

1

INTRODUCTION: THE ROOTS OF MODERN PROFILING

In recent years, the American public has become increasingly fascinated by criminal profiling. This interest has been both evidenced, and capitalized on, by the popular media in movies such as *The Silence of the Lambs* (Bozman & Demme, 1991) and *Copycat* (Fiedler & Amiel, 1995); television shows, including *Millenium* (Carter, 1996), *Profiler* (Kronish, 1996), and *The X-Files* (Carter, 1993); and fictional novels such as *The Alienist* (Carr, 1994) and *The Angel of Darkness* (Carr, 1997). Although the profilers in these movies, television programs, and mystery novels typically have academic backgrounds and law enforcement experience, their methods center primarily on intuitive knowledge and the occasional psychic vision. These portrayals continue to encourage a view of profiling as an art rather than a science.

Behavioral profiling historically has always been an art. Its roots are not in scientific, academic, or applied criminological pursuits—instead, many of the ideas central to profiling first emerged in works of fictional literature. Literature's first criminal profiler was C. Auguste Dupin, the hero of Edgar Allan Poe's (1814/1982) tale "The Murders in the Rue Morgue." Dupin was an amateur detective, an analyst imbued with a keen understanding of human nature. In this story about a series of unsolved murders, Dupin "throws himself into the spirit of his opponent, identifies himself therewith, and . . . sees . . . the sole methods by which he may seduce [the perpetrator]"

into error or hurry into miscalculation” (Poe, 1814/1982, p. 76). Although Dupin lacks the specialized training of today’s FBI profilers, his methods continue to be the basis of the current art of profiling. He uses bits of evidence and other elements of the crimes to draw larger conclusions about the unidentified perpetrator, eventually solving the mystery. In addition to providing the first profiling prototype, Poe may have been the first to expose the American public to the lore of “profiling intuition”—the sixth sense that modern profilers are popularly thought to possess. Poe (1814/1982, p. 75) wrote of Dupin, “His results, brought about by the very soul and essence of method, have, in truth, the whole air of intuition.” Dupin’s skill, therefore, has the appearance of being analytical and methodical combined with an element of mystery in his ability to profile the offender. Poe provided the first characterization of analysts as an elite who are born with rather than taught this intuitive sense: “The analytical power should not be confounded with simple ingenuity; for while the analyst is necessarily ingenious, the ingenious man is often remarkably incapable of analysis” (Poe, 1814/1982, p. 77).

By the mid to late 19th century, other authors began to write mystery novels whose protagonists were, like Dupin, a new hybrid of amateur detective and armchair psychologist. Wilkie Collins’s (1862/1985) novel *The Woman in White* features Walter Hartright, a young man who begins his pursuit of an elusive woman by “gathering together as many facts as could be collected” and “as much additional evidence as [he could] procure from other people” (Collins, 1862/1985, p. 389). Using his intuition and informal knowledge about human behavior, Hartright’s first profiling task is to attribute the authorship of an anonymous letter. After conducting a brief interview in town, he concludes that the local schoolmaster has “unconsciously told” his colleague the identity of the writer (Collins, 1862/1985, p. 75). Combined in Hartright’s conclusion are his careful attention to the schoolmaster’s responses and demeanor, and his inferences about human behavior. *The Woman in White*, like “The Murders in the Rue Morgue,” demonstrates one of the first attempts by a detective/psychologist to flush out a perpetrator. In the novel, Hartright insists, “I can force him from his position of security, I can drag him and his villainy into the face of day” (Collins, 1862/1985, p. 402). Like a modern-day profiler, Hartright considers the evidence and assesses how to best persuade the villain to reveal himself.

Collins is also credited with authoring the first modern detective novel. Whereas Poe’s Dupin and *The Woman in White*’s Hartright were only amateurs, Collins’s (1868/1994) novel *The Moonstone* introduces a law enforcement agent who tries his hand at profiling. Scotland Yard’s Sergeant Cuff is a professional detective employed by a family to locate a stolen diamond. He proceeds in his investigation by collecting witness statements and using crime scene evidence to infer the behaviors and motives of the unidentified

perpetrator. He then uses this information to identify a potential suspect and suggest a strategy for recovering the stolen diamond. This is perhaps the earliest example of bringing in an expert to consult on a criminal case. By the end of the 19th century, however, expert consultation would be the hallmark of mystery literature.

The detective novel may have been invented by Wilkie Collins, but it was popularized from the late 19th century to the early 20th century by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, in his *Complete Sherlock Holmes* (1892–1927/1992). In contrast to the previous early profilers, Holmes is considered by colleagues to be more of a scientist. In describing Holmes to Dr. Watson before their introduction, a mutual acquaintance describes him as “an enthusiast in some branches of science . . . well up in anatomy, and . . . a first-class chemist” (Doyle, 1892–1927/1992, p. 16). The same acquaintance also says “Holmes is a little too scientific for my tastes—it approaches to cold-bloodedness” (Doyle, 1892–1927/1992, p. 17). His methods are even referred to as “the science of deduction” (Doyle, 1892–1927/1992, p. 19). However, the reader is also introduced to the intuitive, nonobjective element of Holmes’ expertise. “He is a little queer in his ideas,” Doyle wrote; “His studies are very . . . eccentric, but he has amassed a lot of out-of-the-way knowledge which would astonish his professors” (Doyle, 1892–1927/1992, p. 16). Holmes describes himself as “a consulting detective” (Doyle, 1892–1927/1992, p. 24). He explains how, when government detectives cannot solve a case, they “lay all the evidence before me, and I am generally able, by my knowledge . . . to set them straight . . . I have a kind of intuition that way” (Doyle, 1892–1927/1992, p. 24). In *Sherlock Holmes*, therefore, Doyle provides the public with the most popular and enduring example of what is now called a *profiler*: an expert called in when traditional investigative methods are inadequate. A profiler possesses some knowledge of science but relies on practical experience and intuition.

JACK THE RIPPER

During the same time that Sherlock Holmes was solving fictional London murders, a very real series of still-unsolved killings was being perpetrated in the Whitechapel district of London. Between August and November of 1888, an individual who would come to be known as “Jack the Ripper” slit the throats of five prostitutes. Although crime, even the murder of prostitutes, was hardly uncommon in 1880s Whitechapel, these particular murders created considerable public fear. Not only were the victims attacked on public streets; their bodies were left somewhat brazenly out in the open. The victims were generally found quite soon after death, their bodies still warm, which implied that the killer—after he had violently killed these

women and even mutilated four of them after death, in some cases disemboweling them and removing organs from their bodies—had very likely walked down the street, and even passed through the crowds, completely undetected.

In response to the murders, many people volunteered their speculations and tips about the unidentified perpetrator. These opinions came from the lay public as well as from witnesses, journalists, and law enforcement officers. The only “profile,” however, came from Thomas Bond, who performed autopsies on two of the Ripper’s victims. Bond was a specialist in forensic medicine and was the first to offer speculations about the psychology of the offender, contained in an 11-point report to the head of the London Criminal Investigation Division (CID):

The murderer must have been a man of great physical strength and of great coolness and daring. There is no evidence that he had an accomplice. He must in my opinion be a man subject to periodical attacks of Homicidal and Erotic mania. The character of the mutilations indicate that the man may be in a condition sexually, that may be called Satyriasis. It is of course possible that the Homicidal impulse may have developed from a revengeful or brooding condition of the mind, or that religious mania may have been the original disease but I do not think either hypothesis is likely. The murderer in external appearance is quite likely to be a quiet inoffensive looking man probably middle-aged and neatly and respectably dressed. I think he must be in the habit of wearing a cloak or overcoat or he could hardly have escaped notice in the streets if the blood on his hands or clothes were visible.

Assuming the murderer to be such a person as I have just described, he would be solitary and eccentric in his habits, also he is most likely to be a man without regular occupation, but with some small income or pension. He is possibly living among respectable persons who have some knowledge of his character and habits and who may have grounds for suspicion that he isn’t quite right in his mind at times. Such persons would probably be unwilling to communicate suspicions to the Police for fear of trouble or notoriety, whereas if there were prospect of reward it might overcome their scruples. (Rumbelow, 1975, p. 138)

This report thus represents the first departure of profiling from the realm of fictional literature. For the first time, a criminal investigation was informed by a medical professional. Bond extrapolated from the available medical evidence to offer speculations about the unknown offender’s behavioral and psychological characteristics. And, as with Sherlock Holmes, Bond’s conclusions went beyond those that could be directly substantiated by the evidence, thus using a certain degree of intuition. Unfortunately, because the Ripper murders were never solved, the accuracy of Bond’s predictions cannot be evaluated today. The value of his report at the time of the crimes

is also unclear. Although it was found among the confidential files of the head of the London CID, it is not certain how much credence investigators gave the report, or whether they used it at all in their investigation.

MILITARY USES OF PROFILING

Since Bond's offering to the Ripper investigation, it is certainly likely that other medical and mental health professionals continued to offer their opinions at various times to law enforcement agencies investigating crimes. However, it was military agencies that first came upon a practical application for profiling. Toward the end of World War II, as Adolf Hitler asserted his power in Nazi Germany, the U.S. military became interested in the nature of his influence over the German people and concerned with the future course of his behavior. In 1943, Walter Langer, a psychoanalyst, was asked to create a personality profile of Hitler for the Office of Strategic Services. In general, the United States needed a "realistic appraisal of the German situation" (Langer, 1972, p. 10). This not only required Langer to construct a biography of Hitler's life and rise to power but also entailed an analysis of Hitler's psychological makeup. The U.S. officials wanted to know "the things that make him tick" (Langer, 1972, p. 10). In addition, Langer was asked to predict how Hitler was likely to respond if he began to fail in his military efforts.

Langer applied a psychoanalytic approach to the task of profiling Hitler. He relied heavily on speeches and literature written by Hitler, searching for the symbolic meaning behind the words:

In every utterance a speaker or writer unknowingly tells us a great deal about himself of which he is entirely unaware . . . the figures of speech he employs reflect unconscious conflicts and linkages, and the incidence of particular types or topics can almost be used as a measure of his preoccupation with problems related to them. (Langer, 1972, p. 141)

From Hitler's words, as well as from documents and interviews with informants close to Hitler, Langer constructed a profile that portrayed Hitler as a repressed and antisocial individual who had projected his own feelings of inadequacy and disgust onto the Jews. Langer examined the various choices that Hitler might face if the Nazis were to face defeat and correctly concluded that rather than fail before the entire world, Hitler would most likely retreat to his safehouse and commit suicide (Langer, 1972, p. 212).

Similar to Langer's task with Hitler, the military has relied on profiling to assess the weaknesses and likely reactions of major enemy figures (Watson, 1978). However, in addition to profiling military foes, psychologists were also asked to profile American soldiers by using personality tests. Up to and

including the Vietnam and Korean Wars, these profiles were conducted to identify which soldiers were likely to be successful soldiers and which ones had vulnerabilities that would make them unsuitable for combat or likely to avoid conscription, run from combat situations, or experience emotional breakdowns if placed in stressful situations. In addition, profiling techniques were used to predict the dependability and success of criminals who were paroled into military service and to identify individuals with certain abilities that might be of use in specialized military operations (e.g., bomb disposal, piloting, code-breaking, and counterintelligence operations). Personality profiling also was used to find those soldiers who could withstand sensory deprivation, interrogation, and pain; individuals who could survive adverse conditions, including isolation and continuous operations; and individuals who had personalities suitable for commando killing and counterintelligence operations.

It is difficult to elaborate in great detail on the military's profiling practices because much of the research involved has been classified or was otherwise conducted in secrecy (Watson, 1978). On the basis of interviews of soldiers conducted after the Korean War, it appeared that at least certain findings regarding soldier behavior and personality profile characteristics were consistent. Even though these claims could not be verified in real combat, the fact that individuals' personalities could be profiled before they were sent into combat as soldiers theoretically provided an advantage that did not previously exist for the military. Profiling conducted in the military used links among language, appearance, lifestyle, personality, and deviant behavior—factors that would later constitute some of the basic criminal profiling components.

BIRTH OF LAW ENFORCEMENT PROFILING

Profiling expertise was first called on by law enforcement in 1956, when James A. Brussel was asked to consult on the Mad Bomber case. The Mad Bomber was an elusive perpetrator who set off more than 50 homemade bombs in New York City over the course of 17 years, beginning in 1940. Although he often left forensic evidence at the scenes of the bombings, and even wrote several letters to newspapers and businesses describing some of his motivations for the bombings (to avenge what he considered to be mistreatment—“dastardly deeds” (Brussel, 1968, p. 17)—at the hands of his former employer, Con Edison), the police were unable to identify or apprehend him. In 1956, Inspector Finney, the director of the New York Police Department's crime laboratory, consulted Brussel, a psychiatrist who had experience with criminal offenders. Although Brussel had no investigative training, the police were under pressure to solve the case and were

desperate for leads. The captain of the New York Bureau of Missing Persons had arranged the consultation between Finney and Brussel and encouraged Brussel to evaluate the evidence. "Give it a whirl, doctor," he told Brussel; "Sometimes the difference between failure and success is a new thought" (Brussel, 1968, p. 5).

Brussel reviewed the letters and crime scene photographs that Finney provided. After considering the available facts, he produced a profile of the unidentified bomber. Brussel described the perpetrator as a paranoid, symmetrically built, middle-aged man. He would be a skilled mechanic of Slavic descent and would live either alone or with an older female relative. He would have a chronic illness (heart disease, cancer, or tuberculosis), which he would believe he had contracted on the job at Con Edison. Brussel predicted that the offender would be a high school graduate, a loner, a regular churchgoer, and impeccably neat. "When you catch him," he told the inspector, "he'll be wearing a double-breasted suit . . . buttoned" (Brussel, 1968, p. 46). Parts of Brussel's profile were actuarial predictions. For example, he predicted the symmetrical body type by referring to Ernst Kretschmer's informal survey of 10,000 patients, which revealed that "85% of paranoiacs have . . . an 'athletic' body type" (Brussel, 1968, p. 32). He also based the age range of the offender on averages, adding the average age of onset of paranoia (early 30s) to the 16 years of the perpetrator's bomb-making. In both of these cases, Brussel wrote, "The laws of probability were on my side" (Brussel, 1968, p. 33). As was the case with Collins's fictional character Walter Hartright, Brussel suggested a proactive strategy to flush out the offender. He suggested publicizing the profile:

By putting these theories of mine in the papers, you might prod the Bomber out of hiding . . . It'll challenge him . . . He'll say to himself "Here's some psychiatrist who thinks . . . he can outfox me . . ." and then maybe he'll write to some newspaper and tell how wrong I am. He might give . . . other clues. (Brussel, 1968, p. 45)

The profile was published in *The New York Times*, and the Mad Bomber did in fact respond with more letters and a threatening phone call to Brussel. Meanwhile, a review of Con Edison's employee records revealed a "troublesome" (Brussel, 1968, p. 62) case involving a disagreement with a generator wiper named George Metesky, who had been injured on the job and blamed this injury for causing a subsequent illness. In one of the letters written by Metesky to Con Edison appeared the phrase "dastardly deeds," the same one that had been used in several of the Mad Bomber's letters to the press. The police investigated Metesky and eventually arrested him for the bombings. Metesky was a 54-year-old man of Polish descent, living with his two older sisters. He was "well-proportioned" (Brussel, 1968, p. 67), at 5 feet 9 inches and 170 pounds. His neighbors characterized him

as aloof and unfriendly; his former employer described him as meticulous in his work—he was a trained electrician. He rarely missed Mass at St. Patrick’s Cathedral, and he had tuberculosis, which he blamed on his accident at Con Edison. When police arrested him, Metesky was wearing “a blue pin-striped double-breasted suit. It was buttoned” (Brussel, 1968, p. 69).

Brussel went on to consult in other high-profile cases, most notably that of the Boston Strangler. He acknowledges that he sometimes made errors; however, there is no information in his *Casebook of a Crime Psychiatrist* (Brussel, 1968) on his accuracy rate. On the basis of anecdotal success, however, police departments and attorneys frequently asked for profiles from him. Ultimately, Brussel was asked by the “father of FBI profiling” (Kessler, 1993, p. 217), Howard D. Teten, to tutor him in his profiling methods. Teten independently began developing ideas on profiling as an evidence officer in California, where he was also earning a degree in criminology at the University of California, Berkeley. On the basis of his observations about the relationships between crime scene evidence and the perpetrators of those crimes, he concluded that patterns could be recognized and compared with patterns from other cases to narrow down lists of suspects. He believed that crime scene patterns could be associated with particular mental disorders. Teten joined the FBI in 1962 and began teaching a course in applied criminology in the late 1960s. In teaching, he offered suggestions and conclusions on unsolved cases that police officers brought to class. When some of these profiles were successfully used to solve some difficult cases, the FBI “recognize[d] we had a contribution to make” (Kessler, 1993, p. 222). Teten’s class evolved into a series of courses and eventually into the training program that has become the FBI’s Investigative Support Unit, which is discussed in more detail shortly.

Teten’s early partner in these endeavors was Patrick Mullany, an agent in New York who had a degree in psychology and was interested in the work that Teten had been doing. He transferred to the FBI Academy, and the two began consulting privately on unsolved murder cases. In 1974, they were joined by Robert Ressler and, 3 years later, in 1977, by John Douglas.

During this time, profiling in the FBI was enjoying some initial success. The first case that was solved using Teten’s systematic profiling techniques was a kidnapping that took place in 1973. Seven-year-old Susan Jaeger had been abducted from her tent while on a camping trip with her family. Teten and Mullany profiled the offender as a young, White, male loner who lived locally in the Bozeman, Montana, area. The local FBI office had identified an individual, David Meierhofer, who matched Teten and Mullany’s profile, but there was no evidence to tie him to the crime. Early the following year, a woman who had been associated with Meierhofer was also reported as missing. Although there was still no evidence to link the two crimes with Meierhofer, this second crime allowed Teten, Mullany, and now Ressler to

“refine the profile” (Ressler & Shachtman, 1992, p. 154). They determined that the offender would be the type of person who would enjoy reliving his crimes and might telephone the families of his victims. On the basis of this, the lead agent on the case in Bozeman recommended to the Jaeger family that they keep a tape recorder near their telephone. On the anniversary of Susan Jaeger’s abduction, the Jaegers received a phone call from the kidnapper. An FBI voice analysis identified Meierhofer as the caller, but this was insufficient for obtaining a search warrant and arresting him. Mullany then suggested to Mrs. Jaeger that, on the basis of the profile, Meierhofer “could be woman-dominated” (Ressler & Shachtman, 1992, p. 155). He recommended that she go to Montana and confront the suspect. She did so, and shortly thereafter the kidnapper called the Jaeger home again. This time, Mrs. Jaeger was able to identify the voice as that of Meierhofer, and the FBI was then able to arrest him and search his home, where they discovered remains of both victims.

Word began to spread about Teten’s and Mullany’s success with profiling unsolved crimes, and with the end of the J. Edgar Hoover era, profiling was becoming a more accepted practice within the FBI. Teten, however, wanted to add a research component to the Behavioral Science Unit and needed a larger database of information on criminal behavior to improve on the unit’s profiling capabilities. Academic research was not thought to be helpful to this end: “By and large, academics study crime from afar. They generally focus on theories and would not think of asking criminals how they did their crimes” (Kessler, 1993, p. 222). So, Ressler and Douglas began to supplement the needed database by interviewing incarcerated serial rapists, murderers, and assassins around the United States.

Ressler and Douglas traveled the United States, collecting 57 pages of data on each of 36 incarcerated offenders. They noted similarities and differences in the offenders’ responses, including information about motives, planning of crimes, and the disposal of evidence. “By the time Ressler and I had done ten or twelve prison interviews,” Douglas reported, “It was clear to any reasonably intelligent observer that we were onto something. For the first time, we were able to correlate what was going on in an offender’s mind with the evidence he left at a crime scene” (Douglas & Olshaker, 1995, p. 117). Of particular interest to them were serial sexual offenders, whose repeated crimes provided a wealth of crime scene and victim information. Collaborating with Ann Burgess, of the University of Pennsylvania School of Nursing, Ressler and Douglas began to direct their interviews in an attempt to create a taxonomy of these sexual offenders. Funded by the National Institute of Justice, this study, called the Criminal Personality Research Project (CPRP), culminated in the publication of *Sexual Homicide: Patterns and Motives* (Ressler, Burgess, & Douglas, 1988), a handbook of characteristics of sexual killers.

Douglas and Ressler subsequently collaborated with Burgess once again (and with Allen Burgess) to author the *Crime Classification Manual* (Douglas, Burgess, Burgess, & Ressler, 1992). On the basis of data from the CPRP and other FBI studies of sexual murderers, rapists, child molesters and abductors, and arsonists, this manual was intended to provide an empirically derived taxonomy for organizing and classifying serious crimes by behavioral characteristics. Finding the academic literature on these subjects to be lacking, Douglas and Olshaker (1995) wrote that this manual provided a system to “explain [crimes] in a way that a strictly psychological approach such as the *DSM* has never been able to do” (p. 354).

Ressler and Douglas are perhaps the best-known FBI profilers in the popular media today, having contributed significantly to the popularization of the art of criminal profiling. Both went on to speak in seminars and write books about their experiences as profilers. Both consulted with Thomas Harris (1991), author of *The Silence of the Lambs*, when he was doing research to construct his plot. In fact, one of the characters was modeled after Douglas, who went on to consult in the making of the Academy Award-winning film version of Harris’s novel.

Douglas eventually became the head of the Behavioral Science Unit (later renamed the *Investigative Support Unit*) and continued to do intuitive profiling, while Ressler became an innovator in the research and training arm of the unit. As early as 1981, Ressler suggested establishing the National Center for the Analysis of Violent Crime (NCAVC), a research and training center that would encompass the CPRP, police intern training, and programs that applied results of research projects to law enforcement tasks such as interrogation and warrant applications. Eventually, the NCAVC would encompass most of the behavioral science programs at the FBI. Ressler also helped to establish the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (VICAP), a nationwide computer system designed to allow law enforcement agencies in one area to cross-reference data from their unsolved cases with data from other unsolved cases in other areas. Since retiring from the FBI, both Douglas and Ressler have continued to stay active in profiling, providing consulting services in the private sector.

Developments in criminal profiling were not limited to the United States. David Canter, an academic in England, made his contribution to British profiling soon after Ressler and Douglas conducted their interviews of incarcerated offenders. Canter was asked by the London police to consult on a series of rapes and murders that plagued London in the mid-1980s. By compiling witness descriptions and applying some of his early profiling theories to the case evidence, Canter assisted police in apprehending the Railway Rapist (Canter, 1994, p. 54). In the resulting criminal trial, John Duffy was convicted of five rapes and two murders in 1988, following the “largest police investigation since the Yorkshire [R]ipper inquiry” (Canter,

1988, p. 14). Although Canter's approach to the Duffy case was certainly not a complete departure from that of Teten and Mullany, he did apply some additional theories and statistical analyses to an equally successful end. Canter's work is considered again in chapters 4 and 5.

PROFILING IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS

Criminal profiling is currently used in three phases of the criminal justice process: criminal investigation, apprehension, and prosecution. Although some of these involvements are explicitly stated by FBI profilers (Douglas, Ressler, Burgess, & Hartman, 1986) or by other, individual profilers (Turvey, 1999), others are simply inferred from the fact that profiling techniques are consistently used in a manner that furthers such goals (e.g., Turco, 1990). Within the criminal investigation phase, profiling still seems to be used after traditional investigative methods have been unsuccessful. In this phase, the goals of profiling are to link offenses together as part of a series, to identify physical, psychological, and lifestyle characteristics of unknown offenders; to suggest the pre- and postoffense behaviors that an offender is likely to exhibit; to evaluate the potential for certain criminal behaviors to escalate to more serious, violent crimes; and to suggest proactive tactics to flush out or lure an unknown offender into revealing his identity. Within the apprehension phase, the goals of profiling are to suggest items to include on search warrants as well as locations to be searched, to predict an offender's reactions or behaviors on arrest, and to suggest interrogation techniques that are likely to elicit a confession. Finally, in the prosecution phase, the goals of profiling are to provide expertise in the courtroom to demonstrate the linking of multiple offenses to one individual and to match a particular individual to the relevant crime(s) by virtue of his or her fit with the profile.

GOALS AND ORGANIZATION OF THIS BOOK

Despite the popularity of criminal profiling, evidence of its accuracy and utility in serving the previously discussed phases of the criminal justice process has not been scientifically demonstrated. Although historically portrayed as an art, profiling has increasingly been represented as a science. For example, the efforts of the FBI have been characterized as a "science of profiling" (Jeffreys, 1995, p. 45), even though this "science" has over the last 20 years consisted mainly of descriptive work.

The purpose of this book is twofold. First, the state of criminal profiling today is critically examined. This examination includes a discussion of the scientific and practical limits of existing approaches and the scientific and

practice implications of these limitations for the field of profiling. To accomplish these goals, Part I of the book is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 introduced a brief history of the roots of modern profiling. Chapter 2 then reviews the nonscientific models of criminal profiling, and chapter 3 presents the problems with these nonscientific profiling models. Chapter 4 reviews the one current model of scientific profiling, and chapter 5 critically evaluates this model as well as the attempted use of science in the nonscientific models of profiling covered in chapter 2. Taken together, these chapters demonstrate that criminal profiling is still an art, not an established science, and that profilers will differ in their conclusions and recommendations given the lack of scientific base for their judgments, a problem that vitiates any claim that profiling is an effective law enforcement tool.

Next, to address this problem and need, Part II is devoted to a discussion of building a science of profiling. Our approach is comprehensive and new but builds on existing practice and research, recognizing that empirical information can lead to better practice strategies and techniques. This discussion comprises eight chapters. Chapter 6 discusses goals for a science of profiling and the development of a theory with which to guide that science. Specification of goals is critical to keep new scientific work focused on testing that which will be important for the development of accurate profiling techniques. Theory is essential because it provides a body of principles to explain how and why the profiling process works, which can then be tested scientifically. Chapter 7 discusses crime scene evidence and its relationship to a science of profiling. This evidence is all that is available to investigators at the start of the profiling process, and thus it is essential to building a profile. Chapter 8 describes the constructs of the three offender characteristics essential to profiling: the perpetrator's motive, personality, and behavior. By describing the offender's motive for committing the crime, personality traits, and behaviors, the profile will narrow the field of persons that investigators need to consider. Chapters 9 and 10 discuss the study of motive and behavior, and personality and behavior, respectively, using examples from the psychological literature. Part II of this book argues that crime scene evidence is predicted by offender behavior, which in turn is predicted by the perpetrator's motive and personality or other offender behaviors. Chapter 11 describes a scientific model of profiling based on our theory relating the components of crime scene evidence, motive, personality, and behavior to each other, and chapter 12 discusses strategies for testing this model. Finally, chapter 13 offers conclusions and recommendations for profiling practice, as the field awaits the development of a new science of profiling. Collectively, these chapters should enable profiling to emerge as a credible and respected field that ultimately will significantly advance law enforcement investigations.