



PROFILING CRIMINAL PROFILING

Y. Hope Osborn
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
May 2012

Author Note

This paper was prepared for Rhetoric 3326, taught by Dr. Bruce Hass.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
DEFINITION	2
HISTORY	3
USES	4
PROFILERS	5
SCIENTIFIC BASIS	6
LEGAL IMPLICATIONS	7
POSITION IN SUPPORT OF CRIMINAL PROFILING	9
POSITION IN OPPOSITION TO CRIMINAL PROFILING	11
SOLUTION	13
REFERENCES	15
CREDENTIALS OF SOURCES	16
EXPENSES	16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past hundred years crime has escalated. Investigators carry heavier caseloads than ever before, and they are expected to provide a broader range of evidence in order to meet the demands of cases that often hinge on minute details. In an effort to increase the effectiveness of investigations, investigators frequently turn to psychology to help capture offenders. Criminal profilers are a common part of many investigations, but the effectiveness of criminal profiling remains subject to debate. This paper seeks to inform the reader about the definition, history, efficacy, legality, significance, and uses of criminal profiling to determine whether or not criminal profiling is a valid and reliable part of the investigation and prosecution of criminals.

INTRODUCTION

Criminal profiling has a long history. Criminal profiling is also a part of the public's understanding of investigative processes because of shows such as *Criminal Minds* and the Hannibal Lector movies. While these shows indicate criminal profiling is an effective and significant part of many investigations, the general public does not usually receive accounts of real life criminal profiling. It is hard to determine just how useful criminal profiling is in the investigation and prosecution of criminals because of the lack of information either proving or disproving its validity or reliability. We need objective research of the issue. Criminal profiling is a critical subject because profiling affects how investigations are conducted and potentially used in a court of law.

DEFINITION

Criminal profiling is also known as criminal investigative analysis, investigative psychology, offender profiling, psychological profiling, profiling, behavioral profiling, criminal personality profiling, sociopsychological profiling, or criminological profiling. For the purpose of this paper we will use the term criminal profiling. According to Devery (2010),

Criminal profiling describes a process that attempts to identify characteristics of an unknown offender, through a detailed examination of the crime scene and victim characteristics, informed by information about prior similar cases. (p. 393)

The FBI (n.d.) says,

Behavioral science is all about better understanding criminals and terrorists—who they are, how they think, why they do what they do—as a means to help solve crimes and prevent attacks. (Behavioral Science)

Former FBI profiler McCrary (2003) defines criminal profiling as,

A process used to analyze a specific crime or series of crimes in order to develop a behavioral composite of an unknown offender. (p. 9)

Professor Canter (2004), Director of the International Centre for Investigative Psychology and world-leading crime psychologist, states,

'Offender profiling' is taken to be the derivation of inferences about a criminal from aspects of the crime(s) he or she has committed. (p. 23)

All these definitions suppose that criminal profiling determines the criminal's psychological status through the investigation of crime scenes and victims.

HISTORY

Criminal profiling dates back to the 1870s in Italy with Cesare Lombrosa, the founder of the Italian School of Positivist Criminology. He first theorized that “criminals are distinguished from non-criminals by multiple physical anomalies.” Lombrosa was in charge of an insane asylum for years, and he studied criminals in post-mortem examinations. (Cesare Lombrosa, n.d)



In 1888, Dr. Thomas Bond conducted the best known early example of criminal profiling in the notorious Jack-the-Ripper case. Dr. Bond was a registered police surgeon who studied medical and police reports and did post-mortems on the victims to form an opinion about the offender. (Offender Profiling, n.d.)

Ebisike (2007) reported that Walter Langer, a psychiatrist based in New York, NY, also figures in the history of criminal profiling. The U.S. Office of Strategy Services hired Langer in 1943 to provide a profile of Adolf Hitler, stating that they wanted,



A realistic appraisal of the German situation. If Hitler is running the show, what kind of person is he? What are his ambitions? We want to know about his psychological make-up—the things that make him tick. In addition, we ought to know what he might do if things began to go against him. (p. 38-39)

Many people believe Langer’s profile is accurate. (Ebisike, 2007, p. 38-39)

Dr. James A. Brussel, a psychiatrist and New York, NY’s former Assistant Commissioner of Mental Hygiene, is the next notable figure in criminal profiling. He assisted the New York police in profiling from 1957—1972. In 1956, the New York City police asked Brussel to help investigate a series of bombings that occurred 1940—1956. Brussel’s profile led investigators to the bomber. He accurately profiled the bomber down to the clothes he wore. Brussel also helped capture the serial sex murderer known as the Boston Strangler. (Offender Profiling, n.d.)

In the 1970s the FBI were the first to organize the practice of criminal profiling. The FBI established the Behavioral Science Unit in 1974. According to Ebisike (2007), the FBI, “designed a method for analyzing unknown offenders in unsolved cases,” with the idea to, “look at the behavioral manifestations at a crime scene for evidence of mental disorders and other personality traits, thus aiding the detectives ‘deductive reasoning’” (p. 50). In the beginning the FBI relied heavily on interviews they conducted on thirty-six convicted killers and forty-one convicted serial rapists. These interviews led to the creation of the Crime Classification Manual. This manual was “a classification system for the types of crimes in which the behavior of the perpetrator plays an important role” (Ebisike, 2007, p. 50).

More recently, David Canter is hailed as the “father of offender profiling in Brittan.” Police initially asked Professor of Psychology David Canter to assist in a case involving a series of rapes

and murders. Using Canter's profile, the police located and trapped the offender. Canter's profile proved very accurate. (Ebisike, 2007, p. 54)

Criminal profiling has a long history covering a variety of uses and methods. Except with the Jack-the-Ripper case, it appears that criminal profiling has a history of success, but because there are not any complete and accurate studies, we have no way of knowing how many cases go unsolved.

USES

Over its long history, criminal profiling's uses have broadened both as to intent and types of cases. Ebisike (2007) quoted former FBI Behavioral Science Unit agents Douglas and Olshaker who said,

[The] primary goal [of criminal profiling] is to aid local police in limiting and refining their suspect list so police can direct their resources where they might do the best good. (p. 17)

In Ebisike's (2007) dissertation in which he cites Holmes & Holmes, he says criminal profiling has these three major goals:

"1) Social and psychological assessments" of offenders in which the offenders race, age, employment status, religious, marital status, and level of education is evaluated.

"2) Psychological evaluation of belongings found in the possession of the suspected offender" This might provide "background and motives for the crime, as well as link the suspect to the crime."

"3) Suggestions and strategies for interviewing suspected offenders when they are apprehended" (p. 19-20).

Canter (2004) discussed "geographical analysis" (p. 7) as one use of criminal profiling in which the location of the crime provides clues as to where a crime may occur again or where the unsub may live. This geographical analysis is supposed to clue investigators into the social and psychological aspects of the unsub. McCrary (2003), in his collaborative book with criminal psychologist Katherine Ramsland, "The Unknown Darkness," includes the following uses for criminal profiling:

- “Crime and crime scene analysis
- Profiling
- Investigative strategy
- Interviewing techniques
- Probable cause in support of a search warrant
- Trial strategy before and during the trial
- Expert witness testimony
- Threat assessment” (p. 11-12).

Ramsland (2010) expands the use of criminal profiling in threat assessment. She wrote that it “involves making educated predictions from a variety of factors about whether a given offender might repeat his or her offense” (p. 145). In interviewing techniques Ramsland (2010) writes that criminal profiling helps in deception detection that might occur during an interrogation, using body language; statement analysis; physiological devices, such as polygraphs; and objective assessments. (p. 178-185) Investigators sometimes use criminal profiling for public alerts about particular suspects.

As the use of criminal profiling widens, so widens the types of cases that profilers apply their craft to. Profiling assists investigators in a variety of cases including murder, rape, arson, burglary, product tampering, kidnapping, bombings, hostage negotiations, and terrorism. Canter (2004) also includes cases such as questionable documents, psychological aspects of weapons, confessions, how police systems are set up, and fraud. (p. 11) Crimes may be singular or serial.

PROFILERS



Since the 1870s with Dr. Lombrosa, criminal profilers include psychiatrists, psychologists, professional investigators, and people who study criminal profiling in varying degrees of coursework. As of today, the most well-known profilers, the FBI Behavioral Science Unit, consists of,

Supervisory special agents and veteran police officers with advanced degrees in the behavioral science disciplines of psychology, criminology, sociology, and conflict resolution. The unit also includes a criminologist, clinical psychologist, research/crime analysts, and management analyst. (Behavioral Science, n.d.)

Other psychologists, such as David Canter, are “expert” in the field.

Despite shows like *Criminal Minds* or Thomas Harris’ series of books that portray the supposed accuracy of criminal profiling, reliability of criminal profiling is questionable, considering the

people who actually profile. The FBI Behavioral Unit relies heavily on past experience and the Classification Manual that is discussed later. McCrary notes that “you’ll even find people offering accelerated weekend seminars that promise certification as a profiler who can consult with law enforcement agencies,” but they write that “behavior analysis within the context of a crime requires an in-depth education in both psychology and law enforcement” (McCrary & Ramsland, 2003, p. 12).

Ultimately criminal profiling is subject to the training and experience of each individual profiler. Profilers include anyone from people with degrees in psychology and/or criminology to investigative reporters who sometimes use media as an unjustifiable outlet.

SCIENTIFIC BASIS

Profilers even debate among themselves about the efficacy of criminal profiling as it relates to the type of research providing the basis for much of criminal profiling. John Douglas and Bob Ressler who were not trained psychologists did not conduct FBI profiler studies in a scientific manner. According to D.M. Risinger and J.L. Loop as cited by Devery (2010), their interviews, which form the basis for FBI profiling today, “did not appear to be conducted on the basis of a defined interview schedule or result in the compilation of formal notes or records of these interviews” (p. 395). Douglas himself states, “The program was informal and aimed at ‘letting us see the way the offender’s mind worked, getting a feel for them, allowing us to start walking in their shoes’” (Devery, 2010, p. 395).

These agents did not use a control group and B. Turvey, as cited by Devery (2010), wonders about the consistency of information that the agents found among serial killers and rapists who may suffer a range of mental illnesses and who are unreliable and likely to lie about their histories and activities. (Devery, 2010, p. 395) These studies form the basis for the FBI Classification Manual. Non-psychology degree-holding agents were responsible for the development of a Manual that provides a system for criminal profiling.

Well-respected investigator McCrary states, “Psychology has made a significant contribution to law enforcement” (McCrary & Ramsland, 2003, p. 20), but he also states, “No agent mistakes criminal profiling for an established science” (McCrary & Ramsland, 2003, p. 21). McCrary goes on to say, “A profile is the end result of interpretation, which is based on the interpreter’s experience and knowledge ... Not everyone will interpret the clues in the same manner” (McCrary & Ramsland, 2003, p. 21).

Criminal profiling is subject to the training and experience each individual profiler has. Individual interpretation is not the scientific objectivity to stake lives on.

The American Psychological Association reported on studies done in 1990 by Anthony Pinizzotto, Ph.D. and published in *Law and Human Behavior*. This study gave FBI profilers, police detectives trained by the FBI, other police detectives, clinical psychologists, and students an opportunity to write a profile on a solved murder and a solved rape case. The study findings are

that “the majority of trained profilers fared better in rape cases in detailing a profile, but they didn’t do any better in murder cases than by a non-profiler” (Does Profiling Really Work?, 2004). The same article reported on a 2003 study by Richard Kocsis, Ph.D. and published in the *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. In Kocsis’ study, “Professional profilers made more correct predictions about the offenders than any other group. But they weren’t uniformly good at their jobs—they also had the highest statistical variation among any of the group” (Does Profiling Really Work?, 2004).

This lack of consistency indicates a weakness in profilers that could very well affect the investigation of a case.

Canter (1998) wrote that “very few police officers have any training in the concepts of science. Most know little of the need to test alternative thought processes that can distort objectivity” (p.10-11). Canter (1998) realizes the problems of criminal profiling as fictionalized on television and in books and as the FBI uses it for its scientific nature and dearth of appropriate information. He also believes that “psychologists have much to offer to criminal, and other, investigations” (p. 10-11). Canter would agree that profilers need to accomplish criminal profiling from the vantage point of the right education and experience.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS



Legal implications and ramifications are another consideration of criminal profiling. In an outline of memorandum in law that the Terri Wood Law Office issued concerning “Admissibility of ‘Criminal Profiling’ Evidence,” they argued, “Profiling is one tool among many like blood-splatter interpretation or wound pattern analysis that can be successfully applied by a trained investigator” (Outline of Memorandum of Law, etc., n.d.).

They go on to report that profiling could produce either reasonable suspicion or reasonable doubt.

In many cases courts exclude criminal profiling testimony. In Oregon (State v. Dunn, Lane Co. Circuit Court), though the detective giving the testimony had sixteen years’ experience as a homicide detective and FBI training as a criminal investigative analyst, “the judge excluded his testimony because ‘he found it to be of scant relevance to (the) case’ such that it would not assist the jury and further found that some of Gebo’s testimony involved matters about which he was not shown to be qualified to give expert opinion.”

In State v. Lowe 599 NE2d 783 (Ohio app. 3 Dist. 1991), the court decided to suppress Douglas’ testimony on the basis of Douglas not being an expert in the field of psychology to give psychological evaluation of crimes. Douglas had a master’s degree in educational psychology with an emphasis on counseling and used crime-investigative analysis in over 5,000 cases. During that trial, Douglas “conceded that none of his testimony could be stated to a reasonable scientific certainty.” Appellate court agreed with the trial court’s findings. (Outline of

Memorandum of Law, etc., n.d.) The following paragraphs show a case in which the court validated this same FBI agent as an expert witness.

In other cases, courts allowed criminal profilers to provide testimony as experts for prosecution. In *State v. Code*, 627 So. 2d 1373 (La. 1993), Douglas, the FBI behavior analyst mentioned before, testified on the modus operandi and ritual aspects of the defendant, and his testimony was accepted into evidence.

In *State v. Russell*, 882 P2d 747 (Wash. 1994,) because Douglas was considered an expert witness, he provided testimony that the defense used as evidence. Davis' opinion was that all three murders were committed by the same person.

Terri Wood Law Office cited the *US v Gil*, 58 F3d 1414 (9th Cir. 1995) in allowing criminal profiling testimony as "specialized knowledge of human behavior patterns characteristic of" particular criminal activity. According to the Terri Law Wood Office, the profiler is able to "illuminate physical evidence, and offender behavior, in a way that allows jurors to understand all of the available evidence in a case so as to arrive at a fully informed determination of guilt or innocence of the accused." (Outline of Memorandum of Law, etc., n.d.) This indicates that in at least some cases courts accepted criminal profiling as valid evidence.

Douglas "conceded that none of his testimony could be stated to a reasonable scientific certainty."

The Daubert decision meant, "Scientific means having a grounding in the methods and procedures of science that are sufficiently established as to have general acceptance in the field and any claim of having 'knowledge must be stronger than subjective belief."

The legal standard for which federal and many state jurisdictions measure social science testimony is the 1993 Daubert decision. The Daubert standard is sometimes applied to criminal profiling. Ramsland (2010) wrote that the Daubert decision meant, "Scientific means having a grounding in the methods and procedures of science that are sufficiently established as to have general acceptance in the field and any claim of having 'knowledge' must be stronger than subjective belief" (p. 223).

This decision meant that judges individually determine whether evidence is admissible or not based on "whether a theory could be tested in

accordance with scientific criteria, the potential error rate was known, peers had reviewed the

method, and the method had attracted widespread acceptance within the relevant scientific community” (Ramsland, 2010, p. 223).

In the *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law* (1998) it is noted,

[The] ‘Courts’ refusal to admit into evidence criminal psychological profiles is based on the grounds that they constitute impermissible character testimony, improper subjects for scientific or expert testimony, and unduly prejudicial evidence. Some courts, however, have permitted the use of profiles for the purpose of making probable cause determinations and linking crimes. Appellate courts have generally upheld these decisions. (If the Profile Fits, p. 249)

The legal implications and risks are directly related to a court’s permissibility of a criminal profiler as expert witness, the aspect of the case on which the profiler testifies, and often the judge’s decision per trial. On one hand, a criminal profiler’s testimony may be very helpful in the investigation and prosecution of a suspect. Courts may also rule this testimony as inadmissible when the case comes to trial.

POSITION IN SUPPORT OF CRIMINAL PROFILING

Criminal profiling is a means that may help or hinder an investigation. Prosecutors, defense attorneys, investigators, and judges weigh it in the balance of justice to victims and protection of the innocent. Criminal profiling has been around since the 1870s, and many people argue that since the beginning it has proven successful in many cases. The following are two examples that indicate that criminal profiling aided in the prosecution and conviction of criminals.

Dr. Katherine Ramsland, who holds degrees in forensic psychology and criminal psychology and who has studied extensively with well-respected profilers, provides one example of a successful profile. In January 1978, an unsub entered the home of pregnant Teresa Wallin. She was shot to death and then mutilated. Three days later the same man entered another home and killed Evelyn Miroth, and her friend, son, and infant nephew.

Investigators brought in agents Ressler and Vorpapel from the FBI Behavioral Science Unit to study the case. Working independently, Ressler and Vorpapel developed the same conclusions. Based on evidence gathered from the scene they concluded that it was likely the unsub had the following characteristics:

- Not employed where it took a lot of organized thinking or was unemployed
- Likely getting disability checks
- Little education
- Mid-twenties in age
- Psychotic mentality
- Lived fairly close to the crime scenes
- Not very mobile
- White
- Thin and undernourished
- Untidy
- Reclusive
- Kept evidence of the crime
- Likely institutionalized at one time

Ramsland (2010) said that “this composite portrait was developed from known data that such crimes tended to be intra-racial, specific to a certain age range, and similar to what other violent offenders with a paranoia-based mental illness had done” (p. 33). Ressler thought the unsub would continue killing until stopped. This profile led investigators to Richard Trenton Chase. When the investigators arrested Chase, he surrendered. The investigators found enough evidence to take him to trial, and he was eventually convicted. (Ramsland, 2010, p. 32-33)

As Ressler and Vorpapel compared Chase to their profile, they found that they were accurate on many points. Chase had the following similar characteristics:

- Institutionalized several times,
- Diagnosed with paranoid schizophrenia,
- Preoccupied with signs that something was physically wrong with him.
- Lived alone
- Unemployed
- Received disability funds (Ramsland, 2010, p. 3)

Investigators used criminal profiling in another case that occurred in June of 1988 in Delaware. Police found the naked body of a woman. A blunt instrument caused her head injuries and significant bruising on the body was partly the result of the unsub binding her hands and feet and strangulation. Tape residue tainted the victim’s face and hair. Fibers found at the crime scene were from carpet.

Furthermore, the characteristics of another unsolved case from 1987 were the same. The police brought in the FBI and, “After analyzing the crime scene evidence, the victimology, and geographical locations where each victim was found, the FBI profilers generated a criminal psychological profile,” (Ramsland, 2010, p. 240) indicating the offender had the following characteristics:

- Mid-twenties to mid-thirties
- White male
- Lived nearby
- Worked in construction
- Drove a van in which he accumulated many miles while stalking victims
- Presented a macho image
- Enjoyed dominating women
- Easily maintained a steady relationship with a girlfriend or wife
- Prepared for the crime in bringing his own weapon
- Destroyed any evidence when finished with the crimes

As a result of that profile, the police began an undercover operation that led to an arrest and seizure of the suspect’s van. Though the defense attempted to suppress carpet fibers gathered in the undercover operation, the Delaware Superior Court,

Upheld the seizure of the van fibers, however, primarily because of the criminal psychological profile. The profile also played a role in the conviction of the defendant: FBI agents testified to the similarities between the murders and the

fact that the same person had committed each one. (Ramsland, 2010, p. 240-241)

The court, however, did not admit the actual profile as evidence to prove the offenders innocence or guilt of the defendant.

These are just two examples of cases in which criminal profiling helped to catch and prosecute murderers. They show that profiling helps in some investigations and shows that the court system is at least sometimes willing to recognize the testimony of expert profilers. With a proper perspective and trained profiler, profiling aids in developing leads, saving valuable time in the process of investigation that may result in saved lives. Criminal profiling also helps build the prosecutor's case against an unsub. Furthermore, in the hands of professionally trained investigators, criminal profiling is based on psychology—a valid science.

With a proper perspective and trained profiler, profiling can aid in developing leads, saving valuable time in the process of investigation that could result in saved lives.

As was the case of the killer Chase, criminal profiling actually helps an investigation to obtain leads as to the killers identity, MO, and even where the killer is likely to strike next. Furthermore, according to Ramsland, the FBI goes through an extensive process to develop a profile. The FBI's premise, as stated by McCrary, is that, "behavior reflects personality whether that be criminals or non-criminals" (2003, p. 10). He believes that, "through a thorough and accurate assessment of those details, we can draw certain logical inferences about the offender" (2003, p. 10). Ramsland concurs with McCrary and goes further to tell about the process of profiling,

From scene elements, profilers can deduce aspects of the offender's behavior that could inspire crime: whether he has been snubbed or has a deformity, is recently unemployed or separated from a significant person, abuses drugs or alcohol, has access to firearms, is physically strong, or has served in the military. Each aspect of the crime is studied to determine how the offender viewed it ... It is also important to know if the offender commits a crime via contact with the victim or from a distance, with a knife, blunt force, or a gun. (Ramsland, 2010, p. 38)

POSITION IN OPPOSITION TO CRIMINAL PROFILING

This paper shows criminal profiling has a long history and many successful cases of criminal profiling in which a criminal is brought to justice and it is possible for profiler's testimony to be admitted to court in prosecution. On the other hand, criminal profiling is also a dismal failure that jeopardizes the innocent. The following are cases in point.

On July 15, 1992, Rachel Nickell was sexually assaulted and stabbed forty-nine times while on a walk in Wimbledon Common with her two-year old son. Investigators called in clinical psychologist Dr. Paul Britton to help. He developed a profile which led the police to Colen Stagg who was known to walk his dog on the Common. As a result, Stagg was arrested and charged with Nickell's death about a year after the murder occurred.

In the meantime, Stagg was crucified by the public. "He suffered death threats, physical attacks, and became one of the most hated man in Britain" (BBC). One year after Stagg was charged with Nickell's murder, he was released, because the police had, according to Judge Justice Ognall, attempted to "incriminate a suspect by positive and deceptive conduct of the grossest kind" (BBC).

A new set of investigators were put on the case, and in June 2006, based on DNA evidence and the questioning of the suspect, the police charged Robert Napper, who confessed to the murder of Rachel Nickell. (BBC)

Besides investigative problems with criminal profiling are its legal implications. In 1994 in *Penson V. State*, "the defendant was convicted of burglary and arson based on his illegal entrance and subsequent setting of a fire in a county rescue building" (Ingram, 1998, p. 250). The state provided the testimony of a FBI serial arsonist profiler for court evidence. The profiler testified about the defendant's personality and history. The court convicted the defendant. Later the appellate court declared the profiler's testimony inadmissible character evidence because the defendant's character was not an issue. As a result, the conviction was overturned. (Ingram, 1998, pp.250-251)

Criminal profiling is also a subjective opinion offered by both experienced and inexperienced profilers whose craft is based on the experience and knowledge of each individual profiler.

Furthermore, profiling sometimes focuses too much energy and time on the wrong suspect or leads to the victimization of an innocent person, which in turn becomes a legal liability. The court may not even accept a profiler or his profile in court. If the profile is publicized, an unsub may change his MO to throw off police.

Criminal profiling is also a subjective opinion offered by both experienced and inexperienced profilers whose craft is not backed up with valid scientific research but on the experience and the knowledge of each individual profiler.

While admittedly criminal profiling could lead to positive results, investigators must consider the

many negative consequences of criminal profiling.

One of the negative consequences to criminal profiling is developing false leads that waste the time and energy of investigators. Investigators develop tunnel vision that causes them to focus on too few factors (Ramsland, 2010, p. 104). This is where an investigator overlooks clues that lead to the real unsub (Ramsland, 2010, p. 104-105).

This was the case with the Nickell/Stagg case. It was years before Nickell's real killer, Robert Napper, was apprehended because once investigators arrested and convicted Stagg, the police were no longer interested in finding the real killer. They thought they had the right man in custody. Professor Canter proposed in 1998 that the case of Nickell/Stagg meant, "The readiness with which the psychologist ' profiler' elaborated on the police assumptions by providing spurious interpretations of the events, helped to maintain a misguided investigation for much longer than was appropriate" (Canter, 1998).

As in the case of Stagg, this sometimes leads to the victimization of innocent people.



Another consideration of criminal profiling is the possibility that if the profile of an unsub is publicized in an attempt to catch the suspect, the suspect might change his MO in order to throw off police, making it more difficult to track him or her down. Katherine Ramsland, in her book *The Forensic Psychology of Criminal Minds*, published in 2010, points to the instance of Dennis Radar also known as the BTK (Bind, Torture, Kill) killer, who watched news reports and, "purposely shifted his MO at times to deflect them and to amuse

himself over confusing them" (p. 104-105). The cases that may or may not be linked to the BTK killer is confusing. (Ramsland, 2010, p. 104-105)

SOLUTION

Despite the positive stories, there is a dearth of information giving scientific evidence that criminal profiling is a valid means of investigation or prosecution. Even profilers themselves are uncertain or contradictory at times on whether or not a profile is accurate, and they certainly do not admit to it being an exact science.

In light of the examples and experiences discussed here, it seems that criminal profiling is not yet ready for responsible investigators to use. By not using criminal profiling, investigators won't fall into the trap of overlooking significant clues, making the profile fit the suspect, or having cases overturned in court. Perhaps at a later date, research and more data will refine this investigative tool, but as it stands criminal profiling remains a slippery slope on which to base an investigation.

In the meantime, investigators continue to rely on tried and true methods of investigation that positively affect the outcome of thousands of people being brought to justice and provide security to the world at large.

REFERENCES

- BBC. (n.d.). Rachel Nickell Murder. *Crime Watch*. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/crimewatch/solved/caseclosed/rachelnickell_murder.shtml
- Canter, D. (1998). Profiling as Poison. *Centre for Investigative Psychology*. 2, 10-11. Retrieved from http://www.i-psy.com/publications/article_poison.php
- Canter, D. (2004). Offender Profiling and Investigative Psychology. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling*. 1, 1-15. Retrieved from www.interscience.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jip.7/pdf
- Cesare Lombrosa. (n.d.). Retrieved April 9, 2012, from www.en.wikipedia.org/wiki/cesare_lombrosa
- Devry, C. (2010). Criminal Profiling and Criminal Investigation. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 26, 393-409. Retrieved from <http://ccj.sagepub.com/content/26/4/393>
- (2004 July) Does Profiling Really Work? *American Psychological Association Journal*. 35(7). Retrieved from www.apa.org/monitor/julaug04/profiling.aspx
- Ebisike, N. (2007, October 1). The Use of Offender Profiling Evidence in Criminal Cases. (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.law.ggu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1023&context=theses>
- The Federal Bureau of Investigation. (n.d.). Behavioral Science. Retrieved from www.fbi.gov/about-us/training/bsu
- (n.d.). If the Profile Fits: Admitting Criminal Psychology Profiles into Evidence in Criminal Trials. *Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law*. 54(239). Retrieved from www.law.wustl.edu/journal/54/Ingram_.pdf
- McCrary, G.O., Ramsland, K. (2003). *The Unknown Darkness*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Offender Profiling. (n.d.). Retrieved April 9, 2012, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/criminal_profiling
- Offender Profiling. (n.d.). Retrieved April 9, 2012, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/james_brussel#James_A._Brussel
- (n.d.). Outline of Memorandum of Law on Admissibility of "Criminal Profile" Evidence. Retrieved from www.terriwoodlawoffice.com/pdfdocs/Criminal_Profile_Evidence.pdf

CREDENTIALS OF SOURCES

Some of the people cited in this document include well-known experts such as:

David Canter, PhD, AcSS, FAPA, FBPsS, FRSM, FRSA, CPsychol: Director International Centre for Investigative Psychology President Int. Academy for Investigative Psychology.

Katherine Ramsland: Graduate degrees in forensic psychology, clinical psychology, and philosophy. Teaches forensic psychology and criminal justice. Published various articles and books on criminal profiling.

Gregg O. McCrary: Former supervisory agent of FBI BSU. Profiling for over twenty-five years on more than a thousand cases.

John Douglas: One of the first criminal profilers with the FBI. Early developer of the FBI offender database. Author

Terri Wood Law Office: Private Practitioner specializing in major felonies criminal trials at state and federal levels, capital cases, and federal appeals since 1988. (Retrieved from <http://www.terriwoodlawoffice.com/resume.html>)

Journal of Urban and Contemporary Law: Now known as Washington University Journal of Law and Policy. Has been in existence since 1968. The Journal says about itself that it “is committed to generating a symposium-based publication that brings together communities of scholars through mutual and collaborative student and faculty process emphasizing existing and emerging visions of law in relation to interdisciplinary and multicultural perspectives, the implications of technology, and the consequences of economic globalization for the purpose of influencing law and social policy.” Articles are authored by professors of law, legal practitioners, judges, and distinguished scholars from a variety of academic disciplines. (Retrieved from <http://law.urustl.edu/Journal/>)

EXPENSES

This whitepaper was written over the period of a month and took sixty man hours.

With the recommendation to not use criminal profiling, there will not be an additional cost to this project.