

Offense Characteristics

Pre-crime characteristics.

Stressful environmental stimuli (“triggers”).

“Charlie was the uncredited composer of a failed song” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 197).

“Melcher . . . never showed up” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 213).

“Charlie was furious when Terry Melcher failed to audition him at Spahn as promised. The insult was bad enough But beyond the blow to Charlie’s ego, Melcher’s no-show

embarrassed him in front of the Family. Charlie's power over his followers depended in large part on them believing him to be the wisest person anywhere, probably Jesus reincarnated and, according to Charlie's sermons to them, the future ruler of the post-Helter Skelter world. It was always a matter of Charlie's Will Be Done; whatever he wanted to happen, had to. He could not be seen to fail, and Charlie slipped when he allowed everyone to see how important Melcher's promised audition was to him. His iron control of the Family might diminish or even disappear as a result" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 214).

"[D]eputies of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office raided Spahn's" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 217).

"Charlie Manson's dream of becoming a rock star more famous than the Beatles was essentially over" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 223).

"With no further chance to get a record deal through L.A. contacts, the Family wondering when exactly Helter Skelter was going to start, and Paul Crockett poaching his followers from Barker Ranch" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 226).

"But he remained convinced that at any moment a Panther hit squad, now bent on revenge as well as retrieving the \$2,500, might launch an attack on the ranch" (Guinn, 2017, pgs. 227-228).

"He'd promised that Helter Skelter would begin that summer, and summer was waning. His efforts to raise sufficient money to finance a long-term Family relocation to Barker Ranch were unsuccessful. The Black Panthers might attack any minute. Two murders, Lotsapoppa and Gary Hinman, might yet be traced back to Charlie and Bobby Beausoleil

at Spahn. Spahn might not even be available as a Family base much longer” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 234).

“Everything was spiraling out of control” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 240).

“For a while there, everything was really coming together for me. There was promise of a soon-to-be released album, I had a small nightclub in operation for which I wrote the songs and led the band, I had able bodies putting together vehicles for the desert, and it was general knowledge that twenty or so of the girls did only what would be pleasing to me. Things were good. . . . But that kind of good thing never seemed to last for me, and when things stopped working out, it all seemed to fall right back in my lap” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 171).

Negative interpersonal/positive intrapersonal “frame of mind.”

“Charlie was getting edgier, too. He was under tremendous pressure” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 209).

“Charlie ‘stopped pretending that he wasn’t angry. He was mad all of the time’” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 224).

“It was a tense time for Charlie” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 234).

“I felt proud and moved around with my head up and my chest out. . . . Then the head starts reeling, pressure mounts, tension increases, frustration starts and there ain’t no rhyme or reason to a fucking thing” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 171).

“[T]he self-pity was pretty well shadowed by hate and contempt. Hate for a world that denied. Contempt for people who can’t see or understand” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 185).

“Fuck, it was just more pressure. I overcame my self-pity, replacing it with bitterness and contempt for anyone who disagreed with me” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 190).

Intentional planning.

“Charlie had to point his followers to the right victims to serve his own purposes, and do it in a way that left them apparently responsible for all of it” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 242).

“Charlie guided Tex to the destination” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 243).

“Then they talked about what to bring: rope to tie people with and of course knives, dark clothes to wear on the way and clean ones to put on afterward. Charlie gave Tex the .22 Buntline. . . . And Tex would need bolt cutters for the phone lines. There was an electronic gate at the entrance to the property . . . and maybe when you pushed the button to open it an alarm went off in the house, so Tex and the others should climb the fence instead” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 243).

“With Tex primed, it was time for Charlie to pick the women who would go with him . . . each of the three was selected because she had something specific to contribute. Charlie took them aside one by one — Susan, who had been with Beausoleil at Hinman’s house and knew what had been written on the walls there; Pat, whose shyness and lack of social skills led most people to believe she was cold and unfeeling; and Linda Kasabian, who had a valid driver’s license. Charlie knew that Susan was capable of anything, that Pat believed she had no option other than to obey him in all things, and that Linda wanted to impress the rest of the Family” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 244).

“Tex said in a matter-of-fact tone that they were going into this big house where Terry Melcher had lived, and they were going to kill everybody inside” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 247).

“And just to make certain that there were no mistakes this time, Charlie was going to come along and show them how it was supposed to be done” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 259).

“At his direction she drove into the residential area of Los Feliz, turning here and there until the Ford was slowly cruising. . . . Tex, Susan, and Pat knew exactly where they were” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 262).

“Before he left Spahn Ranch that night, Charlie had looped a few leather thongs around his neck. Now he tugged one free and told Tex to tie Leno’s hands with it” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 264).

“[W]here he gave them their instructions. Linda would knock on the door” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 267).

“From Stephanie I learned that while at Barker Manson had conducted a ‘murder school.’ He had given a Buck knife to each of the girls, and had demonstrated how they should ‘slit the throats of pigs,’ by yanking the head back by the hair and drawing the knife from ear to ear. . . . He also said they should ‘stab them in either their ears or eyes and then wiggle the knife around to get as many vital organs as possible’” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 369).

Behavioral pattern of ascending proclivity (“build-up”).

“Charlie ordered everybody to carry . . . a sturdy folding buck knife” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 204).

“And now there were guns, too. . . . Over the next months the Family put together a good-sized arsenal” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 204).

“Charlie assembled small squads of followers and took them out nights ‘creepy-crawling.’ The object was to silently enter houses without alerting the people sleeping inside. . . . They were also proving to themselves that they could get into any house, anywhere, anytime” (Guinn, 2017, pgs. 211-212).

“The Family’s approach to Helter Skelter grew darker, even sinister. On Charlie’s command they began stealing things during their creepy-crawling” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 224).

“Charlie began suggesting that the creepy-crawls could be ratcheted up even more — perhaps some Piggies could be kidnapped, or even tied up in their homes and frightened to death” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 225).

“Charlie had to pull the gun himself . . . and managed to shoot Lotsapoppa in the chest” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 227).

“Charlie’s sense of urgency was such that he was prepared to use force. So-called friends could prove their loyalty by giving him money, lots of it, without excuse or delay. If they wouldn’t do it voluntarily, then Charlie would make them” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 230).

“Charlie slashed the blade along the left side of Hinman’s head, splitting his ear almost in half.

Charlie snarled that he expected Hinman to give Beausoleil everything he had . . .

Hinman still insisted that he had no money to give them. . . . Hinman had to die” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 231-232).

Crime characteristics.

Ritualism.

Power, control, and domination.

“Tex had the three-ply rope, but he told Susan to tie Frykowski’s hands behind him with a towel. . . . Tex used the rope to tie Sebring’s hands. . . . Tex looped more rope around Sebring’s neck and then flipped the other end up over a beam in the ceiling. Tex then tied the rope around Tate’s neck” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 250).

“[B]ut Susan laughed at her and killed her and then tasted her blood, which was ‘warm and sticky and nice’” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 310).

“A white nylon rope was looped around her neck twice, one end extending over a rafter in the ceiling, the other leading across the floor to still another body. . . . The rope was also looped twice around the man’s neck” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 30).

“The cord around his neck was attached to a massive lamp, the cord knotted so tightly it appeared he had been throttled with it. His hands were tied behind his back with a leather thong” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 69).

“He hadn’t mentioned it in the autopsy report, but, after studying the abrasions on her left cheek, he had concluded, ‘Sharon Tate was hung’” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 445).

Rage and revenge.

“Tex was frustrated. Charlie told him to bring back money; they’d come to this house because rich people lived there, and now Tate was telling him that they didn’t have any. It made Tex furious, and just then Jay Sebring groaned as he lay on the floor. Tex crouched over him and began stabbing him, slamming the knife into Sebring again and again until he finally lay still enough to convince Tex that he was dead” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 250).

“Cause of death: Multiple stab wounds of the chest and back, penetrating the heart, lungs, and liver, causing massive hemorrhage. Victim was stabbed sixteen times, five of which wounds were in and of themselves fatal” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 57).

“Cause of death: Exsanguination — victim literally bled to death. Victim had been stabbed seven times and shot once, at least three of the stab wounds, as well as the gunshot wound, being in and of itself fatal” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 58).

“Victim had been stabbed twenty-eight times” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 60).

“Victim was shot twice, struck over the head thirteen times with a blunt object, and stabbed fifty-one times” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 61).

“Cause of death: Multiple stab wounds. Victim had been stabbed a total of forty-one times, any one of six of which could in and of itself have been fatal” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 77).

Degradation and Humiliation.

“Susan . . . dipped a towel in Tate’s blood and carefully wrote ‘PIG’ on the outside of the front door” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 252).

“[T]hen either Tex or Pat carved ‘WAR’ on his exposed abdomen. Pat jammed a long-tined carving fork into Leno’s belly and thrust a small kitchen knife into his throat underneath the pillowcase” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 265).

“A bloody towel covered his face, hiding his features” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 30).

“There was a throw pillow over his head, some kind of cord around his neck, and the tops of his pajamas were torn open so his stomach was bare. Something was protruding from his stomach” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 68).

“[T]here was a bloody pillowcase over his head. . . . The object protruding from his stomach was an ivory-handled, bi-tined carving fork. In addition to a number of stab wounds in the abdomen, someone had carved the letters WAR in the naked flesh” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 69).

“Only then was it discovered that in addition to the carving fork embedded in his abdomen, a knife had been stuck in Leno LaBianca’s throat” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 74).

“[I]ndicated that the placing of the pillowcases over the heads of the victims was a belated act, possibly even occurring after they had died” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 77).

““We were going to mutilate them, but we didn’t have a chance to”” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 126).

Sexual fixation.

“They yanked up her dress and nightgown and Leslie repeatedly stabbed her in the buttocks and legs. Tex didn’t feel she showed much enthusiasm, but at least she was doing something as Charlie had instructed” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 265).

“She wore a flowered bra and matching bikini panties” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 30).

“Rosemary LaBianca was lying face down on the bedroom floor, parallel to the bed and dresser, in a large pool of blood. She was wearing a short pink nightgown and, over it, an expensive dress. . . . Both nightgown and dress were bunched up over her head, so her back, buttocks, and legs were bare . . . she had a pillowcase over her head and a lamp cord wrapped around her neck. The cord was attached to one of a pair of bedroom lamps, both of which had overturned. The tautness of the cord, plus a second pool of blood about two feet from the body, indicated that perhaps she had tried to crawl, pulling the lamps over while doing so” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 70).

“All but one of Leno LaBianca’s wounds were to the front of his body; thirty-six of the forty-one inflicted on Rosemary LaBianca were to her back and buttocks” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 77).

“But the killing itself was something else. ‘It’s like a sexual release,’ Susan told her. ‘Especially when you see the blood spurting out. It’s better than a climax’” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 139).

“[S]ex (‘the whole world is like one big intercourse — everything is in and out — smoking, eating, stabbing’)” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 140).

Post-crime characteristics.

Forensic countermeasures.

“Tex thought they’d been careful not to leave fingerprints or any other clues” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 252).

“Linda rolled all the discarded clothes into a bundle and, on Tex’s order, tossed them out of the car and down the steep slope by the side of the road. A little further along he had her throw out the knives, too, and then the .22 Buntline” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 253).

“Charlie told them to wipe off the gobbets of blood that were smeared on the inside and outside of the car” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 254).

“Charlie got into the Ford and drove back to Cielo. Charlie entered the house and wiped surfaces to eliminate stray fingerprints. He moved some things . . . and tossed a towel of Jay Sebring’s head . . . Charlie was so preoccupied with perfectly setting the scene of the slaughter” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 254).

“It became apparent to Dolan, from examining those areas where fingerprints should have been but weren’t, that an effort had been made to eradicate prints” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 72).

“Trophies” or “souvenirs”.

Proactive involvement in criminal investigation.

“Charlie got up in time to catch some of the late afternoon and early evening TV reports” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 259).

“[T]ook the stand and testified (1) that Sadie came in and told her to switch channels to the news; (2) that before this particular day Sadie and the others never watched the news; and (3) that immediately after the newscaster finished with Tate and moved on to the Vietnam war, the group got up and left” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 426).

Offender Characteristics

Biographical characteristics.

“IQ score of 109” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 43).

“Though he’d learned to give and take sexual relief with other boys in reform school, Charlie was mostly attracted to women” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 51).

“He’d scored 121 on an IQ test when he’d arrived at the prison, which placed him in the ‘high normal’ range” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 59).

Environmental characteristics.

Childhood abuse.

“During Charlie’s first day, Mrs. Varner took any opportunities to point out his defects. . . . At the end of his long, terrible day Charlie ran home crying. . . . The next morning Bill rummaged in his daughter’s closet and picked out one of Jo Ann’s dresses. He ordered Charlie to put it on. . . . Then Uncle Bill marched the five-year-old back to Mrs. Varner’s classroom. Charlie had to wear Jo Ann’s baggy dress all day” (Guinn, 2017, pgs. 29-30).

“[H]e consistently attracted the notice of bullies” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 30).

“Charlie claimed he was regularly beaten by the priests ‘with paddles as big as ball bats’” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 37).

“Boys could receive whatever amount of physical correction adult staffers deemed appropriate. This ran a torturous gamut from simple whippings with paddles to duck walking (staggering painfully about with hands clasping ankles) and table bending (arching backward with shoulder blades barely touching the surface of the table; just holding that position for a few moments ensured that a boy could not walk normally for hours afterward)” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 41).

“He claimed later that he was almost immediately raped by other students, who sodomized Charlie. . . . If that is an embellishment, it is undoubtedly true that tiny Charlie was forced into sexual acts by stronger boys” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 41).

“[F]our of the bigger and older inmates cornered me in one of the feed bins. . . . I made a dash for the door, but two of the guys grabbed me and the other two stripped my pants of. . . . Two of them had time to rape me” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 42).

“I saw four larger and older guys beating the hell out of me and wrestling me to the floor, and I remembered them holding me while one ripped my ass with his big cock and then others took their turn” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 202).

Insecure parent-child attachment/familial instability.

“Manson liked to brag that prison was his daddy and the street was his mother” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 5).

“Colonel . . . preferred loot from illicit schemes” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 15).

“He let her think that he really was an Army colonel. Scott also failed to mention that he was married” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 15).

“In the spring of 1934, Kathleen discovered that she was pregnant. When she told Colonel Scott, he said that he had just been called away on military business, but he’d return soon. It was several months before Kathleen realized that he had no intention of having any further contact, let alone marrying her” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 15).

“On November 12, 1934, Kathleen delivered a healthy baby boy at Cincinnati General Hospital. The child’s birth certificate, filed on December 3, contained no taint of illegitimacy. His father was listed as William Manson” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 17).

“Kathleen also loved her son, but upon turning sixteen she was as devoted to having a good time as she was to being a good wife and mother” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 17).

“Kathleen began going out at night without her husband, sometimes even showing up unexpectedly in Ashland or Charleston to drop off Charlie with his grandmother or Aunt Glenna while she caroused. Nancy and Glenna were concerned that Charlie was often left with unsuitable baby-sitters. Kathleen disappeared for days at a time” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 17).

“On April 30, 1937, the court ruled on his request for divorce after less than two and a half years of marriage. He charged Kathleen with ‘gross neglect of duty,’ a catchall phrase used to describe infidelity, drunkenness, abandonment, or some combination of those or other marital transgressions. . . . The court granted William his divorce, and the decree pointedly noted that ‘there were no children the issue of this marriage.’ William was not

legally obligated and so wouldn't pay Kathleen a penny of support for Charlie" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 18).

"Kathleen went to court in Kentucky and filed a 'bastardy suit' against Colonel Scott" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 18).

"Charlie may have met his biological father for the first time during the bastardy hearing;

Kathleen would recall that Scott came to visit the toddler a few times afterward. But what Colonel Scott didn't do was pay Kathleen the \$5 a month child support mandated by the judge" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 18).

"Over the next sixteen months Kathleen and Charlie sometimes stayed with Nancy in Ashland.

They also moved in occasionally with Glenna, Bill, and their daughter, Jo Ann, in North Charleston" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 18).

"There is no record of Kathleen finding employment, but she did go out and actively look for another husband" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 18-19).

"Kathleen's knack for choosing the wrong man was intact; Robey had a string of convictions for bootlegging and minor theft" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 19).

"Charlie, not yet five, probably saw his mother taken away in handcuffs" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 21).

"Kathleen's sentence from Judge Savage was five years for unarmed robbery" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 22).

"Charlie would move in with his Uncle Bill, Aunt Glenna, and eight-year-old cousin, Jo Ann" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 23).

“Charlie had only bad memories of his childhood years. . . . The experiences formed the basis of his adult philosophy that it was better for children to be separated from their parents” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 32).

“The lure of nightlife often overwhelmed her maternal instincts. Charlie ended up stashed with a series of questionable baby-sitters” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 34).

“She was arrested by state police on charges of grand larceny” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 34).

“She and Charlie . . . drifted to temporary lodgings” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 34).

“[A]fterward, Lewis had no interest in helping raise her son. He had no patience with Charlie. . . . He constantly criticized them both” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 35).

“Lewis was always yelling at him even when Charlie hadn’t done anything” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 36).

“During Charlie’s time at the Boys School, his mother was not often in touch with him and may not have visited her son at all” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 42).

“He had no nurturing father figure” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 46).

“Kathleen often battled her own demons at the expense of her son’s emotions security” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 46).

“Jails, courtrooms and prisons had been my life since I was twelve years old” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 21).

“My mom would come to see me sometimes, but not all that often. If she said she’d see me next week, I’d be lucky if she showed up in the next couple of months” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 36).

“At an age when most kids are going to nice schools, living with their parents and learning all about the better things in life, I was cleaning silage and tobacco juice out of my ass, recuperating from the wounds of a leather strap and learning to hate the world and everyone in it” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 45).

“I went back to being bitter and hating everyone. I had been bitter when my mom turned me over to the court when I was twelve years old. I hated her when she refused to let me stay with her after my first escape from Gibault. The bitterness I had learned at Plainfield never left me. And though I don’t blame her or feel bitter toward her now, my wife had the full brunt of my hate then” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 54).

“The psychiatrist noted ‘the marked degree of rejection, instability, and psychic trauma’ in Manson’s background. His sense of inferiority in relation to his mother was so pronounced . . . that he constantly felt it necessary ‘to suppress any thoughts about her’” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 193).

Behavioral characteristics.

Occupational, educational, and relational attainment.

“Charlie remained a poor student” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 30)

“He was enrolled in a local elementary school but seldom stayed in class” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 33).

“Charlie raised his general skills from a fourth to upper seventh grade level” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 45-46).

“He was a social outcast” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 51).

“Charlie was subsequently served with divorce papers; his marriage was over” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 58).

“[B]ut keeping a steady job seemed beyond him. In rapid order Charlie worked as a busboy, a bartender, a gas station attendant, and a frozen food locker clerk. Getting fired on a regular basis didn’t really bother him” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 62).

Childhood behavioral concerns.

“Little Charlie Manson was a disagreeable child” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 25).

“But even at such a young age he lied about everything and, when he got in trouble for telling fibs or breaking things or any of the other innumerable misdeeds he committed on a daily basis, Charlie always blamed somebody else for his actions” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 25).

“You couldn’t ever relax when Charlie was around. It was only a matter of time before he got up to something bad” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 25).

“[T]here was never anything happy about him. He never did anything that was good” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 25).

“He became fascinated by knives or anything else that was sharp. He enjoyed handling guns” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 31).

“[H]e was increasingly incorrigible” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 35).

“His behavior kept getting worse. Now he was stealing things, small items from stores and anything of value he could get his hands on at home. Whenever she caught and confronted Charlie, he never apologized. Instead, he insisted that someone else was to blame, usually her, sometimes Lewis. She didn’t give him enough, so he had to take things” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 36).

“Charlie kept cutting school” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 36).

“[B]egun running away from home for short periods” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 37).

“Charlie returned to Gibault, but ran away about ten months later. . . . Instead, demonstrating his precocious criminal skills, he broke into a few small stores at night and rifled cash registers” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 39).

“[T]he boys somehow got their hands on a gun and committed two armed robberies, one of a grocery store and the other at a casino” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 40).

“Charlie joined six other boys in an escape attempt from Plainfield. It wasn’t his first time; . . . he’d made four previous solo tries” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 42).

“[H]e is criminally sophisticated” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 45).

“The most notable skills Charlie exhibited as a child were criminal — he could steal cars, break into small businesses, rifle safes, and commit armed robberies” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 46).

“Since I had a problem with wetting the bed” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 35).

“I ran away constantly” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 43).

Psychopathological characteristics.

Psychopathy.

Boldness (e.g., narcissism, social dominance/manipulation, emotional stability, etc.).

“But Charlie had unwavering belief in his own talent” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 4).

“He seemed to believe that he held the power of life and death over his followers and friends” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 5).

““Anytime, anywhere, that Charlie decided to be the center of attention, he could be”” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 7).

“The child was also obsessed with being the center of attention. If he couldn’t get noticed for doing something right, he was just as willing to attract attention by misbehaving” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 25).

“When he wanted to be, no one was more charming or persuasive than little Charlie” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 33).

“One of the first things Kathleen noticed when she reunited with her son was that he tried to manipulate everyone, especially women. She realized that his interest in people was dictated by what they might be able to do for him” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 33).

“He felt that anything he wanted ought to be his no matter what” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 39).

“In dangerous situations where he could not protect himself in any other way, he would act out to convince potential assailants that he was crazy. Using speeches, grimaces, flapping arms, and other extreme facial expressions and gestures” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 42).

“Charlie also gave evidence of a desire to be dominant” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 43).

““This boy tries to give the impression that he is trying hard to adjust although he actually is not putting forth any effort in this respect”” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 43).

““He’d decide what he wanted [someone] to do and then talk about it so the girl or whoever would think that she thought of it and it was her idea”” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 59).

“Even though everything in his criminal past indicated otherwise, Charlie always believed that he was never going to be caught again” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 64).

“He wouldn’t talk to or even look at blacks if he didn’t have to, and the same things with the Latins. He just didn’t like them, didn’t think they were anywhere close to a white man’s

equal. . . . Charlie believed that all blacks were genetically inferior and most of them were dumb as rocks” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 74).

“Charlie’s considerable ego” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 95).

“Charlie always seemed to have knives ready. Sometimes he’d take Mary, Lynne, and Pat off into the woods and make one of them stand in front of a tree. Then he’d back up a few steps and throw a knife so it would stick in the tree just over her head, like some circus act. It scared them, but Charlie explained it was a way of testing whether they really trusted him” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 104).

“They would pretty much do anything with anybody if Charlie ordered them to” (Guinn, 2017, pgs. 106-107).

“This crazy man was about to murder him and Charlie wasn’t afraid” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 111).

“Charlie talked about how the Bible made it clear that women had to gladly submit to men. To prove his point, he ordered Lynne to get down on her knees and kiss his feet” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 125).

“Charlie was still Charlie, or occasionally Jesus Christ” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 135).

“The thing Charlie couldn’t risk was someone arguing with him, telling him he was wrong about anything, no matter how insignificant, in front of the others” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 140).

“[H]is disproportionate sense of self-importance and entitlement. Charlie believed that he had the right to do and have anything he wanted” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 167).

“Charlie often presented himself as the reincarnation of Jesus” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 181).

“Having followers hanging on his every word and gratefully doing his bidding also satisfied his obsession with being in charge” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 187).

“[T]here wasn’t anything better in life than having control over several women and letting them provide your every need” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 55).

“Everything I said seemed to impress those around me” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 103).

“And the more I hated the world . . . the more I began to like myself” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 144).

“There are days when I get caught up in being the most notorious convict of all time. In that frame of mind, I get off on all the publicity, and I’m pleased when some fool writes and offers to ‘off some pigs’ for me” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 226).

“Charles Manson had a tremendous drive to call attention to himself” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 201).

“Another characteristic I’d noticed while observing Manson in court was his cockiness” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 280).

“Women had only two purposes in life, Charlie would say: to serve men and to give birth to children” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 302).

“According to Charlie,’ Gregg continued, ‘women were only as good as their men. They were only a reflection of their men, all the way back to daddy. A woman was an accumulation of all the men she had been close to.’” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 302).

“One of Charlie’s basic creeds is that all that girls are for is to fuck” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 312).

“He wanted people to be afraid, and the more afraid the better” (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 318).

Meanness (e.g., lack of empathy, exploitation, aggressiveness, etc.).

“Manson had with him a retinue of girls who adored Charlie and were happy to engage in any form of sex his rock star benefactor desired” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 4).

“[B]ut the leech and his followers were making a considerable dent in Wilson’s personal fortune. . . . They’d wrecked his uninsured Mercedes and run up bills with doctors and dentists. They raided Wilson’s closets and cut up his clothes to make themselves patchwork robes . . . they gluttonously emptied Wilson’s refrigerator and pantry on a daily basis. They even felt his charge account was theirs to use” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 4).

“Charlie liked to start trouble and then let somebody else get blamed for it” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 31).

“Such experiences led him to develop an almost detached view of rape, whether suffered by himself or others. He said . . . , ‘You know, getting raped, they can just wipe that off . . . I don’t feel that someone got violated and it’s a terrible thing. I just thought clean it off, that’s all that is’” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 41).

“The boy was aggressively antisocial” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 43).

“[T]o act as a predator much more often than victim” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 45).

“[T]he talents that he possessed — imagination, glibness, and an uncanny ability . . . to manipulate others by perceiving and then exploiting their ambitions and weaknesses” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 95).

“[B]ut after a while all of them noticed that Mary Brunner always seemed to have a black eye. . . . Sometimes Charlie administered full-scale beatings to Mary, knocking her down and kicking her while she was on the floor” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 130).

“But never has he demonstrated any remorse or uttered a word of compassion for those lives taken in the madness he and his group shared. When questioned about his lack of remorse, Manson abruptly changes his attitude and aggressively defends himself:

‘Remorse for what? I didn’t kill those people!’ (Emmons, 1986, pg. 16).

“I pushed one of Jess’s dogs off the porch” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 33).

“The best part was, with all the willing and skilled help I came up with, I didn’t have to be at the scene of the crime” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 168).

“As I stepped over Crowe, I was aware that I had just killed a man, but had no feeling for remorse. I wasn’t sick or, at that moment, concerned about what the consequences of the shooting might be. Actually, all the pressure and tension left me; a feeling of strength surged through me. I felt good! Looking at Crowe’s friends, I could see fear in their faces, as if each expected to be the next victim. I delighted in their fear” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 181).

“Still, I felt no remorse for taking that life. I had been forced into it. Pulling that trigger didn’t mean any more to me than watching a cops-and-robbers movie, and if the police came after me, it was self-defense” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 182).

“I can’t put a finger on when I became devoid of caring emotion” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 202).

“The interviewer was in her late 20s, neither a beauty nor homely, but by the time Manson had talked to her for a while, she must have believed she was the most attractive woman on Earth. . . . He stood up and began massaging the back of the interviewer’s neck and shoulders. . . . Then, continuing the conversation, he casually reached across the table and picked up the cord of the tape recorder we were using. . . . Suddenly and menacingly, he

wrapped the cord around the woman's neck. . . . Manson applied some pressure on the cord and in an intimidating voice said, 'Whattaya think Emmons, should I take this little bitch's life?'" (Emmons, 1986, pg. 230).

"Jo Anne had the misfortune to meet Charles Manson, who introduced himself, complete with printed card, as 'President, 3-Star Enterprises, Nite Club, Radio and TV Productions.' Manson conned her into investing her savings in his nonexistent company; drugged and raped her roommate; and got Jo Anne pregnant" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 199).

"Apparently not finding Dianne submissive enough, Manson had, on various occasions: punched her in the mouth, kicked her across a room, hit her over the head with a chair leg, and whipped her with an electrical cord" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 277).

"Pressed as to whether all this killing bothered him, Manson replied that he had no conscience" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 497).

"I haven't got any guilt about anything because I have never been able to see any wrong" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 513).

"I'm a very selfish guy. I don't give a fuck for these girls. I'm only out for myself" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 527).

Disinhibition (e.g., impulsivity, etc.).

"He once held a knife to Wilson's throat and asked how the drummer would feel if he killed him" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 5).

"Jo Ann was making one of the beds when Charlie wandered into the room, brandishing a razor-sharp sickle he'd brought in from the yard. He deliberately got in Jo Ann's way. . . . Jo Ann glared at him and ordered Charlie to go outside. . . .[S]he shoved him out of the

room and through the screened back door. . . . Charlie screamed and slashed at the screen with the sickle; Jo Ann was certain that Charlie meant to use the blade on her once he got inside because he looked and sounded so crazy, completely out of control” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 31).

“Every so often he’d lose control and scream, and then even though he was just a kid, barely five feet tall and maybe sixty or sixty-five pounds, he still scared Kathleen with his crazy eyes” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 36).

“But there was also something in Charlie that consistently led him to act out in ways completely against his own self-interest” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 46).

“Maybe he’d beaten her a few times; when he got frustrated with life he sometimes turned mean — he knew that he needed to control his temper better” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 55).

“[H]e had trouble controlling himself” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 57).

“Charlie expected rapt devotion and he could become angry if he thought that girls didn’t pay attention when he talked or, worse, paid attention to someone else at Charlie’s expense. Whenever he thought that happened he would yank hard on Lynne’s or Pat’s long hair. He’d hit Mary” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 106).

“At one point he took out his frustration on Watkins, lunging at him and wrapping his hands around his throat. It was no bluff; Charlie intended to strangle his follower to death. . . . Watkins decided that ‘death is Charlie’s trip,’ and that although Charlie preached about love, all he really wanted to do was kill people” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 210).

“Charlie pulled a handgun, pointed it at him, and asked, ‘What would you do if I pulled the trigger? . . . Jakobson was convinced that Charlie’s ‘main thing’ was fear, not love” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 211).

“But Charlie, faced with the end of his rock star dreams, screeched, ‘Don’t draw on me, motherfucker,’ and began . . . ‘to beat the shit out of [Starr]’” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 223).

“[W]henever Charlie felt frustrated he always seemed to beat up women” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 297).

“‘[G]rabbed me by the hair like that, and he put a knife by my throat, and then he says, ‘Don’t you know I’m the one who is doing all the killings?’” (Guinn, 2017, pgs. 370-371).

“He grabbed a sharpened pencil and leaped over the counsel table in the direction of Older” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 371).

Other personality disorders.

“[H]e mostly demonstrated ‘a tendency toward moodiness and a persecution complex’” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 38).

“[P]rofessed no trust in anyone” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 41).

“Prison psychiatrists diagnose Manson as suffering from paranoia and schizophrenia, and Manson himself accepts that diagnosis, explaining, ‘Sure I’m paranoid. I’ve had reason to be ever since I can remember. As for schizophrenia, take anybody off the streets and put them in the middle of a prison yard and you’ll see all kinds of split personalities” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 229).

Paraphilic interests.

Sexual sadism.

“[I]n January Charlie was caught sodomizing another boy while holding a razor blade to his victim’s throat” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 45).

“Then Charlie mastered the women sexually, both to establish his dominance and to assure himself that they would be willing to give themselves to anyone in any way at Charlie’s command. . . . From there, Charlie indulged his varied appetites” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 133).

“Once, when he found himself alone with the girl and she refused to have sex with him, Charlie pulled a knife and said, ‘You know, I could cut you up in little pieces’” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 168).

“If a girl refused to do something . . . Charlie punished her, sometimes by making her strip naked in front of everyone else and then ridiculing her” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 183).

“The only climax I’d ever had was from jacking-off or sticking some punk in the butt. Having a wet dream wasn’t even possible for me; I’d never had the real thing so I had to finish my dream I started by hand. Still, between the stories of others and my own imagination, I had strong sexual urges, urges that got me in trouble several times. A prison psychiatrist labeled me as having homosexual tendencies. So I was supposed to be some kind of freak. But, hey, I just went for sex the only way it had ever been taught to me. I didn’t have any respect for a joint punk then and I don’t now” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 47).

“A lot of stories go around about forced sodomy and oral copulation in prisons and reform schools. There is some of it happening; I mean, out-and-out rape. I experienced it and I’m still ashamed to cop to it. Most of the sex is by mutual agreement, but however it comes

down, those things are printed in a convict's prison record and are with him for the rest of his life. . . . I was accused of holding a razor blade to the kid's throat while I screwed him in the ass. Truth was, the guy was an undercover queer and wanted a dick in in his ass, and I didn't mind doing it to him. We both agreed that if we got caught, he could say I forced him. We got caught. I was not only listed as a homosexual, but one with assaultive tendencies. That kid knew I didn't force him, and I knew it, but I got the reputation and before long I did put a razor to a kid's throat" (Emmons, 1986, pg. 47).

"Even our sex became more of an angered lust" (Emmons, 1986, pg. 218).

"[H]e took a razor blade and held it against another boy's throat while he sodomized him" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 194).

"Oh, both would be tied up, Susan said. Only this time the rope would be around their necks and their feet, so they couldn't get away 'like the others.' Then, Susan continued, she would castrate Burton, placing his penis, as well as Elizabeth Taylor's eyes, in a bottle. . . . As for Tom Jones, another of her intended victims, she planned to force him to have sex with her, at knife point, and then, just as he was climaxing, she would slit his throat" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pgs. 488-489).

Other paraphilic interests.

"[H]e committed 'eight serious disciplinary offenses, three involving homosexual acts'" (Guinn, 2017, pg. 45).

"Charlie and Rosalie applied for a marriage license. . . . Charlie incorrectly gave his birthdate as November 11, 1933, making himself a year older than his actual age of twenty, and

Rosalie claimed to be seventeen, though some in modern-day McMechen believe that she was two years younger” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 52).

“Ruth Ann . . . was . . . an irresistible little bit of jailbait. . . . They managed to have sex a few times before her mother sicced the law on Charlie” (Guinn, 2017, pgs. 98-99).

“[H]e was intrigued by Dianne Lake, a fourteen-year-old girl. . . . Though he felt obligated to spread his sexual favors among the other women, for the next year Dianne would be by far his most frequent partner” (Guinn, 2017, pgs. 128-129).

“Other times, Charlie served as director, telling each participant what he or she would do, and with whom” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 139).

“Group sex was completely orchestrated by Charlie. He would specify who would do what and with whom” (Guinn, 2017, pg. 179).

“Thoughts went through my mind about what an inadequate person I must be if the girl not only brought home another lover but seemed to get more out of that session than ours” (Emmons, 1986, pg. 89).

“In looking back, I think I can honestly say our philosophy — fun and games, love and sex, friendship for everyone — began changing into the madness that eventually engulfed us in that house. . . . Though I was welcomed to the house by hearty hugs, good music, and passionate kisses, I have bad vibes about being there and staying longer. Yet I stayed. And though I would often leave in the weeks to come, I would also return. Each time I returned, I would observe and listen to all of the practices and rituals of the different groups that visited the place. I’m not into sacrificing some animal or drinking its blood to get a better charge out of sex. Nor am I into chaining someone and whipping them to get

my kicks like some of those people were. Still, through the drugs and listening to the ways a particular leader or guru maneuvered his people, some of their rap may have become embedded in my subconscious. Planting fear in their people is the way a lot of leaders keep control. At the time, love and doing our own thing was what held us together and that's the way I wanted everything to be, but at a later date, the things I was exposed to at the Staircase may have come back to me" (Emmons, 1986, pg. 123).

"What is it you want, a dick in your ass or in your mouth?" He wanted both, so after that I visited his dressing room on a regular basis" (Emmons, 1986, pg. 132).

"Just for the joy of doing it, I wanted to see how she would react to a solo performance in front of a live audience" (Emmons, 1986, pg. 186).

"[H]e had committed eight serious disciplinary offenses, three involving homosexual acts. His progress report, if it could be called that, stated, 'Manson definitely has homosexual and assaultive tendencies'" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 194).

"Since fourteen, Charles Manson's only sexual contacts had been homosexual" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 195).

"He asked me if I had ever made love with my father. I looked at him and kind of giggled and I said, 'No.' And he said, 'Have you ever thought about making love with your father?' I said, 'Yes.' And he told me, 'All right, when you are making love . . . picture in your mind that I am your father'" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 236).

"Why didn't Manson pick up the girls himself? I asked. 'He was too old for most of the girls' Once Charlie, through the connivance of an older woman who posed as

Watkins' mother, even had him arrange a phony registration at a Los Angeles high school so he could be closer to the action" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 317).

"Charlie would direct the orgy, arranging bodies, combinations, positions" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 317).

"If a person indicated reluctance to engage in a certain act, Manson would force that person to commit it. Male-female, female-female, male-male, intercourse, cunnilingus, fellatio, sodomy — there could be no inhibitions of any kind. One thirteen-year-old girl's initiation into the Family consisted of her being sodomized by Manson while the others watched" (Bugliosi & Gentry 1974, pgs. 317-318).

"Fear turns Charlie on" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 319).

"The evidence will show Charles Manson to be a megalomaniac who coupled his insatiable thirst for power with an intense obsession for violent death" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 413).

"Death is Charlie's trip" (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974, pg. 498).

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study sought to examine shared characteristics between cultic violence and sexual homicide — including, but not limited to, offender characteristics between charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults and sexual murderers — in an attempt to establish a possible universal motivation for cultic violence that supersedes previously-accepted individualistic motivations. In spite of a severe lack of empirical research on charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults and cultic violence, available empirical research indicates that shared characteristics exist (e.g., presence of environmental “triggers,” etc.) between cultic violence and sexual homicide — including, but not limited to, offender characteristics between charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults and sexual murderers —, indicating that cultic violence may be the result of an unrecognized universal motivation for sexual gratification rather than various individualized motivations (Carter et al., 2017; Ressler et al., 1992).

As a result of such empirical research, it was hypothesized that numerous similarities will exist between offense and offender characteristics of sexual homicide and cultic violence, as well as between sexual murderers and charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults; consequently, it was also hypothesized that cultic violence will be sexually-motivated. The in-depth analysis of offense and offender characteristics exhibited by Charles Manson and the Manson Family exhibit support for this contention, as Charles Manson exhibits all of the commonly-identified offender characteristics identified in sexual murderers and the Manson Family exhibits a majority of commonly-identified offense characteristics identified in sexual homicide; Charles Manson and

the Manson Family, in fact, exhibited 93.7 percent of the identified sexual homicide-related offense and offender characteristics, indicating that sexual motivation is likely a motivational factor for the perpetration of cultic violence.

Conclusions

While the mere identification of shared characteristics between sexual homicide and cultic violence is necessary, further explanation is necessary to understand the implications of such shared characteristics within a motivational context; as such, it is also necessary to examine such shared characteristics exhibited by Charles Manson, the Manson Family, and the Tate/LaBianca slayings with regard to the Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide, as proposed by Burgess et al. (1986), and the Incentive-Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide, as proposed by Toates et al. (2017).

Ineffective social environment. The development of a sexual murderer, according to such motivational models, begins at a young age, often with the failure of the child to form a secure parent-child attachment to at least one parental figure (Burgess et al., 1986). It is evident that, in examining Manson's childhood, that Manson was never able to form a secure attachment to his mother, his father, or to a substitute parental figure; Manson's childhood, in fact, was characterized by his father's pre-birth abandonment and his mother's incarceration — upon release, Manson's mother continued to choose an irresponsible lifestyle over Manson's well-being, leaving Manson with unknown individuals while she caroused —, as well as a lack of mentorship within the numerous correctional institutions to which he was placed (Guinn, 2017).

In addition to the absence of a secure parent-child attachment, Manson also experienced high levels of childhood abuse, such as physical punishment (e.g., beatings), verbal abuse (e.g.,

Luther's detestation), emotional abuse, (e.g., Uncle Bill's requirement that Manson wear a dress to school as punishment), and sexual abuse (e.g., rape; Guinn, 2017). Manson, as a result, became a social outcast upon his return to McMechen from correctional supervision, forming little-to-no friendships; Manson was, however, able to form a sole romantic/sexual relationship in the years prior to the formation of the Family, though this occurred after years of practicing homosexual assault for sexual gratification and with a young woman that was many years his junior (Guinn, 2017). While Manson had the ability, for a time, to form such a relationship, it quickly evaporated, as Manson and Rosalie were soon divorced; similar occurrences happened throughout his life, such as an additional divorce and the desertion of numerous followers to a fellow guru (Guinn, 2017).

Formative events. Empirical research suggests that abused children — specifically, children with an insecure parent-child attachment and few meaningful social relationships — tend to establish fantastical content to process, address, and cope with victimization; oftentimes, this fantastical content contains the external enactment of victimization-related fantasies and the formation of deviant sexual interests that are associated with the experienced victimization (Burgess et al., 1986; Toates et al., 2017).

Without the proper coping skills or social relationships required to resolve such trauma, Manson withdrew, isolating himself in a psychological state of hostility that encouraged reliance upon fantastical content; Manson's fantastical content, as empirical research indicates, centered upon the external enactment of victimization-related fantasies, the formation of victimization-related deviant sexual interests (Burgess et al., 1986; Guinn, 2017; Toates et al., 2017). In this fantastical state, Manson learned to both manipulate and to aggress against a world that had, in

his opinion, “wronged him;” Manson, as a result, victimized young males in a manner that mirrored his own sexual victimization (i.e., forceful sodomization) and, eventually, came to view sexuality and aggression as indistinguishable experiences (Guinn, 2017).

Patterned responses. As a result of childhood abuse and the subsequent lack of secure parent-child attachment, social relationships, and appropriate coping methods, Manson began to exhibit critical personality traits (e.g., manipulateness, rebelliousness, aggressiveness, isolation, deceptiveness, etc.), as evidenced in his budding criminality (e.g., shoplifting, robbery, automotive theft, etc.; Guinn, 2017). These critical personality traits — many of which mirrored traits associated with psychopathy — remained uncorrected; eventually, these critical personality traits developed into disordered cognitive patterns that centered around narcissism, entitlement, and self-preservation and, as such, encouraged Manson’s evolution from a petty criminal into the ringleader of the Tate/LaBianca slayings (Burgess et al., 1986; Guinn, 2017).

Actions toward others. In addition to the presence of distorted cognitive patterns toward narcissism, entitlement, and self-preservation, Manson’s ability to evade punishment, whether by his parental figures or by the correctional system, further reinforced Manson’s unfavorable acts and behaviors (e.g., sexual assault, automotive theft, lying; Guinn, 2017). Without appropriate punishment, Manson learned to regard such criminal and manipulative acts as acceptable, as evidenced in his later belief in the absence of “right” and “wrong” (Guinn, 2017).

Feedback filter. Manson, in justifying such a reliance upon fantastical content, claimed that the world was unjust and, as such, failed to provide what was entitled to him, indicating that Manson’s fantastical content provided an escape from or control over such perceived injustices (Burgess et al., 1986; Guinn, 2017). Manson, for instance, fantasized about murdering affluent

individuals (e.g., celebrities, upper-class individuals) in the middle of the night and, specifically, leaving a grotesque scene that would lead to widespread panic throughout the U.S (Guinn, 2017).

Manson, however, became desensitized to this stimuli and, as such, required increased arousal to achieve the same level of gratification. As a result, he engaged in “behavioral tryouts” — in this case, “creepy crawling” expeditions of increasing volatility — that precipitated and, eventually, facilitated the external manifestation of Manson’s fantastical content in the form of the Tate/LaBianca slayings (Guinn, 2017); through the perpetration of numerous “behavioral tryouts” and murders, Manson was able to increasingly perfect the external manifestation (i.e., murders), thereby making the external manifestations as identical as possible to the long-held fantastical content (Guinn, 2017).

Implications

As the Motivational Model of Sexual Homicide indicates, Manson exhibits similar formative experiences — specifically with regard to familial instability, childhood abuse, psychopathy, and fantasy — to sexual murderers (Burgess et al., 1986; Guinn, 2017). Manson’s similar formative experiences, however, merely indicate that Manson may have been disposed to the perpetration of sexually-motivated criminal offenses. It is, then, necessary to examine the implications of such formative experiences within the examined criminal offense (i.e., Tate/LaBianca slayings) in furtherance of a universal motivation for cultic violence.

An examination of the events of August 9, 1969 and August 10, 1969 indicate that the Tate/LaBianca murders contain indications of sexually-motivated acts that, while unprovable, illustrate the existence of commonly-identified characteristics of sexual homicide.

In order to identify such commonly-identified characteristics, it is necessary to establish certain facts that, once understood, facilitate the identification of Manson's influence: (1) Charles "Tex" Watson, Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel, and Linda Kasabian received instructions and suggestions from Charles Manson (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974); (2) Charles Manson — the origin of the homicides — did not perpetrate the Tate/LaBianca murders and, as a consequence, the Tate/LaBianca murders contain elements of organization (i.e., Manson) and disorganization (i.e., the Family) that erroneously obscure the sexual-related motivation as Helter Skelter-related.

In an examination of the Tate/LaBianca murders, for instance, multiple aspects of disorganization, such as the presence of fingerprints and the spontaneity of violence, are present; however, upon close examination, the Tate/LaBianca murders contain multiple aspects of organization, such as the use of restraints, premeditated victim selection, and the use of personal weapons (Guinn, 2017). The Tate/LaBianca murders, in addition, contain typical elements of sexual homicide, such as extremely high levels of visible overkill, a reliance upon asphyxia-related bondage (e.g., hanging of Sharon Tate), and the brutalization of genitalia (e.g., extensive stabbing of Rosemary LaBianca's buttocks; Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974).

Further examination of the Tate/LaBianca murders indicates that Manson, following the perpetration of the Tate murders, returned to the crime scene, alone. Despite being well-accepted that Manson returned to employ forensic countermeasures, the presence of numerous footprints, fingerprints, and objects of monetary value suggest otherwise (Guinn, 2017). While Manson did engage in minimal forensic countermeasures, Manson, rather than removing the majority of such evidence, placed a towel over Jay Sebring's face; this act suggests that Manson wanted attention to be focused on Sharon Tate, the scantily clad, attractive actress that lay mere feet away from

Sebring (Bugliosi & Gentry, 1974; Guinn, 2017). In addition to Manson's appearance at the Tate residence, Manson participated in the bondage of the LaBianca's, leaving only when it came time for murder. Such appearances — the majority of which occurred when no other individuals were present — indicate that Manson was invested in participating and in seeing the aftermath of his ordered murders; it seems reasonable to suggest that, in instances when no other individuals were present, Manson may have engaged in masturbation or other forms of sexual gratification.

Due to the overwhelming number of organized and sexually-related characteristics within the Tate/LaBianca murders, it is reasonable to posit that the relative spontaneity (i.e., sloppiness) of the Tate/LaBianca murders does not indicate a non-sexual motivation, but rather indicates that the disorganized perpetrators (i.e., the Family) of the Tate/LaBianca murders were pawns in an organized offender's (i.e., Manson's) attempt to perpetrate sexual homicide. There is, arguably, no greater form of power — and, in this case, sexual gratification — than the ability to order the homicides of seven individuals and, concurrently, the knowledge that five individuals are willing to sacrifice their values, beliefs, morals, innocence, freedom, and, most importantly, life for the vicarious sexual gratification of another.

Recommendations

The current study sought to expand information on and knowledge of cultic violence, specifically with regard to the motivational facets of cultic violence. Law enforcement, facing an unprecedented number of unsolved homicides with unknown motives and an equally abundant amount of fringe religious groups (e.g., Scientology, etc.), has the opportunity to utilize such expanded knowledge within the investigative realm.

Through the retroactive application of the proposed understanding that sexual homicide, in some instances, may be committed by proxy — and, therefore, exhibit mixed characteristics (e.g., organized and disorganized) of criminal sophistication —, law enforcement may be able to identify previously-unidentified instances of sexual homicide (e.g., Tate/LaBianca murders) and, more importantly, recognize such characteristics within current and future investigations, thereby improving homicidal clearance rates.

Most importantly, however, is the proactive application of such a proposed understanding of sexual homicide and cultic violence. Destructive religious cults, although rare, have wreaked havoc on U.S. society; the Tate/LaBianca murders, the Jonestown Massacre, the Waco siege, and the Heaven’s Gate “Away Team” — and the hundreds of deaths associated with them — are the products of cultic violence. With an unknown number of religious cults active within the U.S., law enforcement, prior to the current study, faced an unknown enemy. In better understanding the formation of and characteristics of destructive religious cults, law enforcement has the improved ability to identify possible destructive religious cults prior to the perpetration of violence, thereby preventing future instances of cultic violence and, consequently, increasing general public safety.

Future Research

While an overwhelming amount of empirical research has been conducted on sexual homicide, there is a significant lack of empirical research on religious cults, destructive religious cults, and cultic violence; the research that does exist on cult-related topics, however, can not be considered recent, with most studies originating in the 1980s and 1990s. Despite interest in cult-related phenomena fading in the previous two decades, cult-related phenomena have not faded; it is only a matter of time before another Charles Manson emerges. It is, therefore, necessary to

further explore the formation of and characteristics of religious cults, destructive religious cults, cultic violence, charismatic leaders of destructive religious cults, and followers of destructive religious cults. Such empirical research may lead to the identification of a destructive religious cult prior to the perpetration of cultic violence and, therefore, saves the lives of many.

With regard to the identification of a possible universal sexual motivation for cultic violence, further research should continue to utilize a case study format to examine additional charismatic leaders and their respective destructive religious cults (e.g., Jim Jones and the Peoples Temple, Shoko Asahara and Aum Shinrikyo, Marshall Applewhite and Heaven's Gate, David Koresh and the Branch Davidians, etc.) for characteristics related to sexual homicide. If such examinations exhibit a pattern of high levels of sexual homicide-related characteristics, the possibility of sexually-motivated cultic violence is supported; all information, regardless of support for the proposed hypotheses in the current study, is useful for the improved motivational understanding of cultic violence and, as such, contribute to the safety of the nation.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- Atanasijević, T., Jovanović, A. A., Nikolić, S., Popović, V., & Jašović-Gašić, M. (2009). Accidental death due to complete autoerotic asphyxia associated with transvestic fetishism and anal self-stimulation - Case report. *Psychiatria Danubina*, *21*(2), 246-251.
- Cal. Penal Code §187-188
- Beauregard, E. (2019). Sexual homicide: The need for an international examination of the crime scene. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *63*(9), 1503-1516. doi: 10.1177/0306624X19839959
- Beauregard, E., & DeLisi, M. (2018). Unraveling the personality profile of the sexual murderer. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1-21. doi: 10.1177/0886260518777012
- Beauregard, E., & Martineau, M. (2012). A descriptive study of sexual homicide in Canada: Implications for police investigation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *57*(12), 1454-1476. doi: 10.1177/0306624X12456682
- Beauregard, E., & Proulx, J. (2002). Profiles in the offending process of nonserial sexual murderers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *46*(4), 386-399. doi: 10.1177/0306624X02464002
- Ben-Sasson, A., & Podoly, T. Y. (2020). Sensory habituation as a shared mechanism for sensory over-responsivity and obsessive-compulsive symptoms. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, *14*, 1-13. doi: 10.3389/fnint.2020.00017

- Briken, P., Habermann, N., Kafka, M. P., Berner, W., & Hill, A. (2006). The paraphilia-related disorders: An investigation of the relevance of the concept in sexual murderers. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 51*(3), 683-688. doi: 10.1111/j.1556-4029.2006.00105.x
- Bugliosi, V., & Gentry, C. (1974). *Helter skelter: The true story of the Manson murders*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Burgess, A. W., Hartman, C. R., Ressler, R. K., Douglas, J. E., & McCormack, A. (1986). Sexual homicide: A motivational model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1*, 251-272. doi: 0.1177/088626086001003001
- Burke, J. (2006). Antisocial personality disorder in cult leaders and induction of dependent personality disorder in cult members. *Cultic Studies Review, 5*(3), 390-410.
- Carter, A. J., Hollin, C. R., Stefanska, E. B., Higgs, T., & Bloomfield, S. (2017). *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 61*(14), 1554-1569. doi: 10.1177/0306624X16630313
- Chan, H. C., & Beauregard, E. (2016). Non-homicidal and homicidal sexual offenders: Prevalence of maladaptive personality traits and paraphilic behaviors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*(13), 2259-2290. doi: 10.1177/0886260515575606
- Chan, H. C., & Heide, K. M. (2009). Sexual homicide: A synthesis of the literature. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 10*(1), 31-54. doi: 10.1177/1524838008326478
- Chan, H. C., & Heide, K. M. (2016). Sexual homicide offenders distinguished from non-homicidal sexual offenders: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 31*, 147-156. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2016.09.002

- Chopin, J., & Beauregard, E. (2019). The sexual murderer is a distinct type of offender. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(9), 1597-1620. doi: 10.1177/0306624X18817445
- Cummins, R. G., & Berke, C. K. (2017). Excitation transfer via instant replay in the microstructure of broadcast sport. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 10(4), 468-486. doi: 10.1123/ijsc.2017-0061
- Darjee, R. (2019). Sexual sadism and psychopathy in sexual homicide offenders: An exploration of their associates in a clinical sample. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 63(9), 1738-1765. doi: 10.1177/0306624X19836872
- Dawson, L. L. (1998). *Comprehending cults: The sociology of new religious movements*. Ontario, Canada: Oxford University Press.
- Dayan, H. (2018). Sexual abuse and charismatic cults. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 41, 25-31. doi: 10.1016.j.avb.2018.04.004
- Douglas, J., Burgess, A., Burgess, A., & Ressler, R. (2013). *Crime classification manual* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Douglas, J. & Olshaker, M. (2000). *The cases that haunt us*. New York, NY: Pocket Star Books.
- Emmons, N. (1986). *Manson in his own words: The shocking confessions of "the most dangerous man alive."* New York, NY: Grove Press.
- Galanter, M. (1999). *Cults: Faith, healing, and coercion*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Geberth, V. J. (2010). *Sex-related homicide and death investigation: Practical and clinical perspectives* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

- Groth, A. N., Burgess, A. W., & Holmstrom, L. L. (1977). Rape: Power, anger, and sexuality. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *134*(11), 1239-1243. doi: 10.1176/ajp.134.11.1239
- Guinn, J. (2017). *The road to Jonestown: Jim Jones and the Peoples Temple*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- Hancock, J. T., Woodworth, M. T., & Porter, S. (2013). Hungry like the wolf: A word-pattern analysis of the language of psychopaths. *Legal and Criminal Psychology*, *18*, 102-114. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8333.2011.02025.x
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised* (2nd ed.). Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hare, R. D. (2006). Psychopathy: A clinical and forensic overview. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, *29*(3), 709-724. doi: 10.1016/j.psc.2006.04.007
- Hare, R. D. (2016). Psychopathy, the PCL-R, and criminal justice: Some new findings and current issues. *Canadian Psychology*, *57*(1), 21-34. doi: 10.1037/cap0000041
- Hazelwood, R. R., & Warren, J. I. (2000). The sexually violent offender: Impulsive or ritualistic? *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *5*(3), 267-279. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(99)00002-6
- Healey, J., Beauregard, E., Beech, S., & Vettor, S. (2016). Is the sexual murderer a unique type of offender? A typology of violence sexual offenders using crime scene behaviors. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, *28*(6), 512-533. doi: 10.1177/1079063214547583
- Higgs, T., Carter, A. J., Tully, R. J., & Browne, K. D. (2017). Sexual murder typologies: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *35*, 1-12. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2017.05.004

- Hill, A., Habermann, N. C., Berner, W., & Briken, P. (2007). Sexual sadism and sadistic personality disorder in sexual homicide. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 20*(6), 671-684. doi: 10.1521/pedi.2006.20.6.671
- House, R. J. (1976). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. *Working Paper Series 76-06*.
- Hume, L. (1996). A reappraisal of the term 'cult' and consideration of 'danger markers' in charismatic religious groups. *Colloquium, 28*(1), 35-52.
- James, J., & Proulx, J. (2014). A psychological and developmental profile of sexual murderers: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*(5), 592-607. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2014.08.003
- James, J., & Proulx, J. (2016). The modus operandi of serial and nonserial sexual murderers: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 31*, 200-218. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2016.09.006
- Karia, S., De Sousa, A., Shah, N., & Sonavane, S. (2015). Compulsive masturbation in a patient with delusional disorder. *Journal of Mental Health and Human Behavior, 20*(1), 38-40. doi: 10.4103/0971-8990.164825
- Kavish, N., Boisvert, D., Wells, J., Lewis, R., Cooke, E., Woeckener, M., & Armstrong, T. (2019). On the associations between indicators of resting arousal levels, physiological reactivity, sensation seeking, and psychopathic traits. *Personality and Individual Differences, 141*, 218-225. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2019.01.013
- Keppel, R. D., & Walter, R. (1999). Profiling killers: A revised classification model for understanding sexual murder. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 43*(4), 417-437. doi: 10.1177/0306624X99434002

- Kerr, K. J., & Beech, A. R. (2015). A thematic analysis of the motivation of sexual homicide from the perspective of the killer. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*(20), 2464-3489. doi:10.1177/0886260515585529
- Kerr, K. J., Beech, A. R., & Murphy, D. (2013). Sexual homicide: Definition, motivation, and comparison with other forms of sexual offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*(1), 1-10. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.05.006
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Mothes, C., & Polavin, N. (2017). Confirmation bias, ingroup bias, and negativity bias in selective exposure to political information. *Communication Research, 47*(1), 104-124. doi: 10.1177/0093650217719596
- Langevin, R. (2003). A study of the psychosexual characteristics of sex killers: Can we identify them before it is too late? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 47*(4), 366-382. doi: 10.1177/0306624X03253848
- Levenson, J. S., & Grady, M. D. (2016). The influence of childhood trauma on sexual violence and sexual deviance in adulthood. *Traumatology, 22*(2), 94-103. doi: 10.1037/trm0000067
- Luo, S. & Zhang, X. (2018). Embodiment and humiliation moderation of neural responses to others' suffering in female submissive BDSM practitioners. *Frontiers in Neuroscience, 12*, 1-11. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2018.00463
- Marcus, R. F., & Kramer, C. (2001). Reactive and proactive aggression: Attachment and social competence predictors. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 162*(3), 260-275. doi: 10.1080/00221320109597483

Meloy, J. R. (2000). The nature and dynamics of sexual homicide: An integrative review.

Aggression and Violent Behavior, 5(1), 1-22. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(99)00006-3

Meloy, J. R., Gacono, C. B., & Kenney, L. (1994). A Rorschach investigation of sexual

homicide. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 62(1), 58-67. doi: 10.1207/

s15327752jpa6201_6

Melton, J. G. (1986). *Encyclopedic handbook of cults in America*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc.

Mjanes, K., Beauregard, E., & Martineau, M. (2017). Revisiting the organized/disorganized

model of sexual homicide. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44(12), 1604-1619. doi:

10.1177/0093854817736554

Navarro, J., & Poynter, T. S. (2014). *Dangerous personalities: An FBI profiler shows you how to identify and protect yourself from harmful people*. New York, NY: Rodale.

People v. Davis, 872 P.2D 591 (Cal. 1994)

Peterson, C., Florence, C., & Klevens, J. (2018). The economic burden of child maltreatment in the United States. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 86, 178-183. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.

2018.09.018

Pettigrew, M. (2019). The sexually sadistic properties of necrophilia, in the context of serial

killings, a case study. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*. doi: 10.1007/

s11896-019-09326-5

Porter, S., & Woodworth, M. (2007). "I'm sorry I did it...but he started it:" A comparison of the official and self-reported homicide descriptions of psychopaths and non-psychopaths.

Law and Human Behavior, 31(1), 91-107. doi: 10.1007/s10979-006-9033-0

- Porter, S., Woodworth, M., Earle, J., Drugge, J., & Boer, D. (2003). Characteristics of sexual homicides committed by psychopathic and nonpsychopathic offenders. *Law and Human Behavior, 27*(5), 459-470. doi: 10.1023/a:1025461421791
- Prentky, R., Burgess, A., Rokous, F., Lee, A., Hartman, C., Ressler, R., & Douglas, J. (1989). The presumptive role of fantasy in serial sexual homicide. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 146*(7), 887-891.
- Ramsland, K. (2016). *Confession of a serial killer: The untold story of Dennis Rader, the BTK killer*. Lebanon, New Hampshire: ForeEdge.
- Ressler, R. K., Burgess, A. W., & Douglas, J. E. (1992). *Sexual homicide: Patterns and motives*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Ressler, R. K., Burgess, A. W., Douglas, J. E., Hartman, C. R., & D'Agostino, R. B. (1986). Sexual killers and their victims: Identifying patterns through crime scene analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1*(3), 288-308. doi:10.1177/088626086001003003
- Ritblatt, S. N., & Longstreth, S. (2019). Understanding young children's play: Seeing behavior through the lens of attachment theory. *Young Children, 74*(2), 78-84.
- Robbins, T. (1984). Constructing cultist "mind control." *Sociological Analysis, 45*(3), 241-256. doi: 10.2307/3711480
- Schlesinger, L. (2007). Sexual homicide: Differentiating catathymic and compulsive murders. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*, 242-256. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2006.09.007
- Schlesinger, L., Kassen, M., Mesa, B., Pinizzotto, A. (2010). Ritual and signature in serial sexual homicide. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 38*(2), 239-246.

- Sewall, L. A., Krupp, D. B., & Lalumière, M. L. (2013). A test of two typologies of sexual homicide. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 25*(1), 82-100. doi: 10.1177/1079063212452617
- Scotland, N. A. D. (1987). Toward an analysis of cult. *Themelios, 13*(1), 21-25.
- Sirkin, M. I. (1990). Cult involvement: A systems approach to assessment and treatment. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 27*(1), 116-123. doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.27.1.116
- Sleep, C. E., Weiss, B., Lynam, D. R., & Miller, J. D. (2019). An examination of the Triarchic Model of psychopathy's nomological network: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 71*, 1-26. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2019.04.005
- Smid, W. J., & Wever, E. C. (2018). Mixed emotions: An incentive motivational model of sexual homicide. *Sexual Abuse, 0*(00), 1-34. doi: 10.1177/1079063218775972
- Stefanska, E. B., Higgs, T., Carter, A. J., & Beech, A. R. (2017). When is a murder a sexual murder? Understanding the sexual element in the classification of sexual killings. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 50*, 53-61. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.03.004
- Stefanska, E. B., Nitschke, J., Carter, A. J., & Mokros, A. (2019). Sadism among sexual homicide offenders: Validation of the sexual sadism scale. *Psychological Assessment, 31*(1), 132-137. doi: 10.1037/pas0000653
- Steele, E. H., & McKinney, C. (2019). Emerging adult psychological problems and parenting style: Moderation by parent-child relationship quality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 146*, 201-208. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2018.04.048

- Sturup, J., Rodre, S., Karlberg, D., von Vogelsang, E., Rying, M., & Caman, S. (2019). Male-on-female sexual homicides in Sweden, 1990 to 2013: A population-based controlled study of incidents, victims, and offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *63*(9), 1557-1574. doi: 10.1177/0306624X18786609
- Toates, F., Smid, W., & van den Berg, J. W. (2017). A framework for understanding sexual violence: Incentive-motivation and hierarchical control. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *34*, 238-253. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2017.01.001
- U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division. (2017). *Uniform Crime Report: Crime in the United States, 2017*. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2017/crime-in-the-u.s.-2017>
- Whiteway, K. (2004). A guide to the literature of Jack the Ripper. *Canadian Law Library Review*, *29*(5), 219-229.
- Zhu, W., Chen, Y., & Xia, L. (2020). Childhood maltreatment and aggression: The mediating roles of hostile attribution bias and anger rumination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *162*, 110007. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2020.110007

Appendix

Primary Checklist

Offense Characteristics

PRE-CRIME CHARACTERISTICS

Stressful Environmental Stimuli (“Triggers”)

Negative Interpersonal/Positive Intrapersonal “Frame of Mind”

Intentional Planning

Behavioral Pattern of Ascending Proclivity (“Build Up”)

CRIME CHARACTERISTICS

Ritualism

Power, Control, & Domination

Rage & Revenge

Degradation & Humiliation

Sexual Fixation

POST-CRIME CHARACTERISTICS

Disposal/Revisitation of Victim’s Body

“Trophies” or “Souvenirs”

Proactive Involvement in Criminal Investigation

Offender Characteristics

BIOGRAPHICAL CHARACTERISTICS

ENVIRONMENTAL CHARACTERISTICS (“CHILDHOOD”)

Childhood Abuse

Insecure Parent-Child Attachment/Familial Instability

BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS

Occupational, Educational, and Relational Attainment

Childhood Behavioral Concerns

PSYCHOPATHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Psychopathy

Boldness (Emotional Stability, Narcissism)

Meanness (Lack of Empathy, Exploitativeness, Aggressiveness)

Disinhibition (Impulsivity)

Other Personality Disorders (e.g., Paranoid)

Paraphilic Interests

Sexual Sadism

Other Paraphilic Interests