

## Jeffrey Dahmer — 1/9/92 Interview Notes

Q: Frederick A. Fosdal, M.D.

A: Jeffrey Dahmer

A: Dr. Dietz — we were talking about did I see anything in the Natural History Museum — talking about natural history museums and I remembered way back in high school our class took a trip to a natural history museum and I saw this (Akron, Ohio — high school or junior high) and in the science section they had these folding panels that you just pulled across and in each section in between the sheets of glass was this complete human cadaver — in about four sections. I hadn't remembered that before this. The doctor asked me whether I found this interesting and I told him about as interesting as the rest of the students did — that we looked at all the sections — it was lengthwise a full person — it was kind of shocking.

Q: Did that excite you or turn you on.

A: No — it was just something I hadn't thought of before.

Q: Anything else — we were talking about jogging some memories.

A: We were talking about video tapes that I had seen, and I remembered while I was still at grandma's that I rented these two video tapes — Faces of Death — they show different stages of death and autopsies and things like that — it's a factual based film. A lot of people rent that.

Q: It's educational?

A: Not really — it's more of an exploitive film — it satisfies people's curiosity as to what people look like when they are dead and autopsies and things like that. I watched it a couple of times just for curiosity — like other people. Tape one and Tape two — a sequel. Those are the two points — most everything else was what we covered between us.

Q: Did you have any questions?

A: No, he asked the same thing — I don't have very many questions — just waiting to get it over with.

Q: What's going to happen in a couple of weeks — do you know?

A: Nothing until the trial —

Q: Do you understand the trial phase and all that?

A: Vaguely.

Q: The law changed in 1991 and set up a three phase trial when you enter an insanity plea. So, first phase is guilty — the DA has to prove you guilty beyond a reasonable doubt — that can go on for weeks if you have a full phase — there is some talk that you might plead guilty to the first phase. The second phase has to do with whether or not you were mentally responsible (legal responsibility issue) and there the defendant has the burden of proof to show that he was not responsible for the crimes. If you are found responsible you are sentenced and if you are found nonresponsible you would go to the Mendota State Hospital. There are pros and cons either way.

A: You and I both know that there's really not any pros in this situation. One thing I want made perfectly clear — somehow I have to make it clear that none of these crimes were motivated by racial hatred or sex hatred for gay people. Those are both wrong and that is what the papers have played up according to what the prisoners have been saying. The papers didn't know what the motive was so they invented one — that's why I'm getting so much flack from other prisoners.

Q: One reason I'm here is to clear up misunderstandings — like the point you just made — the fancy word is necrophile — has somebody talked to you about that?

A: Yeah — Jerry explained a little bit of it.

Q: At least my understanding is that it implies these people have to be dead before you could enjoy them and that was not my understanding. I was concerned if you are going to be labeled or branded as a necrophile.

A: That's not the best description to be labeled with.

Q: It was my understanding that you engaged in sexual behavior with deceased people which is one thing but that does not necessarily mean necrophile — that you needed them dead to enjoy them — you never implied that me. You hinted that it was done for other reasons — prolongation — availability and control — you had a nonrejecting kind of situation.

A: Yeah, and that's true. It did seem that after they were completely in my control after strangulation that it became easier to fulfill my sexual desires, whether that labels me what you just said.

Q: It became easier to get relief or satisfaction after they were dead.

A: Yeah — or at least after they were drugged.

Q: How would that help? You would get satisfaction to have the person incapacitated.

A: It gave me a feeling of total control over them. I could take my time and not worry about entertaining them, keeping them satisfied — the issue of having control of them made it more exciting for me. And then as things progressed, I was branching out into the cannibalism aspect — trying to find greater fulfillment and satisfaction and the taking pictures of the internal organs and the saving of the heads. It was just further branching out trying to find greater satisfaction — stimulation.

Q: Kinky kind of things — like a husband and wife trying different things?

A: Yeah — I didn't start doing all these things all at once — it sort of built up.

Q: Agree a necrophile — has to kill a person before he can enjoy them and I thought you could enjoy them alive and sedated and you would rather have them alive.

A: True — that's why I started that drilling.

Q: The killing was not done to bring about their death — that was the sexual thing — there is such a being, but that is not my understanding of you. To you the death was kind of a means to an end — it was a vehicle by which to prolong the relationship.

A: That's a good way — that's what it was — right. Because of time restraints, not having a house of my own — it was the only way to make it possible, at least in part.

Q: Do you see the difference? It may be subtle — you are still having sexual contact with deceased people — people are still getting killed, but that's not the reason. Your wanting to keep them alive speaks against a pure necrophiliac problem.

A: Yeah — we were — he showed the video tapes — we had the tv and vcr here and we watched the Return of the Jedi with the emperor character — the Exorcist III tape and he had a lot of electronics equipment brought in.

Q: What about the videos?

A: I was just pointing out to him the main character — Return of the Jedi — that he uses a lot of control and power in the movie — science fiction — good special effects.

Q: So you were impressed with the emperor.

A: Right — that was the main focus — he exuded total control — power over his empire. I could identify with him — I used to watch it before I went to bars — to sort of psych myself up.

Q: What did you want power over?

A: All aspects of life — financial, social, sexual.

Q: Did you want to be king of the world?

A: Yeah — that would have been the ultimate — carrying it to an extreme — that would be nice — at least in my own life I wanted more power and control. I didn't feel like I had any power.

Q: You were an employee so you were locked into somebody else's wishes there — you weren't your own boss.

A: Which I didn't like — no — never got any satisfaction from the job. Then we watched a couple of pornography tapes — I showed him the ones that appealed to me the most — one that showed the strip tease act that goes on in Chicago that I used to watch.

Q: So he brought them — the police have them.

A: Yeah — they have all my tapes.

Q: How do we stand on the necrophile issue?

A: I think how you described it —

Q: Do you think you've been consistent on that? What I'm afraid of is that at trial there's going to be a mixed understanding — we've got three different formulations going on — either you are or you're not — the term itself is vague — there are not chapters and books written about this, but I guess there are some people that this is their thing.

A: I understand. That wouldn't make sense to me to that extent because I was trying to keep them alive during the last period with the drilling — by having them dead, that was the only way I knew how to control them completely at the time.

Q: You could have had a very compatible cooperative partner — wouldn't that be good enough?

A: It would have, but I never did run into anybody who was willing to be permanently cooperative.

Q: Was it the control — was that exciting for you — or did it just make things easier for you.

A: No. It was exciting having complete dominance.

Q: Did their being dead — did that spoil the sexual experience at all?

A: No. It didn't until I had to do the dismembering and everything.

Q: Did it matter much to your enjoyment of the guy that he was deceased.

A: No because at that point I had complete control and so that heightened the excitement.

Q: It was more exciting than with a live person.

A: Yeah. But if he had been alive and completely in a zombie-like state — totally compliant that would have been better.

Q: Don't you need some participation on the other guy's part?

A: When I was doing this — no. Because of the participation — in most instances wouldn't have been complete compliance to my wishes — and I was never interested in bondage or torture — that's how some people fulfill their desire for control, and I was never interested in that — I didn't want to cause any pain.

Q: It was just as much fun when the guy was dead — you could enjoy him — it didn't spoil it that he was deceased.

A: No, because that was the only mechanism I could get complete control at the time. It was only later on that I tried to change that — to render them in a zombie-like state — to keep them alive — so they would be with me for a much longer period of time – alive, interactive, but on my terms.

Q: Has this control thing always been — where else has that shown in your life?

A: It started with that bike incident with the bat and the bike — that's when I first started thinking like that. Remember that jogger I saw along the country road — that was the first time I ever thought of taking someone by force when I was around 15 or 16. A jogger along the country road — and he was attractive — probably around 18 or 19. And so I sawed a baseball bat in half — took the handle part — took my bike and waited for him along the country road and was planning on knocking him out and enjoying him sexually in the woods — that was the first thought of violence — probably when I was 15 or 16.

Q: The interest then was to have a guy knocked out in the woods and enjoy him.

A: Uh-huh. That is the first time I had thoughts of doing something like that. I went out and waited, but he never came by and so I abandoned the idea — I just went out once waiting for him.

Q: It's kind of similar to what you ended up doing later isn't it?

A: Right — starting with Hicks. I was 18 when I met Hicks.

Q: Had that been on your mind for a while?

A: Yeah — for a few months. It started coming into focus about two years after I was attacked by those group of seniors in high school — I was walking back from a friend's house one night and was approached by three seniors and one of them had a billy club or something and whacked me on the back of the neck real hard for no reason. Unprovoked — when I was 14 — 9th grade maybe. They hit me once and I ran away from them and ran all the way home. I don't know if that triggered anything — the technique that I was using — I never thought about it until I started talking about all this stuff with people — I never gave it any conscious thought through the years.

Q: The idea of incapacitating someone by a blow and then having sex with this disabled person — have any idea where this idea came from.

A: No, I don't — no conscious idea. The best way to get control of someone.

Q: But you know months before that — maybe years — that you would enjoy homosexual behavior.

A: I was 14 when I had the consenting meeting with Tyson at the club house. In the community I was living in, homosexuality was the ultimate taboo — it was never talked about — there was no outlet. There was never any opportunity for a good sex life — I never saw any opportunity normally to meet anyone like that — it was just an issue that was never discussed in the community at all. Never met anybody that was of the same mindset as myself, so I didn't see any other way than to do it forcefully — when I was 16 — that's when the idea first came. That's the only way I could think of making it possible to satisfy myself.

Q: Are you saying that had there been other avenues for you?

A: Had I met someone who I thought was gay, I probably would have done things differently — but I never did.

Q: I still think there is a qualitative difference between being a homosexual necrophile or a heterosexual necrophile — the only way I enjoy women is if they are dead and that is why I kill them — so I can get them in a deceased state — that is part of the pleasure — I get more pleasure when a person is all bonded up or S&M behavior — that further enhances by sexual experience. My understanding of your sexuality is that you didn't need to have them deceased for your sexual needs — it was just a vehicle — not administrative — somehow logistical means to an end type thing. Have you been able to count the number of approaches you have taken to achieving this end? We can give the baseball bat one time and then you get into — is the next vehicle just the Halcion — did you make a big jump to Halcion — was there anything in between?

A: No — then it goes to just using visual pictures and magazines up until Hicks — good looking men.

Q: As far as vehicles to render the person submissive — death is the ultimate submission — ultimate passivity — so you can do your own thing. There was the baseball bat, barbells — what about alcohol?

A: Most of them didn't want to drink enough to be in that mode — alcohol played a part, but the Halcion — I started using that in the bath house here in Milwaukee. I did try ether and chloroform later, but it never seemed to work — it never seemed to lengthen the unconscious state — I tried it on a couple — the ones that I was drilling — all the drilling people — it didn't work for some reason.

Q: You wanted to prolong the sedated state?

A: Yeah — without using more pills. I don't know why it didn't work — I used one of those dust masks you can buy in the hardware store and used a medicine dropper to drop it, but it didn't seem to have any effect. I tried mallet one time when I was out of pills.

Q: Well these are all different ways to try to achieve the same thing. But again, it wasn't to get them deceased so that you could enjoy them because that was —

A: No it would have been much preferable to have someone completely compliant for a long period of time — alive — that would have been the best.

Q: Are you really sure you tried that hard to go that route?

A: Well, I tried it with the drilling.

Q: Not to find this compatible partner?

A: I probably didn't try as hard as I should have when I was at grandma's — because of the living conditions — I was living with her and it just wasn't possible to have a long term relationship with anyone like that — under those conditions. And then when I moved into the apartment, I had done it several times and it worked — so I just continued with that method. Your saying I should have tried harder.

Q: I'm not impressed — that you started up so many relationships and that you were abandoned and jilted and had your heart broken time and time again — and finally you resort to what you did.

A: No, I didn't — no.

Q: I would assume that there are a lot of people out there that would have liked to have an ongoing relationship. It's just a matter of finding each other.

A: Uh-huh. No, I didn't — I guess I didn't look hard enough.

Q: So, what do you daydream about? Your interest is in homosexuality.

A: Right. I need some goodlooking guy to —

Q: You aren't dreaming about some incapacitated person.

A: Daydreaming about them being completely compliant with my wishes — being with them for a long period of time — having daydreams of incapacitating them ever since the baseball bat incident — because that is the only way I knew of —

Q: About whooping somebody?

A: I don't know how much I daydreamed about that — I concentrated my daydreams on a good-looking guy who was lying there — I never really entered any real violence into most of the daydreams. He would just lie there — kissing, touching, in total compliance with my wishes.

Q: In this regard, the clubbing the guy — baseball bat, barbell — that in and by itself — did that hold any sexual pleasure for you?

A: No. If that was my thing, I would have tortured them — I wasn't interested in that.

Q: So, the assault aspect — from strangling to dismembering, etc. — that's not sexual.

A: No.



Q: There was a lot of work involved in the disposal?

A: Too much.

Q: You kept some stuff — it wasn't all junk for you.

A: No, I wanted to keep the skulls and sometimes the genitals — so I didn't feel like I was losing the person completely.

Q: So, just that much of a keepsake — you could use that and kind of recreate the guy — I have a skull and I can think of the guy.

A: Right, that's why I took the pictures too.

Q: So you could use those for arousal purposes — could you actually arouse yourself with the pictures and the skulls?

A: Yeah.

Q: That could turn you on just like looking at a magazine?

A: Yeah — in fact it was better because it was more personalized — if I had been able to get one of these chambers — it's a freeze drying chamber — I would have used that — it preserves the person in life-like condition permanently. Preserve the body indefinitely. Yeah — they have such things now days.

Q: So the parts could be used as a turn-on. You could excite yourself — get an erection and all that stuff.

A: Yeah — but it wasn't as good as having a whole person.

Q: Have you had your best sexual experience with one of your pick-ups — a really great evening?

A: Yeah — only when they are under my complete control though.

Q: You must have had guys that just totally went along with you — have a wonderful evening together — wasn't that as good?

A: Not as many as you would think because a lot of them wanted anal sex which I wasn't interested in, and they just wanted to hop from room to room in the bath clubs.

Q: So, even shared partners throughout the evening — it isn't just one guy —

A: Sometimes it is, but a lot of the times it isn't. Very promiscuous.

Q: So, was your best ever with a live person?

A: No, it was with a guys that I drugged — while they were drugged.

Q: Your best deceased experience was never as good as your best drugged experience — is that what you are saying?

A: Right. I had a lot of good drug experiences — it worked rather well.

Q: It's too bad you didn't stop there.

A: Yeah — that's right — that's true.

Q: But that wasn't enough?

A: No — it wouldn't have lasted long enough.

Q: It didn't have the longevity?

A: Right.

Q: There were shortcomings in the deceased technique too.

A: I know — that was better than nothing. Only being able to be with them for a few days — at least I was able to save something from them. There were drawbacks — they didn't last forever.

Q: Besides being illegal.

A: The ultimate drawback.

Q: You must have known you couldn't do this forever?

A: True. I had a great terror of being caught — so I never wanted to get caught. I never wanted to be apprehended — that's why I went to such great lengths to dispose of the evidence — using the acid technique.

Q: You can do the same thing to a deceased body as you can on a live person, can't you?

A: Right.

Q: A mouth job is a mouth job, anal intercourse is anal intercourse, kissing and whatever is all the same isn't it?

A: Yes.

Q: Is there something so driving, so pleasurable that you had to have them in a deceased state to do it?

A: The factor of complete control and the time factor.

Q: So it's time and control — that's the only advantage to having them deceased. Otherwise, the sexual behavior was the same?

A: Right.

Q: So, it's like when she's drunk, I get to have intercourse with her — so I gotta get her drunk — when she's not drunk, she won't have intercourse — so there's no big prize for you in the deceased state other than the control issue and the longevity issue?

A: Uh-huh.

Q: You squeezed out a few more hours — a couple of days?

A: Right.

Q: But otherwise the behavior is kind of the same?

A: Uh-huh. I guess I never took the time to really nurture any long-term relationships.

Q: People vary in how attached they become — some people readily get involved or fall in love or become close and some people are very aloof.

A: The only long-term attachments that I was interested in was of a sexual nature — as far as regular friendships — it never interested me too much. After work I like to just go and do my own thing — go to the bars — try to meet the ideal person that I was physically attracted to.

Q: No nonsexual interest in people — you didn't have these kinds of friends?

A: Just work acquaintances.

Q: Confidants or people you talked to?

A: No — never had anything like that. Kept everything to myself.

Q: Do you think you are kind of a loner?

A: Uh-huh. Yes, I think so.

Q: How about with your family?

A: After the divorce, I really never kept in touch with them very much at all.

Q: Were they your confidants while you were growing up and stuff?

A: No — we would talk about things, but I would usually keep my innermost feelings to myself.

Q: So you didn't confide in them — either one of them? Any reason why not?

A: No. I just felt it was best to keep my private thoughts private — I didn't really trust my private thoughts with anyone else — even family members.

Q: Do you think — it occurred to me last week that maybe this kind of aloofness from people in general — standoffish — do you think this affected your ability to have the kind of relationship with a guy — if I'm a loner with people, I can be a loner with men and women —

A: I think it did. After the Hicks incident, I really closed myself off as far as interpersonal relationships — I felt I had something to hide and it affected me greatly. I could interact with people just fine at work and things, but it was almost like leading a double life — it's almost the way it felt.

Q: You mean you had this whooping secret to carry around with you? Which means you can never be honest with somebody — you can't be honest with the world anymore.

A: Uh-huh. Right — that's the way I felt.

Q: Like you are a fugitive from justice and can't be found out.

A: Un-huh — a double life — it affected all areas of my life.

Q: It certainly got worse — right?

A: It did.

Q: In talking about your personality style you are a kind of stand-offish kind of guy in general with people — there is no reason why you should be extremely warm and honest and get real close to a gay man.

A: Yes, that was my mindset. I was never one that was real interested in getting involved with a big group of people or anything — even from my earliest childhood.

Q: Were you lonely — did you miss people — were you missing something?

A: During high school years it was frustrating to not be able to meet someone of my interests so it was frustrating — yeah it was lonely.

Q: What about afterwards?

A: And afterwards.

Q: Like in Milwaukee — are you lonely?

A: Uh-huh.

Q: You felt lonely — being lonely was being by yourself — kind of sad — Some people don't mind it.

A: I can take it to a point, but not years and years.

Q: See, maybe had you been a little more susceptible to form a relationship with some other guys — maybe none of this might have happened.

A: And if I didn't have such a desire for the total control and domination — right — if I wasn't so selfish. I have to admit what I was doing the ultimate in selfishness.

Q: I asked you about that — it's like putting my sexual interest above their well-being — are you with on that?

A: Right — uh-huh — that's accurate.

Q: Which brings up — that's a value — that's an attitude — that's conscience — how much of a conscience do you have? A guy can rob a bank and shoot 5 tellers and snuff out these people and just go in a convenience store and steal \$50 and shoot the clerk — that person has a problem with his conscience — there's something wrong with their attitudes and values — we all have conscience — some are thicker than others — there are some that couldn't go through

a red light if they are in the middle of the Nevada dessert because it's against the law. Some people are very conscience stricken.

A: No moral compass. That's why when I first got back up here to Milwaukee after I tried to straighten out my life and it didn't work with the religious — going to church and everything — I progressively started going to the bars — the bookstores and then I found out what a bath club was and I tried that with a cemetery and a mannequin because I didn't want — I was trying to find a way to satisfy myself without hurting anyone again like I did with Hicks. But after the Ambassador Hotel — which was not intentional, I had no morals — no moral compass after that.

Q: So that sensitivity, or that thoughtfulness, or something was gone?

A: It was gone.

Q: But it wasn't across the board — you didn't become a common thief.

A: No, but there's a big difference between stealing and doing what I was doing.

Q: So, the hell with their life — who they are, or what they are.

A: It made it possible (easier to do it) for me to do it if I didn't get to know them well — if I didn't know much about them — I depersonalized them.

Q: Was that an active process? How do you do that?

A: Uh-huh. Just not ask them any questions about where they live or their home life or anything — not having long conversations with them. If I had gotten to know them better, it probably would not have happened — if I was in a private setting at home and there was time to talk, maybe it would have been different — I don't know — but when I first started doing this again I was living at Grandma's and there just wasn't that time period to do that.

Q: You didn't tell me about the cemetery incident.

A: Didn't I? Did I tell you about the mannequin?

Q: Yes — I brought it up. I said that you should have a mannequin and you said that once you went and got a mannequin — you just never told me about the cemetery.

A: Well, that was around the same time period — in Milwaukee — at grandmother's. Looked through the obituaries and ran across a guy, 18, who had died — went to the funeral home and viewed the body — he was attractive. After he was buried I went out — I bought a shovel — a

wagon type device to carry the body back and at 12 at night — 12 midnight — I went to the gravesite and was planning on trying to dig him up.

Q: To take the body — to steal the corpse?

A: Yes — but it was in the middle of winter and the ground was too hard, so it didn't work.

Q: To walk out of the cemetery at night with a body over your shoulder?

A: Not over my shoulder, but in the cart that I had — a wagon.

Q: What's that all about?

A: That was another effort to try to satisfy the cravings — the desires — without hurting anyone.

Q: Then the killing has already been done for you. The guy was already dead — that's what you needed.

A: Right — but I didn't want to have to do the act myself.

Q: Where does this fit in?

A: As far as morals — I didn't want to have to hurt anyone to satisfy myself.

Q: Is this past Tuomi?

A: This is before Tuomi — I was living in Milwaukee but I hadn't met Tuomi yet — and even him — I didn't plan on doing anything.

Q: This is before Tuomi's death — during that phase you were doing bath houses and stuff?

A: Just bath houses.

Q: So there I don't have to do the killing — at least I didn't kill the guy, but then I'm guilty of robbing a grave — right?

A: Right.

Q: Did you know you could get in trouble for that — it's not charged very often — there aren't many people robbing graves anymore.

A: But it's a much lower level than doing what I was doing later.

Q: But the value for you is that at least now the person is in a deceased state.

A: Right.

Q: So your hope was — at best you might have them for a couple of days — or if they are embalmed they might last longer — what was your thinking.

A: That was my thinking. To have them for a few days.

Q: But the ground was frozen — but you would have been stuck with a body on your hands.

A: Right. Right.

Q: You never owned a car?

A: No, just for a short period after I came up from Miami and lived with dad. Never had a car in Milwaukee. Used the bus in Milwaukee all the time.

Q: What about the guys you would take home — what did they do with their cars?

A: They usually came by bus or walked — none of them had any cars — none of the people I met had cars.

Q: Was that on purpose?

A: No — it just worked out that way.

Q: You and a guy go home together in a car — he gives you a ride home and then he's done with and then his car is parked down in the street.

A: That wouldn't have worked.

Q: Was that an issue?

A: Yeah — if they had a car, then I wouldn't ask them back.

Q: You meet the guy at the tavern, and he says I have a car —

A: Then I wouldn't have pursued it any further.



Q: This goodlooking guy that owns an automobile would have come back to your place in his car — that would not have worked out?

A: No.

Q: Because then you have to dispose of the car — or leave the car at the bar.

A: No. Usually they would have wanted to drive the car back – so that's ruled out.

Q: Little things like that made a difference.

A: Yes.

Q: How does that interfere?

A: They would have parked the car near the house and that wouldn't have worked — they could have been traced.

Q: How much did you earn a year?

A: About anywhere from \$20,000 to \$25,000. I wasn't good at saving money — I usually ate out a lot and was paying my grandma \$400 month rent and I never seemed to be able to build any cash.

Q: Spend a lot on booze?

A: Uh-huh — quite a bit.

Q: Do you think historically you had this cavalier (casual, carefree) attitude about killing people?

A: No — it concerned me because of the chance of being caught — so no there was nothing cavalier about it.

Q: Do you think you were kind of thin about that sort of thing — what bothers me is at the age of 18 you were able to even consider whopping Hicks.

A: Yes — there was something wrong with my morals that's for sure. That's how strong the compulsion — the driving urge was – mad some wrong choices.

Q: In general did you feel you were conscientious, or did you do a lot of things that weren't very wise or reckless?

A: Yeah I had one shoplifting incident here in Milwaukee — drunk and disorderliness, but nothing major compared to these — I didn't have a cavalier attitude towards it — not a carefree attitude if that's what you mean. It became easier as time went by — after the Ambassador incident.

Q: Can you set up for me your final arrest?

A: Okay, a week before the arrest I had been drinking a can of beer at a bus stop — just sitting there thinking and it was at night and Tracy Edwards came by and sat down next to me and asked me for a cigarette — he was waiting for the bus — I gave him a cigarette — we had just a short conversation — he got on the bus and went home. A week later I was in the Grand Mall eating dinner, drinking some beer in the ■■■ Garden and was on my way out to go home, saw him and recognized him from the bus stop incident, asked him whether he wanted to go back for \$50 for pictures — he agreed — bought some 151 proof rum — didn't have pills left — was planning on getting him really drunk and doing it that way. We got back to the apartment — we were watching the Exorcist video — drinking.

Q: He was worth killing?

A: Yeah.

Q: Why were you out of pills?

A: I had used them all up previously. All the pills were used on victims. We were sitting there drinking for maybe an hour — watching the video — I told him I wanted to take some bondage pictures and put one cuff on one hand — he didn't want to do that and so after putting the cuff on his hand I have no memory of anything until five minutes before the police knocked on the door with him in front. They came in and asked me if I knew him — asked me where the key to the cuff was — I pointed to the bedroom, but it was actually in the trash outside — I don't know why I pointed to the bedroom — they went in — opened the top drawer to the dresser and saw the pictures — they cuffed me and then they looked in the fridge and saw the head and I don't remember the ride down — I remember waking up and talking to the detective — I don't remember the ride down to the police station.

Q: How much did you have to drink that day?

A: About 10 beers over the course of the whole day and that's not enough to make me blank out — so, I don't know why I lost track of time like that and blanked out.

Q: Were you drinking any of the rum — were you mixing drinks?

A: The rum was for him. I don't remember drinking anything other than beer.

Q: Drinking was always involved to some degree wasn't it?

A: Yeah, it was.

Q: In all the cases — in general were all alcohol related to some degree — do you think that helped to do it?

A: Uh-huh. It lowered my inhibitions and made it easier to go through with the act — it heightened the sexual arousal.

Q: How have you been since the arrest — you are still gay?

A: Yes, I still have those inclinations.

Q: You haven't become neutral or heterosexual?

A: No, I wish I could, but it doesn't work that way.

Q: You still have sexual feelings — what are they?

A: Interest in a good-looking guy, but any thoughts of violence I push out of my mind. I tune it out.

Q: You would still enjoy an incapacitated person? If you had your druthers, would it be pleasurable? Could you do it again? Could you have a drugged person and enjoy his sexually?

A: I am trying my best to push those thoughts out of my mind — whenever they come to me. I just start reading or doing something else — I try not to think about it.

Q: Isn't there a chance that people hearing about what you did might get some bright ideas?

A: That's an interesting question because I've gotten letters from people I don't know — guys — who have said that they are killing people and doing the same thing. I've given those letters to Jerry Boyle and he's had the police follow-up on that. I think there's been two letters — but the police are notified about those.

Q: Killing them like you are — kill them and use them for sexual purposes?

A: Uh-huh. Why anyone would write about it and publicize it like that I have no idea. Hopefully it won't give them any ideas. I don't have any control over that, that's for sure.

Q: So basically 75—100 times in bath houses and hotels — different men — Milwaukee and Chicago — and these you were not paying for.

A: Right — they were consensual.

Q: So the payment is to get them to come home with you.

A: Right.

Q: Did you first try to get them to come home with you without paying them and save yourself money?

A: I did, but it seemed that offering money always seemed to make them more willing to come back, so I just went with the standard procedure. More of an incentive for them.

Q: Didn't any of them come home with you on their own?

A: Once — Sears — the last guy — he was talking to me in the bar before we left — he's the one that started up the conversation with me, but it always made it easier if I offered money so that's what I continued to do.

Q: A lot of them might have on their own — you're not giving yourself much credit.

A: I don't think they would have. I guess I didn't give myself much credit — I always offered them money.

Q: So all the guys that came home with you — money was part of it. There weren't dozens of guys that came home and left without being paid. Hundreds of guys also didn't come to your apartment.

A: Yes. The times I didn't offer money was just in the bath house.

Q: So if there's any drive — I think we kind of ruled out a pure necrophiliac drive — I need to have the guy dead so I can do my sex thing — I want to do things homosexually with this person and also I want to control this guy — so the issue is when we are talking about trying to control someone and not kill then, we are talking about putting your desire for homosexual behavior and also your desire for passivity.

A: If it was a pure necrophilic drive, I wouldn't ever have started using the drilling technique to render them in a permanent zombie-like state.

Q: The standard for responsibility has to do with ability to control your conduct to the requirements of law — which means ability to conform to the law and not kill people. You chose to kill them as part of your routine to render them inactive — so to conform, you would have had to put your need to have them passive aside and would have had to give up your homosexual — what are you controlling — your need —

A: Need for total dominance.

Q: Put that aside and any sexual interest

A: Right — which seemed impossible to do when I was out on the street.

Q: But you did control it at different places and settings — it was there.

A: Right.

Q: We haven't talked much about the altar. You brought it up, but I didn't ask you much — was it crucial?

A: That was a center I was constructing in the bedroom — with skulls on the table of the victims — two completed skeletons standing on each side — a large lamp with blue globe lights to give the room (with all the lights off) a dark blue mysterious effect and with the two incense burners on the end of the table — that was where I was planning on —

Q: Did you get that far?

A: No. Nothing got set up. It was to get in contact with the spiritual forces to gain power. To perform rituals to contact, I guess, demons or Satan — to

Q: Did you believe in that stuff?

A: Yeah — and the purpose of it was to draw power to me — in all aspects of my life — financial, social, sexual. If six more months had gone by it would have been completely set up. I already had the table and planned on getting the lamp — all I needed was the lamp and the chair.

Q: How do you get this far — I don't follow.

A: Just from performing rituals and chants to Satan. I brought the book by [REDACTED] — the Satanic Bible and I was reading it in the past — I got different at the Occult bookstore. So I was in the process of formulating the ideas.

Q: Did your ideas — were they satanic — did it come from them.

A: It didn't come from them, but I felt that the temple would help solidify my control and power. Not satanic acts — not religious acts. The Exorcist movie fueled my fantasies. I concentrated on the third — that was the best done. It was more realistic and fit into my fantasies. I didn't think I was possessed — I did not think I needed exorcism.

Q: Do you think you are going to testify.

A: I don't know — I'm debating whether I should or not. I'll make that decision in the future — shortly. I might. My attorney is not saying I can't — he's sort of leaning towards me not testifying but it's my decision.

Q: Why would you want to testify — I'm not saying you should or shouldn't.

A: To make sure that the issue of the motives is cleared up.

Q: You are pretty concerned about it being racial and all that — anything else you would like to cover.

A: No, No, everything else will pretty much be handled by the questioning.

Q: If they ask why did you kill them what will you say?

A: For sexual control, dominance — to satisfy the lustful desires that I had that were so obsessive in my life.

Q: Do you have any questions?

A: No.