

IF WORDS COULD KILL:
RHETORICAL METHODOLOGY IN MEDIA DEPICTIONS OF SERIAL KILLERS

A Thesis Submitted to the College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements For the
Degree of Master of Arts In Rhetoric, Media, and Sensationalism
In the Ron and Jane Graham School of Professional Development,
College of Engineering, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon

By

Mimi Huyen Nguyen

© Copyright Mimi Huyen Nguyen, September 2022. All rights reserved.
Unless otherwise noted, copyright of the material in this thesis belongs to the author.

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis work or, in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other uses of materials in this thesis in whole or part should be addressed to:

Head of the Ron and Jane Graham School of Professional Development
College of Engineering
57 Campus Drive
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5A9 Canada

OR

Dean
College of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies
University of Saskatchewan
116 Thorvaldson Building, 110 Science Place
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 5C9 Canada

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores how the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), a trusted national broadcaster, engages in implicit and particularly damaging rhetoric in *The Fifth Estate*'s "Karla Homolka" documentary to influence audiences into adopting a misleading impression of its conveyed message. Originally aired on November 25, 1997, the hour-long episode of CBC's flagship television program, *The Fifth Estate* is dedicated to examining the Ontario Crown prosecutors' plea bargain with Karla Homolka. *The Fifth Estate*'s "Karla Homolka" from the CBC will serve as the primary rhetorical artefact with *Geraldo*'s "Manson: Psycho" from a syndicated network acting as a secondary rhetorical artefact and comparison point.

To understand the rhetorical processes in the respective episodes of *The Fifth Estate* and *Geraldo*, this thesis will conduct an analysis using (1) leadership theory by John P. Kotter and James MacGregor Burns, and (2) rhetorical criticism rooted in concepts provided by Lloyd Bitzer, Edwin Black, and Kenneth Burke. The leadership and rhetorical theories offer insight into identifying the context, motives, and patterns to critically analyze *Geraldo*'s "Manson: Psycho" as a baseline of defining sensationalism to contextualize with the sensational tactics in *The Fifth Estate*'s "Karla Homolka" episode.

To conclude, this thesis reveals how the leadership and rhetorical strategies enacted by the CBC undermine its own integrity in the documentary by inviting an audience to indulge in salacious entertainment, motivated less by a desire to understand a complex legal process than to be titillated by sensationalistic and fantastical narratives. The CBC manipulates and misdirects the audiences' attitudes, flirting with societal harm and public moral panic over a supposed threat that was disparate to its potential harm or actual danger.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincerest gratitude goes to my supervisor, Dr. Jeanie Wills, for showing me the treasure trove of rhetoric. From the start to end of this adventure, Dr. Wills shared in my enthusiasm and passion for rhetoric, encouraged me along the best paths and showed unwavering faith and support to help me handle my fears. She advocated for me and empowered me to be the best I can be. It was a privilege to be on this rhetoric journey with you.

To Dr. John Moffatt, who also graciously agreed to become my co-supervisor, I would like to sincerely express my thank you for opening the roadmap of rhetoric. As I reflect on my thesis journey, Dr. Moffatt was my thoughtful guide, mapping out the terrain and pointing the best route to climb to succeed in exploring rhetoric. His advice and expertise gave me the knowledge and confidence to climb a mountain.

Warm thanks to my advisory committee, Tate Cao and Dr. Allison Muri for their insight, patience, and support of my academics, and to Dr. David Beard for acting as my external reviewer.

My most heartfelt gratitude goes to my partner, Leejay Schmidt, for being the linter to my code.

There are so many people who have supported me along the way that I cannot possibly name everyone, but to all who have been a part of my journey, I am deeply grateful.

For my one and only,
Leejay Joel Schmidt.
My func is void without you.

For my mom, Lan Anh Thi Tran
Fearless. Resilient. Survivor.
You are my hero.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERMISSION TO USE	I
ABSTRACT	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
INTRODUCTION	1
ARTEFACTS	3
SYNOPSIS OF THE ARTEFACTS.....	4
LEADERSHIP THEORY.....	6
RHETORICAL CRITICISM.....	6
THESIS STRUCTURE.....	8
LITERATURE SURVEY	9
RHETORICAL THEORY: SITUATIONS, TOKENS, AND CLUSTERS.....	15
LEADERSHIP THEORY: BASES OF POWERS AND WIELDING POWER	19
CHAPTER 1: SENSATIONALIZING MANSON IN GERALDO	21
1.1 THE GERALDO SHOW AND “MANSON: PSYCHO” EPISODE	21
1.2 INTRODUCTION: RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF GERALDO’S “MANSON: PSYCHO”	23
1.3 WHERE THE RIVERA LEADS, PEOPLE DROWN.....	24
1.4 BITZER’S RHETORICAL SITUATION: INTENSIFYING THE SATANIC PANIC	27
1.5 BLACK’S SECOND PERSONA: RIVERA AND THE AUDIENCE’S IDENTITY	29
1.6 BURKE’S CLUSTER CRITICISM: EXPOSING POSSESSION AND RESURRECTION	36
1.7 RIVERA: SENSATIONALISM MAKES CENTS	39
CHAPTER 2: CBC, THE FIFTH ESTATE, AND MEDIA LEADERSHIP	41
2.1 KOTTER’S BASES OF POWER: THE POWERS THE CBC EXPLOITS	41
2.2 BURNS’ POWER WIELDER: LEADERSHIP OR LEADER-SHEEP?	48
2.3 WOOD A GOOD LEADER ABUSE THEIR POWER?	49
CHAPTER 3: THE FIFTH ESTATE – “KARLA HOMOLKA” EPISODE	50
3.1 INTRODUCTION: THE FIFTH ESTATE’S RHETORICAL AGENDA	50
3.2 MAINSTREAM MEDIA CONTEXT SURROUNDING HOMOLKA	52
3.3 AN OVERVIEW OF THE “KARLA HOMOLKA” EPISODE	60
3.4 BITZER’S RHETORICAL SITUATION: ENTERTAINMENT DEALS AND BIASED VIEWS	61
3.5 BLACK’S SECOND PERSONA: ENTHYMEMATIC TOKENS AND SCHOOLGIRL PERSONA	71
3.6 BURKE’S CLUSTER CRITICISM: THE COMPLETE CAST OF A FAIRY TALE	76
3.7 THE FIFTH ESTATE: VIEWERSHIP, SHOCK VALUE, SENSATIONALISM, AND TITILLATION	88
CONCLUSION	91
SENSATIONAL PARALLELS BETWEEN GERALDO AND THE FIFTH ESTATE	91
THE CBC UNDERMINED ITS ETHOS WITH SENSATIONALISM	93
APPENDICES	95
APPENDIX A: TRANSCRIPTION OF GERALDO – “MANSON: PSYCHO”	95
APPENDIX B: CHRONOLOGY FOR THE CHARLES MANSON EVENTS	136
APPENDIX C: TRANSCRIPTION OF THE FIFTH ESTATE – “KARLA HOMOLKA”	146
APPENDIX D: CHRONOLOGY FOR THE KARLA HOMOLKA & PAUL BERNARDO EVENTS	184
BIBLIOGRAPHY	193

INTRODUCTION

Humans wield symbols to communicate their perspectives on how they encounter the world around them. Although communication may appear to simply facilitate an exchange of information, in actuality, communication is rhetorical in nature. Rhetoric refers to “the ways in which signs influence people; and through that influence, rhetoric makes things happen.”¹ Rhetoric is ubiquitous, persuasive, and multi-dimensional because it involves the (1) rhetor and their created rhetoric, (2) audience that is called into being, and (3) rhetorical message.

For rhetors, the signs and symbols that they use invite the audience to agree or act. In describing rhetors and their rhetoric, Sonja Foss emphasizes that the purpose of rhetoric “is communication [...] [and] we use rhetoric in an effort to persuade others – to encourage others to change in some way. [...] [R]hetoric is an invitation to understanding – we offer our perspectives and invite others to enter our world so they can understand us and our perspectives better.”² A rhetor that builds credibility and trust with an audience will wield more persuasive power and will appeal more favourably to an audience.

The rhetorical audience is influenced in particular ways based on the motive and world view of the rhetor. On the practical nature of rhetoric, Barry Brummett asserts that “we think or act in certain ways in response to texts, because of the meaning that the texts have for us and the meanings that texts urge us to attribute to our experience.”³ An audience encounters symbols continuously; audiences respond to symbols by processing how they operate and deciding how to interpret meaning. A symbol or sign that evokes an audience’s emotions and basic instincts (fears, feelings, values, dreams, frustrations, egos, vanities, and desires) will affect their attitudes and perspectives, as well as motivate them to act.

¹ Barry Brummett, *Rhetoric in Popular Culture*, 4th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2015), 11.

² Sonja K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 3rd ed. (Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2004), 5-6.

³ Barry Brummett, *Rhetoric in Popular Culture*, 80.

The rhetorical message as a symbolic act is the object of study in rhetorical criticism.⁴ A message or artefact contains rhetorical characteristics or strategies that enable it to function in particular ways. Rhetorical messages are often explicit in their appeals; however, there are some appeals that are hidden and/or implicit. To explain the rhetorical message, consider a treasure chest as an example. The treasure chest, a locked container filled with valuable relics and artifacts from a bygone era, is the rhetorical message. The explicit nature and design of the chest is to store and hold treasure, and those treasures are implicit or hidden unless the lock is opened by its devoted key. Without this tool or instrument, the chest loses meaning in worth and value as the contents of the chest remain a mystery. In rhetoric, rhetorical criticism is the key to unlocking the treasure trove and overall meaning of the rhetorical message. Rhetorical study is a tool/instrument for deeper critical thinking, which scopes the act of uncovering the implicit features of the rhetor's motivation and perspective, individual processes, and strategic choices. The study of rhetoric also allows us to analyze how the message shapes an audience's attitude and encourages action, what identity the rhetor has in mind for the audience, and what rhetorical patterns or moves are used to enable the message to function in particular ways. As a result of the rhetorical tools, a treasure trove of meaning is unlocked and fully visible to the beholder.

To make visible what is hidden and implicit in a rhetorical message, my study is a rhetorical analysis of how the television media shapes its narrative of serial killers for an audience. Mainstream media's responsibility is to inform the public and make complex crime stories easier for the public to understand. However, driven by the public's fascination with serial killers and the opportunity to capitalize on public anxiety, the media does not consider the dangers of giving these killers airtime, such as iconizing serial killers or coaching an attitude in the public that murder is entertainment. People are bombarded by the televised media every day, inviting them to act in particular ways and believe certain ideas to be true or false. When investigative journalists communicate about serial killers and their crimes on televised media, they provide clues on how the audience should identify these serial killers and coach the audience to view these serial killers through a certain lens. When the implicit rhetorical messages of media are

⁴ Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 7.

uncovered, we can see how the media is influencing viewers to share the desired viewpoints of the media outlet. Rhetorical study is essential to understanding and interpreting rhetorical messages. As Foss posits on rhetorical study:

[W]e can understand and explain why we like or don't like something by investigating the symbols themselves – we can begin to make statements about these messages rather than statements about our feelings[,] [which] [...] enables us to become more sophisticated and discriminating in explaining, investigating, and understand[ing] symbols and our responses to them.⁵

Artefacts

The Fifth Estate's "Karla Homolka" from the CBC will serve as my primary rhetorical artefact and Geraldo's "Manson: Psycho" from a syndicated network, acting as my secondary rhetorical artefact, will serve as a reference point for sensationalism that is present in the Homolka episode. When I was selecting the artefacts, I considered the components of the rhetor, audience, and rhetorical message. My rhetorical analysis addresses the underlying question of what is "the [rhetorical] message within the message?" Specifically, my rhetorical analysis examines how the CBC, traditionally viewed as a Canadian news leader, turned a true crime documentary into a source of entertainment, complete with sex and violence so that this media outlet could "try" the Crown prosecutor's decision about the plea bargain in the court of public opinion. In the process of attempting to demonstrate how Homolka manipulated the Crown, the CBC manipulates their audience, inviting them to sit in the role of judge, jury, and voyeur instead of acting as critically thinking citizens. Therefore, my research question asks how the rhetorical strategies enacted by the CBC undermine its own integrity in the documentary. To provide context about sensational news reporting, I will similarly conduct a rhetorical analysis of *Geraldo*'s "Manson: Psycho" as a comparison point to the CBC's handling of the Homolka story and show how the CBC uses sensationalism to attract public attention and invite the audience to become voyeurs and salaciously entertained by serial killers.

⁵ Sonja Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 7.

Synopsis of the Artefacts

The Geraldo Show: Geraldo Rivera and Charles Manson

Geraldo, a production of the *Investigative News Group*, was a popular American tabloid talk show that ran eleven seasons from 1987 to 1998. Geraldo Rivera, the host and investigative journalist of *Geraldo*, has a background that includes investigative journalism, award-winning news stories, and sensational news reporting. The show presents controversial themes of conflict and violence amongst guests and the host, complete with sensational taboos and theatrics. The show is also known for its controversial guests, such as Charles Manson, who is the focal point and featured guest in the “Manson: Psycho” episode that aired on May 9, 1988. Cult leader Manson directed his followers to commit a series of nine murders in 1969. In *Geraldo*’s “Manson: Psycho,” Rivera attempts to provide a “fresh look into the mind of an American monster, [Charles] Manson.”⁶ The episode features Rivera, who interviews two guests invited on the show – Robert Ressler from the Behavioral Analysis Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and Dr. Jack Levin, professor of sociology and criminology from Northeastern University. Rivera structures the Manson episode to involve (1) a discussion with the guest speakers regarding the interview footage between Rivera and Manson; (2) the audience (on the set of *Geraldo*), interacting with Rivera and the guest speakers; (3) video footage of Rivera interviewing Charles Manson. Like *The Fifth Estate*’s “Karla Homolka” documentary, *Geraldo*’s “Manson: Psycho” investigates violent crimes and exposes the actions of the serial killer, presenting interviews and video footage of individuals involved in the criminal cases. With the true crime similarities of both episodes, I will apply a leadership and rhetorical analysis of *Geraldo* to show how *The Fifth Estate* exploits many of the same *Geraldo* strategies when reporting on serial killer Homolka. While *Geraldo* is regarded as a tabloid talk show and *The Fifth Estate* is considered a news documentary, a rhetorical analysis of the “Manson: Psycho” episode will highlight how *The Fifth Estate* exhibits sensational reporting in their rhetorical construction of the “Karla Homolka” documentary.

⁶ Geraldo Rivera, “Manson: Psycho,” *Geraldo*, Investigative News Group, Tribune Entertainment, 1988, accessed July 12, 2020, <http://index.geraldo.com/page/manson-psycho>.

The Fifth Estate: Trish Wood and Karla Homolka

As the flagship television program of the CBC, *The Fifth Estate* “tradition[ally] offer[s] viewers compelling in-depth stories, and fast-reaction investigations of ongoing events through unparalleled storytelling, production values and journalistic skill.”⁷ Originally aired on November 25, 1997, *The Fifth Estate* dedicated an hour-long episode to examine the Ontario Crown prosecutors’ plea bargain with Karla Homolka. Trish Wood, the host and investigative journalist for *The Fifth Estate*, “received tremendous acclaim for [the] piece looking [at] the Crown’s questionable deal with Karla Homolka.”⁸ Homolka and her then-husband, Paul Bernardo, murdered three teenage girls between December 1990 and April 1992 (see [Appendix D: Chronology for the Karla Homolka & Paul Bernardo Events](#)). Bernardo was charged with first degree murder, receiving a life sentence with the possibility of parole after 25 years. In exchange for a full testimony against Bernardo, without which the Crown could not have received a conviction, Homolka agreed to a plea bargain that stipulated she serve twelve years concurrently for two counts of manslaughter in exchange for immunity from further prosecution. With the aim to establish Homolka’s “true” character, *The Fifth Estate* features dramatic re-enactments, interview tapes between Homolka and the police, and Homolka-Bernardo home videos and images. Moreover, Wood conducts nine interviews: (1) Dr. Fred Berlin – psychologist; (2) Mary Hall – Crown prosecutor; (3) Dr. Andrew Malcolm – Homolka’s psychologist; (4) Kathy and Alex Ford – Homolka’s friends; (5) Jenny Black – Homolka’s co-worker; (6) George Walker – Homolka’s lawyer; (7) Vince Bevan – police inspector; (8) Stephen Williams – book author of *Invisible Darkness*; and (9) Jack Rosen – Bernardo’s lawyer. These interviews support the documentary’s rhetorical construction of Homolka’s identity, which helps Wood appear to be a leader and build ethos (as defined by Aristotle⁹) with the audience. Ultimately, since *The Fifth Estate* is a flagship program of the CBC and Wood is the host on *The Fifth Estate*, the ethos of the CBC is directly impacted by the journalistic decisions of both Wood and *The Fifth Estate* as a whole.

⁷ Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), “The Fifth Estate About the show,” (2021), accessed December 5, 2021. <https://www.cbc.ca/mediacentre/program/the-fifth-estate>.

⁸ CBC, “The Fifth Estate: Karla Homolka,” (November 25, 1997), accessed July 12, 2020, <https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/2653449772>.

⁹ The foundations of rhetoric are Aristotle’s rhetorical appeals – *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* – will be discussed in the Literature Survey on page 15.

Leadership Theory

I will assess John P. Kotter's bases of power to identify how Rivera and Wood are leaders in their fields. Once I have addressed their leadership, I will apply James MacGregor Burns' concept of the "power wielder" to show how Rivera and Wood sacrifice journalistic ethos and subsequently fail at their leadership, disempowering the audience from thinking critically to bolster their respective viewership and television ratings. While they undermine their ethos and leadership, Rivera and Wood also employ sensational rhetorical strategies, which I will highlight and discuss with the methods of rhetorical criticism.

Rhetorical Criticism

Rhetorical criticism is "designed for the systematic investigation and explanation of symbolic acts and artefacts for the purpose of understanding rhetorical processes."¹⁰ To understand the rhetorical processes of *The Fifth Estate* documentary and *Geraldo* episode, I will use methods of rhetorical criticism rooted in concepts provided by Lloyd Bitzer, Edwin Black, and Kenneth Burke. Their rhetorical methods offer insight into identifying the rhetorical context, motives, and patterns to critically analyze *Geraldo*'s "Manson: Psycho" as a baseline of defining sensationalism to contextualize with the sensational tactics in *The Fifth Estate*'s "Karla Homolka" episode. A careful comparison of the *Geraldo* episode reveals the explicit and implicit rhetorical situation within *The Fifth Estate* that arises when television media sensationalizes serial killers to shape the audience's attitude for gains in viewership. To explore both the explicit and implicit rhetorical situation, I will start by applying rhetorical theory derived from Bitzer to analyze episodes "Manson: Psycho" (*Geraldo*) and "Karla Homolka" (CBC's *The Fifth Estate*).

¹⁰ Sonja K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 6.

The Rhetorical Situation of the Artefacts

As the artefact is “called into existence by a situation,”¹¹ I will examine how the rhetorical context of the television media hosts’ attempts to build identification with their respective audiences. Once I establish Bitzer’s method of analysis as a framework to examine *The Fifth Estate* and *Geraldo* episodes, I will use Edwin Black’s framework to reveal how “tokens” in the rhetorical message call the audience into being – which will be described in the next section.

The Second Persona in the Manson and Homolka Episodes

With Black’s method, my analysis of “Manson: Psycho” and “Karla Homolka” will focus on the rhetorical approach with which the media offers up “stylistic tokens,”¹² cuing the audience to become jury, judge, or voyeurs of murder and perceive serial killers as entertainment for viewership. Black’s rhetorical tools will help me to highlight how the audience is called into being and demonstrate the rhetor’s understanding of their rhetorical audience. To follow Black’s method of rhetorical criticism, I will apply Kenneth Burke’s *Cluster Criticism* to help me identify the motives of both *Geraldo* and CBC’s *The Fifth Estate* and how the two episodes make symbolic choices to coach the audience’s attitude of the situation.

Word Clusters within Geraldo and The Fifth Estate

A careful comparison of the use of symbols in the *Geraldo* with *The Fifth Estate* episodes will reveal explicit and implicit connections of sensationalism, which undermines the integrity of CBC’s *The Fifth Estate* as a news documentary. As well, I will discern the individual motivations and rhetorical moves that emerge from the situation, the communicators, and the exigencies within these episodes. With Burke’s cluster criticism being the final framework in my rhetorical analysis of the “Manson: Psycho” and “Karla Homolka” episodes, I will next provide the structure and outline of my rhetorical study.

¹¹ Lloyd Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1, no. 1 (1968): 9.

¹² Edwin Black. “The Second Persona”. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56, no. 2 (1970): 112.

Thesis Structure

In *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*, Roderick Hart and Suzanne Daughton assert that television media “give[s] viewers a sense of control even as it seeks to wrest control away from them.”¹³ With leadership and rhetorical analysis as methods, I will examine the strategic ways that television media communicates about serial killers to a variety of audiences, which can lead to a more developed or complete understanding of what occurs in the message and situation. In turn, my study on television media will allow us to better protect ourselves from this form of influence and control. Moreover, my leadership and rhetorical study allows people to become informed by helping them process, evaluate, and explain the ethics of the message – how the message affects them on an individual and societal level as they seek to understand the world. With the methodologies from leadership theorists Kotter and Burns, as well as rhetorical theorists Burke, Black, and Bitzer as a framework, I will explore how the CBC engages in implicit and particularly damaging rhetoric in *The Fifth Estate*’s “Karla Homolka” documentary to influence audiences into adopting the desired perception of its conveyed message.

The first chapter conducts a leadership and rhetorical analysis on *Geraldo*’s “Manson: Psycho” to expose the parallel patterns of sensationalism between “tabloid” television and *The Fifth Estate*’s portrayal of the Homolka story in its episode. The second chapter introduces leadership theory and the CBC, outlining its leadership history and rhetoric with the public for the purpose of gaining an in-depth understanding of its power, identity, and integrity. The third chapter uses the rhetorical theories as a framework to examine *The Fifth Estate*’s “Karla Homolka” and identify how reputable news media, such as the CBC, present a narrative of female criminality. Finally, the conclusion addresses the outcomes of my analysis: (1) how news media, both reputable and tabloid, often exploit many of the same rhetorical tactics when presenting narratives about serial killers, and (2) how the CBC, a Canadian news leader, undermines its own ethos by turning *The Fifth Estate*’s documentary into a source of salacious entertainment: a sensationalized trial in the court of public opinion.

¹³ Roderick Hart and Suzanne Daughton, *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*, (New York: Pearson Education, 2005), 187.

LITERATURE SURVEY

As a tween, I was excited to come home from school and tune into the YTV Canada network, where I would watch television shows like *Are You Afraid Of The Dark?*, *Goosebumps*, and *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* with great interest. These horror shows gave me an emotional thrill and I knew I was safe because ghosts, monsters, and vampires do not exist. But I remember a time when a different show caught my attention while I was flipping through the television channels. In the show, the music provoked an immediate fear reaction from me, and I remembered a deep, butter-smooth male voice verbally illustrating the details of a true crime while simultaneously, zooming into actual footage of where the murder took place. I understood that the show was real life from the serious tone in his voice, as he described the crime using macabre language and imagery. In my young memory, the location of the murder looked like any other forest clearing surrounded by leafy green trees, bushes, and unkept grass, but there was a mound of disturbed soil. The presentation had a shocking and terrifying effect on me at that time, where I was anxious for an extended period of time; the imagery imprinted on my young mind to the point that I would sleep with the light on and with the covers over my head for days, even weeks, not caring if I had a hard time breathing. The impact of the image was so profound that for weeks, when I walked to school every morning and came home in the afternoon, I (much to my chagrin) would subconsciously search for the same forest in my surroundings. That image still impacts me to this day - when I saw *The Fifth Estate*'s "Karla Homolka," I experienced that flash back and a similar, chilling emotional response. I found it disturbing that *The Fifth Estate* documentary made me experience the same sort of reaction that I had earlier. I was conditioned by horror television to be tolerant to a degree of this kind of emotional stimulus, but experiencing the same stimulus in the context of "serious investigative journalism" was very problematic on an ethical level. From that moment, I was determined to conduct a rhetorical analysis of *The Fifth Estate* episode.

Originally, my proposed research would have examined the rhetorical context that shaped serial killers' communication, specifically how Homolka fashioned her identity to manipulate her audience's attitude and view of her. However, I came to the disturbing discovery that somehow *The Fifth Estate* documentary was overstepping the same emotional boundaries that my earlier encounter with true crime had in escalating my response to horror-based television. With two examples of media that evoked a visceral emotional response, I decided to investigate my suspicion that the media might actually be the source of anxiety and fear about serial killers, more so than the serial killers themselves.

The central focus of my thesis is to study the pervasive nature of sensationalism in contemporary journalism, specifically focusing on the parallels in sensationalism between American tabloid journalism and Canadian investigative journalism. The basis of my analysis will be a comparison of the "Karla Homolka" episode of CBC television program, *The Fifth Estate*, as an example of Canadian investigative journalism and the "Manson: Psycho" episode of *Geraldo* as American tabloid journalism. I apply a rhetorical approach to my analysis, drawing on methods proposed by rhetorical theorists in order to identify patterns in the motivations, situations, and outcomes between the two styles of reporting. In addition to rhetorical theory, I will apply contemporary leadership theory to shed additional light on the CBC's or at least Trish Wood's, ethos and how it "coaches an attitude"¹ in the audience. Applying leadership and rhetorical theory to examine the rhetoric within the two journalism styles will aid me in better identifying the distortion of audiences' attitudes, decisions, and views when investigative news journalism employs sensationalism.

An extensive body of scholarly analysis of independently presented subjects on Canadian investigative journalism (1,609 peer-reviewed results), American tabloid journalism (10,195 peer-reviewed results), serial killers (33,716 peer-reviewed results), and sensationalism in news reporting (7,901 peer-reviewed results) exists, based on my search of the University of Saskatchewan library catalogue. When I performed a university library search of "serial killers media," I found nearly 11,700 results for peer-reviewed articles (more than 15,000 search results

¹ Kenneth Burke, *Attitudes Toward History*, 3rd ed., (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 322.

without the peer-reviewed filter). Clearly, the topic of serial killers in media is very popular for academic analysis. After surveying these results, I found the common argument among a large sample of the results that the media sensationalizes serial killers (nearly 287 with the peer-reviewed filter). This conclusion was not unique to American or Canadian media analysis, or limited to specific serial killers – seemingly, the media commonly sensationalized many different serial killers across various geographical borders. However, relatively little work has been done to date comparing attitudes towards journalistic ethos in Canadian and American media, particularly around the issue of crime reporting. The present study seeks to address this gap in the scholarship by analyzing my selected artefacts to highlight key points of comparison and contrast in the ethos of Canada’s and America’s respective media.

When I surveyed the academic works about serial killers in media, one that stood out was April Pace’s “Serial Killers in Popular Media: A content analysis of sensationalism and support for capital punishment.” Pace argues that sensationalism in the media, particularly sensationalism that favours fear in the audience, can lead to cultural shifts within society. She also asserts the following:

The media sensationalism section addresses the existence of media bias in the United States and its impact on public opinion regarding serial killers, including how the creation of fear by the media allows for the continued public support of capital punishment in the United States.²

The pathos appeals made by the media drive cultural change within the society, which plays out even more extremely with tabloid journalism. Through sensational reporting and content, tabloid journalism can shape a cultural climate and construct widespread anxieties and fears. In her article, “American Monsters: Tabloid Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970-2000,” Sarah Hughes notes how societal “panic unfolded mostly through infotainment, lending appeal to subgenres like talk shows.”³ She indicates how the “legitimacy of sensational material on television was

² April Pace, “Serial Killers in Popular Media: A content analysis of sensationalism and support for capital punishment,” Order No. 22588145, Eastern Kentucky University, 2019, 7.
<http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/dissertations-theses/serial-killers-popular-media-content-analysis/docview/2311919040/se-2?accountid=14739>

³ Sarah Hughes, “American Monsters: Tabloid Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970–2000,” *Journal of American Studies* 51, no. 3 (2017): 691–719. doi:10.1017/S0021875816001298.

bolstered by the use of anecdotal evidence, eyewitness testimony, surveillance footage, on-scene reports, and dramatic re-enactments that often revolved around extremely intimate situations.”⁴ Pace’s and Hughes’ articles provide useful critical models of how tabloid and “News Media” uses sensationalism in its delivery of emotional appeals to push cultural change and moral panic in society, especially in American and Canadian journalism.

How media sensationalism leads to cultural shifts in society is also relevant in Julie Wiest’s article, “Casting Cultural Monsters: Representations of Serial Killers in U.S. and U.K. News Media,” which offers a geographically comparative study similar to my own. Her essay, “informed by theoretical arguments within cultural sociology[,] draw[s] on a qualitative content analysis of news articles published in the United States and the United Kingdom” to explore news media representations of serial killers.”⁵ She indicates that “serial murder is deeply embedded in Western cultures, and serial killers are the subject of widespread coverage in news and entertainment media.”⁶ Additionally, Wiest notes that “media representations reveal much about a culture, and the use of extreme images [...] speaks especially loudly.”⁷ She indicates that while “there are several similarities in the way U.S. and U.K. news sources represent serial murder, [...] U.K. articles include more monster imagery and U.S. articles include more celebrity imagery.”⁸ Her take on how media portrayals of serial killers shape national and cultural identity allows me to consider if similar portrayals and cultural impacts exist within the Canadian media landscape.

The way that serial killers are portrayed in the news media of the United States and United Kingdom is relevant to serial killer portrayals in Canadian news media. Wiest’s work is also referenced in Sean Heir’s, “Almost Famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in cultural construction of a serial killer.” In his essay, Heir points out the following:

⁴ Sarah Hughes, “American Monsters: Tabloid Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970–2000.”

⁵ Julie B. Wiest, “Casting Cultural Monsters: Representations of Serial Killers in U.S. and U.K. News Media,” *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 27, no. 4 (2016): 327-46.

⁶ Julie B. Wiest, “Casting Cultural Monsters: Representations of Serial Killers in U.S. and U.K. News Media.”

⁷ Julie B. Wiest, “Casting Cultural Monsters: Representations of Serial Killers in U.S. and U.K. News Media.”

⁸ Julie B. Wiest, “Casting Cultural Monsters: Representations of Serial Killers in U.S. and U.K. News Media.”

In the Canadian context alone, the scholarly silence on media framing of serial murderers is astounding. Not only is there virtually no scholarly attention focused on killings carried out by obscure serial murderers ranging from Woodcock/Krueger to Cody Legebokoff (a teen killer who murdered four women between 2009 and 2010). There is also very little scholarly research on Canada's celebrity serial killers—especially [...] Paul Bernardo.⁹ Heir also discusses how “news media routinely sensationalize modern serial killers thematically by casting them as variations on celebrity monsters,”¹⁰ such as in the case of Peter Woodcock. Woodcock was a “serial murderer who, at 18-years of age, killed three children [...] in the city of Toronto.”¹¹ While he confessed to all three murders, Woodcock was found “not guilty [...] by reason of insanity and [...] sent to the Oak Ridge Psychiatric Unit in Penetanguishene, Ontario, where all of the province's criminally insane offenders were housed.”¹² Woodcock's criminality was exploited in media for commodifying the growing international interest in serial killing in popular culture,¹³ and Heir notes that the “influence of mass media on cultural meanings has become so profound” that some have “laid claim to a symbiotic relationship between serial killers and mass media.”¹⁴ Within his essay, Heir also discusses how “the news media's role in finding the actual killer [became] profoundly diminished” because “the preferred solution to the problem of two remarkably similar child murders was to attend to sex deviants and dangerous geographies.”¹⁵

Taking an approach comparable to Heir's essay, Deanna Elizabeth Simonetto wrote an article about an Ontario-born serial killer Karla Homolka, of similar study to my research, entitled “Who is Karla Homolka? A Case of Media Identity Transformation.” She asserts that the media

⁹ Sean Heir, “Almost famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in the cultural construction of a serial killer,” *Crime, Media, Culture*, 16 (2020): 375-394, Accessed June 4, 2022. doi:[10.1177/1741659019874171](https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659019874171).

¹⁰ Sean Heir, “Almost famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in the cultural construction of a serial killer.”

¹¹ Sean Heir, “Almost famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in the cultural construction of a serial killer.”

¹² Sean Heir, “Almost famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in the cultural construction of a serial killer.”

¹³ Sean Heir, “Almost famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in the cultural construction of a serial killer.”

¹⁴ Sean Heir, “Almost famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in the cultural construction of a serial killer.”

¹⁵ Sean Heir, “Almost famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in the cultural construction of a serial killer.”

constructs a story through a lens of gender and uses interpretive sociology theory to study the complex relationship between existing socially constructed personal identities of Karla Homolka in media descriptions. She also explains “media identities [support] other research claims that, when a woman commits an act of violence, her gender serves as the lens through which all of her actions are understood,”¹⁶ which highlights the gender-focused reporting by media that is relevant to my research.

A commonality between all these scholarly works is the use of sociology as the underlying theoretical framework. My method diverges from these scholarly works in applying rhetorical theory, and Lili Paquet’s essay, “Literary Forensic Rhetoric: Maps, Emotional Assent, and Rhetorical Space in *Serial* and *Making a Murderer*,” provides a basic premise to my work. While Paquet’s essay is neither about Homolka nor news media, it is a comparative study of a serial killer podcast and a documentary that uses Aristotle’s forensic rhetorical theory, establishing facts and truth that pertains to legal discourse by examining past situations.¹⁷ Paquet’s article explores how the podcast *Serial* and Netflix documentary *Making a Murderer* use techniques of forensic rhetoric and literature to draw in audiences.¹⁸ She suggests that these true crime series are “taking back legal narratives from institutional gatekeepers, ‘jurifying’ the audience,”¹⁹ and the “narratives provide a link between rational and emotional ‘proofs.’”²⁰

While these key works provide a scholarly context and basic premise for my research – theoretical framework, comparative study, national and cultural identity in media outlets, and serial killers – they do not fully address my narrowed research topic, which is the relationship between sensationalistic reporting and the audience, specifically focusing on the rhetorical parallels in sensationalism between American tabloid journalism (*Geraldo*’s “Manson: Psycho”)

¹⁶ Deanna Elizabeth Simonetto, “Who is Karla Homolka? A Case of Media Identity Transformation”, 49, no. 4 (2011); 24.

¹⁷ William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*, Bedford/St. Martin’s (2008), 25.

¹⁸ Lili Paquet, “Literary Forensic Rhetoric: Maps, Emotional Assent, and Rhetorical Space in *Serial* and *Making a Murderer*.” *Law and Humanities*, 12, no. 1 (2018): 71-92.

¹⁹ Lili Paquet, “Literary Forensic Rhetoric: Maps, Emotional Assent, and Rhetorical Space in *Serial* and *Making a Murderer*.”

²⁰ Lili Paquet, “Literary Forensic Rhetoric: Maps, Emotional Assent, and Rhetorical Space in *Serial* and *Making a Murderer*.”

and Canadian investigative journalism (CBC’s “Karla Homolka”). In the next section, I will focus on how rhetorical theorists Aristotle, Bitzer, Black, and Burke all provide frameworks for the analysis and assessment of how rhetors frame their communication to move audiences on multiple levels.

Rhetorical Theory: Situations, Tokens, and Clusters

The foundations of rhetoric are Aristotle’s rhetorical appeals – *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* – that emphasize the ability to persuade an audience. Ethos seeks to persuade an audience based on credibility, character, and trustworthiness.²¹ William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg indicate that rhetors create ethos through action, deeds, understanding and expertise.²² Pathos appeals involve the emotional state of the audience, as produced by the rhetor or message, and the audience’s feelings (or what Aristotle calls their “state of mind”) help frame how they understand the arguments of the speech, including whether they accept what is presented to them.²³ The logical appeal, or logos, moves an audience from one idea to another through reason and facts. Within the logos appeal, Aristotle refers to *enthymemes* as a method of reasoning or logic that can be adapted to persuade an audience.²⁴ As Aristotle explains, “The enthymeme must consist of few propositions, fewer than those which make up the normal syllogism, for if any of these propositions is a familiar fact, there is no need even to mention it; the hearer adds it himself.”²⁵ The logic of enthymemes conforms to the following formula: If A = B and B = C then A = C. For example, a documentary on a serial killer is aired on a national news service (A), and the national news service is known for trustworthy and reliable news (B), therefore the documentary must be trustworthy and reliable (C). The implied premise in this logic is that the documentary in that national news service is accepted as honest. This premise does not need to be stated because the logic is culturally accepted in society. Additionally, there is a pathos dimension to enthymemes because an enthymeme also speaks to values, and not just to reasoning

²¹ William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*, 38.

²² William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*, 39.

²³ William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*, 39.

²⁴ William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*, 37.

²⁵ Aristotle, “The Rhetoric,” *Rhetoric and on Poetics*, Ed. Friedrich Solmsen. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts, (Franklin, Pennsylvania: The Franklin Library, 1954): 1395a.

processes. Therefore, emotional and logic appeals can also make it easy for sensationalism to sneak under the radar on major news sources.

Aristotle's rhetorical appeals of ethos and enthymemes are core to my study because they explain how persuasion is developed in a message and the ways these messages are received and understood. Ethos appeals will be useful in my thesis to critique the credibility of Geraldo Rivera and Trish Wood specifically, while the concept of enthymemes will equip me with understanding the impact of assumptions about gender in the artefacts – how these impacts operate enthymematical. In the next section, the rhetorical theory of Bitzer defines the situational context in which Aristotle's appeals would apply.

Lloyd Bitzer – Rhetorical Situations Invite Responses

In Lloyd Bitzer's "The Rhetorical Situation", the author posits that an act/action "is a response to a situation of a certain kind."²⁶ Bitzer offers an analysis method of the artefact, including the *constraints* and *exigence* in the situation. According to William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, "Bitzer's goal [is] defining the rhetorical situation [...] to specify what makes the occasion unique."²⁷ Bitzer defines exigence as "an imperfection, marked by urgency,"²⁸ which he stresses is only resolvable by discourse. Where the exigence, as defined by Bitzer, is the urgent defect,²⁹ the constraints "are the things that stand in the way of dealing with the exigence. They can be attitudes or real structures."³⁰ As a framework, his concepts of rhetorical exigence and constraints will provide insight into the artefacts as a rhetorical situation, in which there is an agonistic relationship between the subject and the motives of the airing broadcaster. The rhetorical situation invites action and calls an audience; the role the audience is invited to become will be discussed in Edwin Black's rhetorical theory.

²⁶ Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1, no. 1 (1968): 3.

²⁷ William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*, 28.

²⁸ Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," 6-7.

²⁹ Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," 221.

³⁰ William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*, 28.

Edwin Black – Tokens and Cues within the Message

Edwin Black's essay, "The Second Persona," provides perspectives on how a rhetor's symbolic choices "contain[s] tokens [...] of their internal states,"³¹ and the "model of what the rhetor would have his real auditor become."³² The rhetor or "author implied by the discourse is an artificial creation: a persona, but not necessarily a person."³³ The "persona" is a fictitious idea or way of presenting an individual, representing the perspective of the individual behind the "mask" and the way in which they want to present as the message. The audience (what Black calls the "implied auditor"³⁴ or "second persona"³⁵) has a role in responding to a message; they are "but cursorily treated [...] [and] sometimes sitting in judgement of the past, sometimes of the present, and sometimes of the future, depending on whether the discourse is forensic, epideictic, or deliberative."³⁶ Black developed his theory in the context of political and social discourse, showing how the *second persona* is used to induce cooperation in anti-communist discourse in Cold War-era America; he also deploys Civil Rights discourse around racist language to explain how to identify tokens. The second persona is invited to take on an identity after being persuaded by a message from the persona. The message is a "network of interconnected convictions that function in [the audience] epistemically and that shapes [their] identity by determining how [they] vie[w] the world."³⁷

Since the audience is shaped by the sets of beliefs that they interpret through their experiences and the world around them, Black suggests that there are two implications for the verbal tokens of ideology: 1) the rhetor and audience must share core ideology in values and belief system, and 2) the rhetor must implement a strategy and methods to exert influence and tailor their message to the needs of the auditor rather than delivering a generalized message. With Black's method, my analysis of the artefacts will focus on the rhetorical approach with which the media offers up "stylistic tokens,"³⁸ cuing the audience to take on a certain identity and act on the rhetor's

³¹ Edwin Black. "The Second Persona". *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56, no. 2 (1970): 110.

³² Edwin Black, "The Second Persona", 115.

³³ Edwin Black, "The Second Persona", 111.

³⁴ Edwin Black, "The Second Persona", 111.

³⁵ Edwin Black, "The Second Persona", 111.

³⁶ Edwin Black, "The Second Persona", 111.

³⁷ Edwin Black, "The Second Persona", 112.

³⁸ Edwin Black, "The Second Persona", 112.

understanding of their rhetorical audience. Furthermore, Black's theory will reveal the attempts made by the two programs and their respective hosts at building ethos, leveraging their leadership and rhetoric to generate appeal with their audiences. After I have applied Black's rhetorical methodology, I will apply Kenneth Burke's *Cluster Criticism* to help me identify the motives of the artefacts and how they make symbolic choices to coach the audience's attitude of the situation.

Kenneth Burke – Word Clusters from the Subconscious

Kenneth Burke emphasizes the connection between language and motives, and the “use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents.”³⁹ Burke's *Cluster Criticism* (or *Key-Term Analysis*) offers analytical tools to uncover clusters of terms and concepts that may not be obvious to the rhetor. The methodology involves “‘what goes with what’ in these clusters: what kinds of acts and images and personalities and situations go with his notion of heroism, villainy, consolation, despair, etc.”⁴⁰ His methodology also includes (1) “identifying key signs within the text, those signs that are privileged with repetition, intensity, or prominence,”⁴¹ (2) asking “what other signs are associated with (i.e. clusters around) these key signs?” and (3) noting the “absence of certain signs or clusters in a text may also be central to the appeal.”⁴²

Burke's theory is equipped with a “vocabulary of thoughts, actions, emotions, and attitudes for codifying and thus interpreting a situation,”⁴³ which will help me name the rhetorical motives that arise. His theory is useful in revealing explicit and implicit connections of the rhetor's motivations and rhetorical moves that emerge from the situation, the communicators, and the exigences within these artefacts.

³⁹ Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969), 41.

⁴⁰ Brian Ott and Robert L. Mack, *Critical Media Studies: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, 2014, 117.

⁴¹ Brian Ott and Robert L. Mack, *Critical Media Studies: An Introduction*, 117.

⁴² Brian Ott and Robert L. Mack, *Critical Media Studies: An Introduction*, 117.

⁴³ Sonja K. Foss, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 70.

Leadership Theory: Bases of Powers and Wielding Power

Though rhetorical theory will equip me with the tools to name the rhetorical motives that arise, leadership theory will be a useful framework for analyzing the influence, and potential influence, the journalists' possess – which has an impact on our understanding and perception of their ethos.

John P. Kotter and the Available Bases of Power

Leadership theory is not often thought of as rhetorical theory per se; nevertheless, this theory is fundamentally rhetorical because it studies influence. In *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*, John P. Kotter, an authority on leadership, outlines a leadership process to inspire and create change. To show what constitutes successful and effective leadership, he describes how to leverage the five *bases of power* – *referent*, *expert*, *legitimate*, *coercive*, and *reward*. With referent power, the leader has the capacity to influence people by building respect, admiration, trust and credibility.⁴⁴ Expert power relies on what others respect as the leader's possession of knowledge, skills, or expertise.⁴⁵ The formal rights that come to a leader who occupies a particular position defines legitimate power.⁴⁶ Coercive power is the leader's ability to influence people by using the threat of force or punishment – including emotional, physical, and social means.⁴⁷ Reward power, lastly, refers to leadership that influences people to comply with a desired action through incentives, rewards, or benefits.⁴⁸ Referent, expert and legitimate of the Bases of Power will be central to my analysis because the journalists' in my artefacts depend on these powers to build their ethos. Once I have identified how the journalists' are implicitly positioned to exert leadership through their influence on their audience, I will apply James MacGregor Burns' leadership theory to determine whether the journalists are “power wielders.”

⁴⁴ Peter Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 6th ed. (LA: Sage, 2013), 10-11.

⁴⁵ Peter Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 10-11.

⁴⁶ Peter Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 10-11.

⁴⁷ Peter Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 10-11.

⁴⁸ Peter Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 10-11.

James MacGregor Burns and Leadership as Disempowerment

According to James MacGregor Burns, *Power Wielders* are “leaders who secured a commitment from followers that satisfied the leaders’, rather than followers’ interests. [...] [P]ower wielders tended to induce high levels of dependency amongst their followers.”⁴⁹ Burns’ theory of the power wielder operates along the principle of disempowering their followers and building allegiance to an ideal body.⁵⁰ Burns’ observation, regarding power wielders, concludes the following:

They consciously exploit their external resources (economic, social, psychological, and institutional) and their “effectance,” their training, skill, and competence, to make persons and things do what they want done. The key factor here is indeed “what they want done.” The motives of the power wielder may or may not coincide with what the respondent wants done [...]. Power wielders may or may not recognize respondents’ wants and needs; if they do, they may recognize them only to the degree necessary to achieve their goals; and if they must make a choice between satisfying their own purpose and satisfying their respondents’ needs, they will choose the former.⁵¹

Whether the power wielder shares the same motives, goals, beliefs, and values with the followers is inconsequential; power wielders treat their followers as a means to an end. Seen through the lens of these theories of leadership, the influence exerted by journalists in the American and Canadian artefacts is indexical to key similarities and differences in the construction of ethos in both cultural contexts.

While a substantial body of work on the relationship between media reporting and serial killers exists (especially in the U.S.), the lack of comparative work on Canadian and American manifestations of sensationalist journalism provides an opportunity for innovative interdisciplinary analyses. This study’s combined application of rhetorical analysis and leadership theories not only responds to this gap in the scholarship, but also establishes a model for future comparative studies of ethos in Canadian and American media.

⁴⁹ Keith Grint, *Leadership: A very short introduction*, Oxford: OUP, 97.

⁵⁰ Keith Grint, *Leadership: A very short introduction*, 97.

⁵¹ James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership*, Open Road Media (2012).

CHAPTER 1:

SENSATIONALIZING MANSON IN GERALDO

This chapter conducts a rhetorical analysis of Geraldo’s “Manson: Psycho” to establish an understanding of sensationalism in tabloid journalism and its “investigation” of serial killers. This rhetorical analysis of *Geraldo*’s episode will ultimately provide a baseline to understand how *The Fifth Estate*’s “Karla Homolka” uses sensational tactics in its narrative to turn a true crime story into dark, titillating entertainment for an increase in viewership. Before conducting the rhetorical analysis, I will provide information on *Geraldo* and its episode “Manson: Psycho” for context in the following section. For a full transcription of the *Geraldo* episode, see [Appendix A: Transcription of Geraldo - "Manson: Psycho"](#).

1.1 The Geraldo Show and “Manson: Psycho” Episode

A nationally syndicated show, *Geraldo* aired for eleven seasons, from 1987 to 1998. During the time that *Geraldo* was broadcast, American society developed a taste for news reporting and investigative journalism as sensationalistic entertainment. In “Serial Killers in Popular Media: A content analysis of sensationalism and support for capital punishment”, research by April Pace points out that:

Sensationalism and tabloid marketing became an increasingly popular tactic during the 1980s, and the decade’s journalists exploited the “newly discovered” crime of serial murder for their own gains. While the phenomenon of serial murder had existed in documented human history for centuries, it garnered little public or academic attention until the 1980s due to significant increases in the discovery of serial murder victims and apprehension of serial killers.¹

¹ April Pace, “Serial killers in popular media: A content analysis of sensationalism and support for capital punishment,” 2.

At the expense of accuracy and professionalism, sensationalism is intentionally controversial and exaggerated, provoking emotional appeals to gain an audience or notoriety. *Geraldo* exemplifies a “trash” talk show that thrives on sensationalism. The show features controversial topics, interviews and discussions that invite the studio audience to participate, and presents information in a manner intended to provoke emotional appeals to garner ratings.

On May 9, 1988, Rivera featured a San Quentin State Prison interview with Manson on the *Geraldo* episode entitled, “Manson: Psycho” with the aim to take “a fresh look into the mind of an American monster.”² In the 1960s, Manson created a cult called the “Manson [F]amily,”³ where Manson led his followers to murder people for him.⁴ At the studio location of *Geraldo*, Rivera has guest speakers Robert Ressler, psychological profiler and agent of the FBI Behavioral Science Unit who is known for coining the term “serial killer”, and Jack Levin, professor of Psychology in the Northeastern University in Boston. Rivera relies on the expertise of his guest speakers to support and answer his highly loaded questions in connection with Manson. Rivera dedicates an hour-long episode to examining Manson’s life, which includes his childhood, parents, the “Manson family”, his involvement in the violent crimes, and what Rivera claims is Manson’s self-proclaimed embodiment of Jesus and Satan.

² Watch *Geraldo*’s “Manson: Psycho” episode: <http://index.geraldo.com/page/manson-psycho>. For the transcription of the episode, see [Appendix A](#), 95.

³ See Appendix A, 99.

⁴ See Appendix B: Chronology for the Charles Manson Events.

1.2 Introduction: Rhetorical Analysis of Geraldo's "Manson: Psycho"

"Manson: Psycho" brings Charles Manson, who had been in prison for about 20-years at this point, back into the public eye and exploits his historic notoriety to draw in larger viewership numbers for the show. Rivera's instincts allow him to link Manson's notoriety to several ongoing neuroses in the American public about the contradictions between the traditional security and even sanctity of the American family unit, and the imminent danger posed to society by the breakdown of that unit. Rivera passes off his reportage as news by deploying tokens of bad parenting, and especially of bad mothering, which hints at a not always latent misogyny in this approach. Rivera uses Manson as a "poster boy" for bad parenting and links these ideas with the era's "Satanic Panic" - the supposed widespread satanic worship and abuse of the 1980s and 1990s, to tap into the anxieties and fears of the audience. Not only do Rivera's exploits stir up these anxieties, but they also coach in the audience the false belief that a lack of parental guidance could produce another Manson. *Geraldo* calls itself investigative journalism while practicing sensationalism and archetypal representations.

To uncover the damaging approach taken by Rivera, I will examine his narrative by applying James MacGregor Burns' leadership theory in coordination with John P. Kotter's theory of Bases of Power, and make explicit Rivera's failed leadership role with his guests. Then I will perform an analysis using Lloyd Bitzer's theory to provide context of the rhetorical situation, exigency, and constraints surrounding the episode. Next, Edwin Black's essay, "The Second Persona", will help me identify the "tokens" that Rivera calls the audience into being. Finally, I will conduct an analysis using Kenneth Burke's Cluster Criticism to identify how Rivera and his show coaches the audience's attitude. Once this analysis is complete, I will explain how Rivera's inflammatory language, failed leadership, and manufactured exigence ultimately contribute to ideal conditions for tangible societal damage for which he was required to apologize.

Starting with leadership theory as a framework in the next section, I will examine Rivera's failure as a leader in presenting *Geraldo* as a news and journalistic investigation – opting instead for an entertainment spectacle that leans heavily on sensationalist tactics to garner public interest.

1.3 Where the Rivera Leads, People Drown

As host of *Geraldo*, an American daytime show, Rivera is notorious for his sensationalism in his journalistic work and news media relations, and he develops audience buy-in for the notion that he is a leader in his field – a notion that is damaging because it undermines the legitimacy of the media. Despite Rivera claiming a leadership role as a shaper of popular opinion, I will establish that Rivera’s leadership failed using the five bases of power (referent, expert, legitimate, coercive, and reward) by John P. Kotter as a framework.

In leadership terms, Rivera has expert power (knowledge, skills, and expertise) because he “received a juris doctorate from Brooklyn Law School [...] [and] work[ed] as an attorney for Puerto Rican activists in New York[,] [which] led to television interviews that became his break into journalism.”⁵ Additionally, Rivera serves as a rotating co-host on FOX News Channel, which describes him as possessing eight years as an investigative reporter, and hosting a series of investigative specials on NBC.⁶ In an effort to bolster his journalistic ethos, he also uses reminder images in his shows that “Geraldo is produced by The Investigative News Group”⁷ to suggest to the audience that a team of reporters deeply investigate the subject matters in the show. These reminders also help him build credibility with his audience and stake the claim that he has journalistic integrity.

In addition to expert power, Rivera possesses referent power (trust and respect) because his show is popular with the audience. He “had the most talked about talk show on television for more than a decade [and] scored the highest ratings in history.”⁸ Fox News Channel describes him in the following:

One of [Rivera’s] hour-long reports [...] was, for more than two decades, among 20/20’s highest rated shows. [...] [His journalism was] [t]he winner of the 2000 Robert F. Kennedy journalism award (his third) for his NBC News documentary [...], and the

⁵ Larry Powell, “Geraldo Rivera,” Encyclopedia Britannica, accessed on January 13, 2022, <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Geraldo-Rivera>.

⁶ Fox News Network, “Geraldo Rivera,” accessed on June 4, 2022, <https://www.foxnews.com/person/r/geraldo-rivera>.

⁷ Watch *Geraldo*’s “Manson: Psycho” episode: <http://index.geraldo.com/page/manson-psycho>.

⁸ Geraldo Rivera, “Geraldo,” accessed June 4, 2022, <http://www.geraldo.com>.

Scripps Howard Foundation national journalism award[.] [...] Rivera has received more than 170 awards for journalism, including the prestigious George Foster Peabody Award, three national and seven local Emmys, two Columbia-Dupont and two additional Scripps Howard Journalism Awards.⁹

His awards indicate that audiences could identify with him, and his format of reality television gained trust and respect. While Rivera has expert and referent power due to his background, he is a “sensationalist showman of [the] 80s”¹⁰ and *Geraldo* is a “trash” reality program that ought not to be taken as fact-based investigative news, despite claiming the contrary.

To address Kotter’s theory of expert and referent power within Rivera’s leadership, I assess Rivera as a Power Wielder by applying James MacGregor Burns’ theory of leadership as a framework. According to Burns, Power Wielders are “leaders who secured a commitment from followers that satisfied the leaders’, rather than followers’, interests. [...] [P]ower wielders tended to induce high levels of dependency amongst their followers.”¹¹ Rivera sends charismatic signals, by orchestrating sensational entertainment, to get the audience to buy-in to his show for his own benefit and celebrity status as opposed to the fulfillment of informing and educating the audience. For example, Rivera spotlights his interview with Manson to educate his audience that, after 20 years of prison, Manson is a “psycho” to resurrect the public’s fear and anxiety around a decades-old case when there are no legitimate grounds for investigation. There is no sense of a failed justice system involving Manson because he had already received the maximum sentence and penalty for his crimes in the 1960 murders. *Geraldo* is not delivering any novel information regarding Manson.

As a power wielder, Rivera does not empower the audience to think critically, and instead coerces the audience to blindly follow him and adopt his overdramatized representations and prejudices. Unlike some of Rivera’s other episodes, there are no confrontational or controversial

⁹ Fox News Network, “Geraldo Rivera,” accessed on June 4, 2022, <https://www.foxnews.com/person/r/geraldo-rivera>.

¹⁰ Jeremy Barr and Elahe Izadi, “How Geraldo Rivera, the sensationalist showman of ’80s TV, became the voice of election reason on Fox News,” *The Washington Post*, accessed on June 4, 2022, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/media/2020/12/17/geraldo-rivera-fox-news-voice-of-election-reason/>.

¹¹ Keith Grint, *Leadership: A very short introduction*, 97.

expert guests in the Manson episode. While it may seem that there is no antagonistic relationship between Rivera and his expert guests, there is tension in their messages due to Rivera twisting his guests' words to maintain and bolster his narrative arc so that he can build his relationship with the audience. For example, he intensifies Ressler's response in the following:

Ressler: The courts have stated that Charles Manson is sane. Under law he is sane. Okay? He knew right from wrong, he doesn't care. [...] Some say he's paranoid, schizophrenic some say he's suffered from paranoia. Some say, undifferentiated schizophrenia, but most of the part, they really agree on is that he is anti-social, he doesn't really care what he does, he understands, but just doesn't care.

Rivera: My diagnosis, he's evil.

Ressler: He's evil.¹²

The antagonistic relationship is not between Rivera and his expert guests, but rather between their respective messages. Rivera's guests state unopinionated factual evidence and Rivera takes that information, creates an opinion, and then leads his guests to concur with him. He leads the audience to the answers that he wants them to see – how the expert “diagnosis” should be interpreted and how the information from the responses should be processed – and drums up fear and anxiety for its own sake.

In addition to telling the audience how information from responses should be processed, Rivera exploits sensationalism by using leading questions in his interview with Manson. For instance, Rivera asks Manson, “Is it easy to take a life? [...] Is it easy to stick a knife in somebody's body?”¹³ That question operates on Rivera's assumption or pre-conceived notions that he held about Manson to raise public outrage. He places Manson at an unfair disadvantage; thus, Manson's responses are skewed and invalid because they are the result of Rivera coercing Manson. As a result, the questions pander to the audience's sentiment in an exploitative manner. In addition to Rivera using leading questions, he also exploits Manson by using sensationalistic tactics in the form of archetypal representations which hint at misogynistic ideologies in popular

¹² See Appendix A, 121.

¹³ See Appendix A, 124.

culture, provoking pathos appeals and titillating entertainment to raise his show's ratings and attract viewership.¹⁴

With his expert and referent power and as the host of "Manson: Psycho," Rivera has a social responsibility to the audience to be a leader, but instead only succeeds in making the audience perceive him as such. Rivera is creating societal damage; he fails to be an effective leader. He also drums up fear and anxiety in the audience by linking Manson's criminality to the "Satanic Panic" prevalent at the time, and I will use Bitzer's framework to help provide context and address the episode's rhetorical exigence in the next section.

1.4 Bitzer's Rhetorical Situation: Intensifying the Satanic Panic

1.4.1 Rhetorical Exigence of Satanic Abuse

Lloyd Bitzer emphasizes the importance of situations to which people respond, theorizing that all rhetorical situations have an exigence, "an imperfection marked by urgency."¹⁵ The rhetorical situation that brought *Geraldo's* "Manson: Psycho" episode into being is the exigence of the supposed "Satanic Panic" that dominated the media in the 1980s and 1990s. Initially emergent in North America, the Satanic Panic was the supposed widespread occurrence of satanic worship and abuse that created fear, anxiety, and alarm in the public. News reports featured criminal cases and trials showing this "satanic abuse" happening at numerous daycare centers, preschools, and in after-school programs throughout the nation. This report "validate[d] a national hysteria over the presence of devil-worshipping pedophiles in America's suburbs."¹⁶ According to Sarah Hughes, to flesh out the Satanic Panic narrative, most televised media outlets used sensationalism to unfold satanic ritual abuse stories, which was "reinforced by reports of cults, rapists, kidnappers, pedophiles, and serial killers."¹⁷ National broadcasters aired the panic story four times a day: morning, noon, evening and late night.¹⁸

¹⁴ Further discussion on sensationalistic tactics is provided in Bitzer, Black and Burke theoretical application sections.

¹⁵ Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," 221.

¹⁶ Sarah Hughes, "American Monsters: Tabloid Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970–2000."

¹⁷ Sarah Hughes, "American Monsters: Tabloid Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970–2000."

¹⁸ Sarah Hughes, "American Monsters: Tabloid Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970–2000."

With the news saturation of the Satanic Panic as a backdrop, “Manson: Psycho” seizes the opportunity to capitalize on the public’s anxiety and responds to an exigence of moral panic. Disguised as educational and informative, the episode’s actual rhetorical purpose is to gain and sustain viewership and popularity. Therefore, Rivera creates a harmful social construct by exploiting sensationalistic tactics and pathos appeals that leave the audience disgusted, alarmed, and anxious about Manson and other allegedly rampant satanic cults. Rivera gives Manson a platform to speak at the audience and constructs the Manson murders as egregious and entertaining, which leaves the audience wanting more (exclusive) information about Satanism in their backyard, driving them to continue tuning into his show.

The audience is under the impression that *Geraldo* is a show hosted by a journalist who upholds journalistic standard practices and conducts investigative journalism; however, these factors do not constrain Rivera’s sensationalistic tactics. Instead, Rivera oversteps journalistic integrity and validity, which I will discuss in the next section by identifying Rivera’s rhetorical constraints (or lack thereof).

1.4.2 Rhetorical Constraints of Exploiting Public Anxieties

According to Bitzer, constraints include a set of beliefs, personal histories, and values that affect both the rhetor and the audience,¹⁹ as well as “constrain decisions and action needed to modify the exigence.”²⁰ Rivera does not seem to address the constraints imposed by his topic, his “star” guest, and the public. Rather than using this episode to educate an audience about Manson’s influence as some type of guru, Rivera intensifies the public’s anxieties instead. Larry Powell points out that Rivera’s sensationalism on Satanic ritual abuse resulted in public frenzy:

[Rivera] was leading many people to wrongly believe that Satanic ritual abuse [is] widespread in the country. The [episode] had tremendous influence and caused many people to be wrongly accused and convicted of child abuse.²¹

¹⁹ Lloyd Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation,” 222.

²⁰ Lloyd Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation,” 222.

²¹ Larry Powell, “Geraldo Rivera.”

Rivera caused a widespread societal problem and led to “the boom of the Satanic Panic in America.”²² The impact was severe enough that “[i]n 1995[,] Rivera realized his mistake and publicly apologized.”²³

Rivera’s mandate is to maintain and grow his audience by any means necessary, even ripping apart the social fabrics of society. Because sensational tactics are a shortcut for creating more appeal and entertainment for an audience, he exploits such tactics to easily draw a larger audience with minimal effort. I will show the type of audience that Rivera calls into being to develop a sensational story in the next section, using Black’s “Second Persona.”

1.5 Black’s Second Persona: Rivera and the Audience’s Identity

Edwin Black’s “The Second Persona” focuses on the use of symbols in communication that “contain tokens of their authors”²⁴ and call a particular audience into being. Rivera provides “tokens” that instruct the audience to view Manson as a father-figure and infantilize Manson’s followers. Since *Geraldo* is a daytime television talk show, Rivera gears his programming towards American women, specifically housewives and stay-at-home mothers. In a study on television talk shows, Stacy Cress and Kevin D. Rapert explain the relationship between talk shows and women:

[T]alk show[s], and the critical commentary which surrounds [them], is gendered...the topics of talk shows are often “women’s issues” [...] [and] the types of talk on talk shows is another explanation for why women might watch. [...] Disclosures by guests on talk shows are seen as one-sided and immediately intimate [and] often take the form of gossip.²⁵

Talk shows invite the target audience of women (housewives and stay-at-home mothers) to step out of their situations in life and become a part of the persona of the show. This target audience

²² David Mathews, “Revisiting the Satanic Panic television specials of the 1980s and ‘90s,” *Splinter*, October 29, 2015, accessed June 4, 2022. <https://splinternews.com/revisiting-the-satanic-panic-television-specials-of-the-1793852408>.

²³ Larry Powell, “Geraldo Rivera.”

²⁴ Edwin Black, “The Second Persona,” 110.

²⁵ Stacy Cress and Kevin D. Rapert, “Talk Show Viewing Motives: Does Gender Make a Difference?” *Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association* (San Diego, 1996), 8.

allows Rivera to suggest the imminent danger to the sanctity of the traditional family by giving the false impression that bad parenting, especially bad mothering as exemplified by Manson's own upbringing, is the root cause of Satanism. The evoked audience (or second persona) is an anxious, even paranoid parent (perhaps specifically a mother) who is likely religious and quite conservative. Through the establishment of this second persona, the discourse cultivates a susceptibility to simplistic good versus evil characterizations in the news; consequently, the "ideal audience" the reader is called upon to be will probably be willing to support any number of extreme measures to "fight Satanism" and "protect the family".

Sarah Hughes' essay on the "American Tabloid Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970-2000," points out the connection between bad motherhood and the Satanic Panic in the period when "Manson: Psycho" aired:

[T]he [satanic] panic stemmed from national anxieties surrounding the recently articulated problem of child abuse. [...] [M]ale pediatricians, who arose as the nation's preeminent experts on child abuse, had determined that "bad mothering," or the lack of a "mothering imprint" was the cause. Based on samples pooled from their private practices, they argued that child abusers were motivated by "unrewarding experiences with their own mothers."²⁶

Although there is no established basis that the Satanic Panic and child abuse stemmed from "bad mothering," Rivera recognizes the opportunity to capitalizing on the societal panic and anxieties. Therefore, he emboldens his viewership by inviting the audience to become self-righteous defenders of the traditional family unit since they are staying at home, tending to their children, and housekeeping. I will reveal how Rivera's "tokens" carry bad mothering tropes, and how he deploys Manson to tap into these societal anxieties.

1.5.1 Token 1: Manson as the Result of "Bad Mothering"

Rivera spotlights Manson's childhood to give the false impression that Manson became a satanic cult leader due to his own empty childhood.²⁷ By setting the discussion side by side with the

²⁶ Sarah Hughes, "American Monsters: Television Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970-2000."

²⁷ How Rivera links Manson with Satanism will be further discussed under Kenneth Burke's *Cluster Criticism*.

Manson interview, Rivera strategically starts with describing how Manson was “shuffled from foster family to one institution or another[.] [...] It was a disciplinary problem.”²⁸ Then, Rivera shows the interview in which Manson talks about being in jail since he was nine years old and how “[his] mother got out of jail...and put [him] in with the monks [...] in Terre Haute Indiana.”²⁹ Finally, he calls Manson a “wolf boy [...] from the old story of the baby raised by wolves [...] [because] Manson said he essentially raised himself.”³⁰ Rivera leverages these interview snippets to instruct the audience how to characterize Manson; Rivera influences the audience to view Manson as wild and unruly specifically due to his “jailhouse mother.” To build on the “bad mothering” perspective, Rivera also presents footage of Manson confirming his childhood issues, “I didn’t have no parents. When you don’t have any parents, you got nobody, there’s no place that would take you off the street and throw you somewhere.”³¹ Rivera’s sensationalistic strategies involve playing with the audience’s emotions from outrage and disgust to prejudices and pity. In another clip, Rivera further showcases Manson’s childhood and lack of parental guidance: “My mother got out of jail. My mother got out of the joint and put me in with the monks. In with the Catholic monks. The brother monks in Terre Haute, Indiana.”³² Rivera explicitly suggests that Manson’s bad childhood and mothering led to a record of crimes and resulted in his evil³³ ways. To build on Rivera’s description of Manson, Ressler describes Manson’s childhood:

[Manson] was an individual who was born to a 16-year-old prostitute. He never knew his father. As he indicated he was in foster homes, things of that nature at a very young age. His mother was in jail. She gets out of jail. He looks to her as being the person he’s going to have some family where she puts him into an institution he escapes from the institution, he returns to the mother after escaping from institution, she puts him back in the institution and from there on. From 8-9 years of age, Charlie spends a lifetime re-entering penitentiaries – he went from child institutions, reform schools.³⁴

²⁸ See Appendix A, 100.

²⁹ See Appendix A, 101.

³⁰ See Appendix A, 102.

³¹ See Appendix A, 100.

³² See Appendix A, 101.

³³ See Appendix A, 121.

³⁴ See Appendix A, 102.

Due to Manson’s parental neglect, Rivera’s narrative indicates how Manson attempts to fill the void with “his ragtag bunch of followers,”³⁵ which Rivera points out is the “the only family he could claim.”³⁶ Rivera exploits Manson’s childhood struggles to explain his criminality. His claim is that bad mothering led to Manson being a wolf boy, unconstrained by society’s rules. According to Rivera’s binary portrayal, the parental neglect of Manson led to him acting on one hand as a parent figure and claiming a family, while on the other hand, his untamed personality “turned them loose,”³⁷ and created a “re-death movement.”³⁸ Therefore, Rivera declares that the Manson family was a satanic cult,³⁹ and diagnoses Manson as evil⁴⁰ and a “satanic cult leader”⁴¹ – all stemming from bad mothering. The interview footage and narrative arc is important because it signals to the Satanic Panic and scapegoats mothers for child sexual abuse, implicitly claiming that the problem is deeply rooted in bad mothering. While Manson had a rough childhood, “tokens” within the episode presented a similar narrative about Manson’s followers portrayed as children.

1.5.2 Token 2: When Schoolkids Grow Up

Throughout the entirety of “Manson: Psycho”, Rivera features himself, his guest speakers, and Manson repeatedly emphasizing the “kids” (Manson’s followers) to invite the audience to be intrigued and disgusted by what Manson made these “kids” do. To build on the “schoolkids” persona, Rivera describes Manson’s followers as if they were children:

With their long hair and sandaled feet, Manson’s group on the surface seem like most other middle class college age kids of the 60s. In fact, before meeting Charlie, Patricia Krenwinkel had been a Sunday school teacher and planned to become a nun. Tex Watson had been student body president and voted most likely to succeed. Then they met Charlie.⁴²

³⁵ See Appendix A, 99.

³⁶ See Appendix A, 100.

³⁷ See Appendix A, 116.

³⁸ See Appendix A, 116.

³⁹ See Appendix A, 105.

⁴⁰ See Appendix A, 121.

⁴¹ See Appendix A, 97, 104.

⁴² See Appendix A, 110.

As a sensational tactic, Rivera explicitly shapes his narrative to respond to the common childhood question of “What do you want to be when you grow up?” To gain viewership, he uses sensationalist tactics by coaching the audience to identify the followers as “kids” or victims of Manson, who had not yet grown up and were controlled by Manson. With Rivera’s preconceived notions of the followers as impressionable schoolkids, he is specifically identifying the female followers as schoolgirls, which will be discussed next.

1.5.3 Token 3: Manson’s Followers as Middle-Class Schoolgirls

In his “family”, Manson had three female followers: Susan Atkins, Lisa Kasabian, and Patricia Krenwinkel. At the time of the 1969 murders, these women were adults in their 20s; however, for salacious entertainment, Rivera’s tokens refer to them as “kids”⁴³ or “girls”⁴⁴ to suggest Manson has sex with schoolgirls and cue the audience to be shocked and disgusted. For example, Rivera sensationalizes the childlike persona by saying, “How did [Manson] come by his [...] ability to turn good kids horribly bad?”⁴⁵ Rivera is not asking a question, but providing the audience with cues to see Manson’s followers as children who have been corrupted. For a dramatic effect, he makes the audience believe that Manson’s followers were innocent and naïve “kids” controlled by Manson, rather than adult women accountable for their actions and who understand the consequence of their behaviours. In another instance, Rivera voices the followers’ social class, girlhood, and schoolgirl personas: “Manson’s disciples [were] mostly middle-class college aged kids.”⁴⁶ That quote identifies the three women as “kids” rather than adults, and cues the audience to become shocked, angered and disgusted by Manson for corrupting these three so-called ordinary kids. When Rivera questions, “How did this ex-con coerce or seduce college educated middle class girls?”⁴⁷ and “[w]hy did those girls murder for [Manson]?”⁴⁸ The juxtaposition between “ex-con” and “college”, “middle-class” and “girls” suggests the contrast between the uncivilised criminal and well-mannered civilised girls. Rivera utilizes the anxieties that exist in his audience around the potential breakdown of the traditional American family, and

⁴³ See Appendix A, 97.

⁴⁴ See Appendix A, 110.

⁴⁵ See Appendix A, 97.

⁴⁶ See Appendix A, 100.

⁴⁷ See Appendix A, 110.

⁴⁸ See Appendix A, 124.

general US society. He gives the false notion that the followers were still progressing from childhood to adulthood to invite a disbelief response from the audience by giving the impression that ordinary children can be easily convinced to commit evil acts by an alleged “psycho.”⁴⁹

Rivera processes a biased viewpoint of female criminality for the audience by suggesting that white, middle-class, and educated “girls” are not capable of committing violent crimes of their own accord. Rather, he re-defines Manson’s female followers into the enthymematic assumption that Manson influenced these women by making them believe he was filling a parental void in their lives, which will be discussed next.

1.5.4 Token 4: In the Name of the Father

To provoke pathos appeals in the audience for entertainment, Rivera’s implicit message offers up “tokens” about a lack of parental image or imprint in the Manson followers’ life through the interview footage in the episode. Levin points out the followers’ need for validation:

But the truth is they were very needy. Very needy people. They were young people who didn’t get along well with their parents, in fact, had profound problems growing up. They weren’t, quote, normal. They certainly weren’t insane. But they were people who wanted to feel special. And Charles Manson gave them that feeling.⁵⁰

Levin’s point helps Rivera use the Manson followers’ backgrounds to leverage the subject of bad parenting. Rivera exploits this description of the dysfunctionality of these individuals and enthymematically connects it to Manson’s own experience of bad parenting.

Rivera has direct access to information, footage, and edits of the interview to leverage how the audience identifies and connects with the interview. In an interview clip, Rivera shows Manson indicating that his followers look to him to lead: “I was only the guy that cared. I was the one that picked the kids up out of the streets and given them a place to stay.”⁵¹ Rivera’s choice of interview clips and guest comments implicitly suggest that a lack of parenting resulted in the

⁴⁹ See Appendix A, 96.

⁵⁰ See Appendix A, 110.

⁵¹ See Appendix A, 116.

“kids” searching for that nurturing parent-child relationship, which resulted in them finding a father figure in Manson. Although Rivera does not give the audience any concrete evidence of the followers’ parents actually failing them, he encourages the audience to assume a failure of the traditional family. Because Manson was a victim of bad parenting, he could appeal to his followers’ sense of being products of bad parenting; Manson’s cultivation of his followers’ sense of grievance made them susceptible to his manipulation. Rivera constructs Manson into an abusive father figure so that he can connect Manson to the Satanic Panic. Part of the Satanic Panic was an alleged rise in child abuse (including sexual abuse) due to satanic rituals and cults, so Rivera had to connect Manson to similar acts in order to maintain the audience’s anxiety over the assumed connection between parental failure and Satanism.

1.5.5 Token 5: The Sex Story Between Manson and the Schoolgirl

In the Manson episode, Rivera influences his audience into believing that Manson has sexual relationships with “kids”. Rivera showcases an interview clip between Manson and Rivera, where Manson describes meeting Linda Kasabian:

But our new kid Linda Kasabian I’ve seen her three times in my life maybe two minutes in my whole life I seen the broad. She come up to the ranch for about a week and she said, “Hey my name is Linda.” I said, “Hello Linda,” and she said, “Can I stay here?” I said, “Can you stay here?” She said, “I like to live at the ranch.” I said, “I’d like to live at the ranch.” She said, “Well can I stay here?” I said, “Can I [bleep] you?” She says, “yeah.” And I put my hand up her dress and I said, “Yeah okay you can stay around.” That’s my biggest thought in my head is getting into her body.⁵²

Rivera treats the Manson followers as victims of manipulation and sensationalizes the idea that Manson led a satanic cult,⁵³ in which he “seduce[d] [...] girls,”⁵⁴ using his “evil charisma [...] to turn good kids horribly bad.”⁵⁵ In addition, Rivera has Ressler agree that Manson “got sex from the girls.”⁵⁶ Rivera exploits sex and murder to demonstrate the apparent dangers caused by the

⁵² See Appendix A, 112.

⁵³ See Appendix A, 104.

⁵⁴ See Appendix A, 110.

⁵⁵ See Appendix A, 97.

⁵⁶ See Appendix A, 114.

rise of evil, and elicit concern from his audience that their children are at risk if traditional family units no longer remain intact. Manson's behaviour, as described by Rivera, builds the enthymeme of Manson's involvement in Satanism – Manson “got sex from the girls,” who were “kids”, and child sexual abuse is part of Satanism, therefore, Manson must be involved in Satanism. Rivera furthers the concept of Manson as the archetype of the Devil as tempter by describing his “evil charisma”⁵⁷ and the idea of Manson “turning” people.

From this perspective, Rivera offers up tokens that calls forth concerned and self-righteous parents in the audience by explicitly disseminating a cascade of false information, in the form of sensationalism, to provide entertainment, garner popularity, and promote his NBC special, “Devil Worship: Exposing Satan's Underground.” With the NBC special, Rivera spins Satanism into Manson's story to construct Manson as archetypes of Christ and Satan. In the next section, I will use Kenneth Burke's *Cluster Criticism* to help me explore the rhetorical strategies Rivera uses when he sensationalizes Manson in the episode.

1.6 Burke's Cluster Criticism: Exposing Possession and Resurrection

Burke's *Cluster Criticism* identifies clusters of words in a message; the rhetor is not always self-aware that they are coaching an attitude towards a situation and exhibiting images, personalities, and acts that go with notions of heroism, villainy, consolation, and despair.⁵⁸ In his portrayal of Manson, Rivera exhibits clusters of pre-conceived notions, diving into biblical archetypes (Christ and Devil) and sensationalism, that incite panic and fear in the audience to drive up *Geraldo's* metrics. In the next section, I will discuss how Rivera unleashes biblical archetype representations in his portrayal of Manson, starting with the devil archetype.

1.6.1 Evil Clusters: Manson as the Devil Archetype

Increasingly without regard for propriety, truth-telling, or facts, Rivera emphasizes on crafting an entertaining story with sensational appeal by using biblical archetypes for publicity. In the

⁵⁷ See Appendix A, 97.

⁵⁸ Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941), 20.

terminology of Burke's *cluster criticism*, his key terms casts Manson as the devil archetype to tap into people's fears and anxiety and coach the attitude that criminality and violence is fascinating and innate. Rivera's approach endorses the power of enthymemes in rhetorical practice when his word clusters of Manson include "self-proclaimed Anti-Christ,"⁵⁹ "evil messiah,"⁶⁰ "devil,"⁶¹ "satanic cult leader,"⁶² "evil,"⁶³ "evil charisma,"⁶⁴ "evil madman,"⁶⁵ and "evil person."⁶⁶ To position Manson as the devil, Rivera makes it easy for the audience to follow and understand while, at the same time, appeals to their fears. While Rivera's key terms are biased and simplified portrayals of Manson as the devil, Levin is also in agreement that Manson is "evil"⁶⁷ and "Satan."⁶⁸ The episode deploys enthymemes to move the audience to a point where they will accept these overt labels unquestionably, for example, Ressler mirrors both Rivera and Levin when he calls Manson "evil"⁶⁹ and a "self-style[d] Satanist [who][...] embrace[d] Satan as an excuse for the anti-social acts that he [did]."⁷⁰

The rhetorical practice of calling Manson the devil archetype is Rivera's way of selling Manson as "news" to the audience and making him the face of lurking threats to "normal" Americans. This rhetorical practice operates in tandem with the concept of trash TV as primarily motivated by the desire to entertain by engaging the emotions, rather than to educate by engaging the brains of the public. Rivera is harmfully coaching the audience's attitude to be avid consumers of criminal narratives. Exploiting archetypes is harmful because it upends social order, allowing criminality and violence to be normalized and helps criminals become popular culture icons. To call Manson the devil archetype as a rhetorical strategy, Rivera is raising Manson's profile and allowing him to become even more infamous via the platform on *Geraldo*, potentially increasing the number of his followers. In addition to coaching the audience to view Manson as the devil

⁵⁹ See Appendix A, 96.

⁶⁰ See Appendix A, 96.

⁶¹ See Appendix A, 106.

⁶² See Appendix A, 97, 104.

⁶³ See Appendix A, 96, 99, 103, 119, 120, 126.

⁶⁴ See Appendix A, 97.

⁶⁵ See Appendix A, 99.

⁶⁶ See Appendix A, 119.

⁶⁷ See Appendix A, 121.

⁶⁸ See Appendix A, 108.

⁶⁹ See Appendix A, 121.

⁷⁰ See Appendix A, 108.

archetype, Rivera paradoxically also presents word clusters that tell the audience to view Manson as the Christ archetype.

1.6.2 Good Clusters: Manson as the Christ Archetype

Rivera wants the audience to believe that Manson is presenting himself as a Christ-like archetype to strengthen the audience's attitude that Manson is "psycho,"⁷¹ establishing Manson as a blasphemer and megalomaniac, on top of being a satanist. The Christ archetype completes the package of Manson as dangerous on the largest possible scale. Therefore, as a rhetorical strategy, Rivera elaborates that Manson calls himself Christ and directs the audience to the understanding he wants, with his key-word clusters, when he declares that Manson "even calls himself Jesus."⁷² Rivera continues to create the association with the Christ delusion by calling the followers, "Manson's disciples."⁷³ Rivera tells the audience how to process the information even though Manson does not specifically state that he is Jesus, nor does he make that claim in the entirety of the episode, explaining that "[y]our court rooms have convicted me for being Jesus Christ."⁷⁴ That quote is important because Manson does not specifically state that he is Jesus, but that the "court rooms" have applied that attribute. Instead, Manson says, "I didn't invoke any name. They put that on me. The spirit laid that over my track."⁷⁵ Additionally, Manson debunks the roles, including the Christ archetype, Rivera casts upon him by stating:

Who say that I'm all these things that you say I am. Wouldn't that be more fearful then letting me try to be a nice guy? Would you want to make me into those things? Would you want me, do you need someone like that in your world? That's your judgement now, the judgement you making on this mirror man, you got to carry.⁷⁶

As a rhetorical strategy to draw more viewership based on shock value, Rivera's key term clusters coach the audience to take on the belief that Manson casts himself in the Christ role. He seeks to distract the audience's attention from his own rhetorical practice by depicting Manson as playing word games on this subject. In fact, Rivera is the one who twists Manson's words; he is

⁷¹ See Appendix A, 96.

⁷² See Appendix A, 105.

⁷³ See Appendix A, 100.

⁷⁴ See Appendix A, 107.

⁷⁵ See Appendix A, 106.

⁷⁶ See Appendix A, 107.

creating a straw man fallacy as a rhetorical strategy, wherein he distorts Manson's statement about others describing him as Jesus into the claim that Manson believes he is Jesus. Distorting Manson's statement allows Rivera to bolster his argument that Manson is psychotic with delusions of grandeur.

In the *Geraldo* episode, Rivera's word clusters coach the audience to outfit Manson into dualistic archetypal motifs of biblical figures (Christ and Devil) as a sensational and rhetorical strategy to entertain and appeal to the audience's emotions for improved viewership numbers and television ratings. Rivera's use of biblical archetypes to represent Manson is troubling because Rivera is inflating Manson's reputation partly to manipulate the audience's anxieties, and in doing so, he further cultivates a public taste for tabloid-style entertainment as a substitute for meaningful journalism.

1.7 Rivera: Sensationalism Makes Cents

This chapter has used leadership theory (Kotter and Burns) and rhetorical criticism (Bitzer, Black, and Burke) to uncover the sensationalistic tactics and archetypes used in *Geraldo*, and shows how Rivera contributes to societal damage by inciting fear and anxiety in his audience. With his expert and referent power (Kotter's theory), Rivera identifies as a power wielder (Burns' theory) who does not enable the audience to think critically and who uses sensationalism in the form of leading questions to stir up fear, intrigue, and anxiety in people, subsequently increasing his viewing numbers.

In terms of rhetorical theory, *Geraldo* is the response to the exigence (cf. Bitzer) of the Satanic Panic; to create a false sense of urgency, Rivera "exhumed" Manson (a criminal almost two decades from the past), effectively bringing him back from the dead, as evidence of the danger of satanic rites threatening US society. He links Manson's criminal notoriety to the American public's anxiety of the alleged ongoing Satanism and child abuse events of that era, positioning Manson as an ongoing threat. Rivera calls it educating an audience without providing any real legitimate grounds for investigation or failed justice systems. In fact, Rivera is disguising sensationalistic tactics and entertainment with news and investigative reporting, and employs

such tactics to build a desire in the audience to consume more content from him on the subject of Satanism.

Rivera's "tokens" (cf. Black) sensationally spin his narrative to indicate the imminent danger to the traditional family unit. In broad terms, Rivera suggests that Manson's lack of parental guidance directly led him to Satanism, to becoming an abusive father figure to his "kids," and ultimately to child sex abuse. For shock value, Rivera imparts verbal cues to the audience to obsess about the deep-rooted issue of "bad mothering," or a lack of motherly guidance and imprint on a child, which he believes has led to satanic cults and the rise of child abuse.

The deployment of biblical archetypes of Christ and the Devil, present in Rivera's Burkean key-term clusters, make the Manson content more amenable to Rivera's satanism narrative and digestible for audiences; however, Rivera is actually allowing Manson's notoriety to spread and potentially grow the number of his followers. Rivera may possibly contribute to the very problem he claims to be challenging.

The journalistic integrity that Rivera should uphold fails to constrain the sensationalism in "Manson: Psycho." As a result, Rivera takes advantage of the public's trust to intensify their anxieties and fears, strictly for the purpose of audience entertainment, attention, and ratings growth. By exploiting Manson, the era's Satanic Panic, bad parenting (specifically bad mothering), and biblical archetypes, Rivera is able to pass off emotional manipulation of widespread public paranoia as serious investigative reporting.

This chapter on Geraldo's "Manson: Psycho" is a baseline for sensationalism in tabloid journalism to consider the similarities in how a reputable and trustworthy news source – the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) – stoops to the use of similar sensationalistic tactics when it portrays murderers, specifically in *The Fifth Estate* documentary, "Karla Homolka." The following chapter will provide an in-depth understanding of how the CBC came about its national status and name.

CHAPTER 2:

CBC, THE FIFTH ESTATE, AND MEDIA LEADERSHIP

This chapter seeks to analyze the CBC as a national leader by applying John P. Kotter's *Bases of Power* from *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management* and James MacGregor Burns' theory from *Leadership*. I will use Kotter's *Bases of Power* to help me address how the CBC empowers *The Fifth Estate*, as well as Trish Wood, with this power to establish and enhance their leadership status. Then, I will apply Burns' theory to explore the leadership identity theory of Kotter's *Bases of Power* and assess how the CBC undermines its own ethos.

2.1 Kotter's Bases of Power: The Powers the CBC Exploits

The CBC is a national institution; it is a national voice that cultivates Canadian culture and “reflect[s] Canada to Canadians.”¹ Due to its ubiquity, the CBC is an important source for information on Canadian history and events. While the CBC is known for its production values and ethical standards, the “Karla Homolka” episode of its flagship investigative journalism series *The Fifth Estate* fails to meet its standards, and provides storytelling and context that has become speculative, sensational, and even untrustworthy. Of the five bases of power, *referent*, *expert*, and *legitimate* are the powers that the CBC uses to help build their ethos. The CBC has *legitimate power* due to its history and status as a national public broadcaster influencing viewers across Canada, on which *The Fifth Estate* leans to help set up its Homolka episode. The next section will provide background of the CBC's legitimacy as a national leader having influence on the identity, and voice of Canadians.

¹ Senate, Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications, *Evidence*, no. 2, session 2, 41st Parliament, February 11, 2014 (Konrad von Finckenstein).

2.1.1 Legitimate Power: CBC's History as a National Leader

The CBC's relationship to its public has always been concerned with differentiating Canadians from Americans,² and building a Canadian identity with distinct values.³ The Canadian *Broadcasting Act* of 1936 established the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation/Radio-Canada (CBC),⁴ which replaced the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission (CRBC), to counter the growing influence of radio programming from the United States of America on Canadian airwaves.⁵ The original framework for the CBC was modeled on the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)⁶ and followed the slogan "inform, enlighten, and entertain."⁷

With the start of the Second World War, the CBC focused its attention to build national unity during the 1940s, by advising Canadians on what was important to Canada. The CBC expanded its news programming to dedicate "20 per cent[sic] of broadcasting hours to news"⁸ and announced its directive to the public in the following:

From the start, the policy which has guided the presentation of CBC News has been based upon the conviction that this service is in the nature of a public trust – to present, in clear and interesting style, all the significant news of the day's happening in Canada and abroad; and to present political and controversial news without bias or distortion. That policy will be continued without deviation throughout 1942.⁹

² Mary Vipond, "The Beginnings of Public Broadcasting in Canada: The CRBC, 1932-1936," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 19, no. 2 (February 1994).

³ "Time for Change: The CBC/Radio-Canada in the Twenty-first Century," Senate, Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications, January 5, 2022. <https://sencanada.ca/content/sen/Committee/412/trcm/rep/rep14jul15-e.pdf>, 31.

⁴ CBC, "Notes to Financial Statements: For the year ended March 31, 1998," CBC Annual Report 1997-1998, accessed January 5, 2022. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/radio-canada-cbc/BC1-1998-5-eng.pdf, 57.

⁵ CBC, "Through the Years."

⁶ Telecommunications Research Group, "Research Project on Regionalisation of CBC-TV Programming," Government of Canada, March 31, 1975, accessed on January 5, 2022. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2020/isde-ised/Co24/Co24-341-1975-eng.pdf, 79.

⁷ CBC, "CBC Annual Report 1996-1997," accessed on January 5, 2022. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/radio-canada-cbc/BC1-1997-1-eng.pdf, 4.

⁸ CBC, "When CBC news took to the air," Accessed on January 5, 2022. <https://www.cbc.ca/archives/when-cbc-radio-took-to-the-air-1.4884273>.

⁹ CBC, "When CBC news took to the air."

By the 1950s, the CBC built a strong sense of national identity for itself and served viewers in both English and French, offering newscasts, sports games, soap operas, and Parliamentary speeches from Queen Elizabeth.¹⁰

In the 1970s, part of the CBC's mandate (under the *Broadcasting Act*) was to “actively contribut[e] to the flow and exchange of cultural and regional information and entertainment [...] and [to] contribut[e] to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity.”¹¹ At the time, the CBC was at the forefront with its identity as a national public broadcaster, and simultaneously establishing its vision of Canada's identity.

Launched on September 16, 1975, the CBC's television investigative series, *The Fifth Estate*, aired its first documentary. The investigative series was titled “The Fifth Estate” as a reference to news media and press, to highlight the program's determination to progress beyond everyday news into original and investigative journalism.¹² As the first show attracted 1.3 million Canadian viewers, the CBC continued to devote an hour to its flagship documentary series, *The Fifth Estate*.¹³ With the successful launch of the television program, the CBC was building its ethos as a national broadcaster, meeting Canadian expectations of good and ethical reporting; the CBC gained strong and unwavering trust from Canadians.

The CBC developed a policy manual for journalistic work that ensured journalists produced new content that was credible and showed journalistic integrity¹⁴ in 1982. Then, in the 1990s, the CBC documented and published the strategy of its Mission, Values, Goals, and Objectives, as well as appointing an ombudsman to investigate Canadian viewer complaints to ensure that news stories, events, and content complied in accordance with its Journalistic Standards and Practices.¹⁵ At the time, the CBC was committed to evaluating its standards and practices, while

¹⁰ CBC, “Through the Years.”

¹¹ Telecommunications Research Group, *Research Project on Regionalisation of CBC-TV Programming*.

¹² CBC, “The story of The Fifth Estate: The Early Years Page 1,” accessed on January 5, 2022.

<https://www.cbc.ca/fifth/history/early.html>.

¹³ CBC, “The story of The Fifth Estate: The Early Years Page 2,” accessed on January 5, 2022.

<https://www.cbc.ca/fifth/history/earlytwo.html>.

¹⁴ CBC, “Through the Years.”

¹⁵ CBC, “Through the Years.”

improving its strategy in journalism to maintain its identity and ethos with the Canadian public. The CBC is privileged with its nationally trusted status, including holding the distinction in 2020 as the “most trusted brand in Canada”¹⁶ for two years in a row. To date, an enduring value that continues to live throughout the history of the CBC is the mandate that “informs, enlightens, and entertains,” with the promise of high-quality Canadian programming to reflect and “contribute to shared national consciousness and identity.”¹⁷

Given this prior reputation, the “Karla Homolka” documentary presents a perplexing ethos problem. The publication ban and exclusion order barred national and international news agencies from reporting and accessing transcripts on the Homolka and Bernardo trial proceedings. This ban and order outraged news media organizations because it impeded their responsibility to inform the public. Thus, it is possible to trace the apparent sensationalism in reporting on the case to a response to the blackout; the Homolka documentary can be seen as the CBC’s way of reclaiming their status as a leader by offering more details of the case than had previously been available.

The CBC has *legitimate power*, but its reputation as a news leader may be at risk with *The Fifth Estate*’s narrative choices made in the Homolka documentary. The crumbling leadership style present in the episode is also clear in Trish Wood’s *referent power* and discussed in the next section.

2.1.2 Referent Power: Trish Wood and The Fifth Estate

The CBC takes pride in its adherence to strict ethical standards and balanced perspectives. According to the CBC “Programming Policies: 1.1.6 Violence in Programming,” they are aware of the influence they have on the public:

Effective: July 6, 1994

¹⁶ “Most trusted Brand in Canada Gustavson School of Business University of Victoria”. Media Solutions, January 5, 2022. <https://solutionsmedia.cbcr.ca/en/news/cbc-named-most-trusted-media-entertainment-brand/>.

¹⁷ “Broadcasting Act,” Minister of Justice, accessed on January 5, 2022. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/B-9.01.pdf>, 5.

Television has a powerful role in shaping the attitudes of society to contemporary issues, and in affecting the behaviour of those who watch television programs. The CBC, as the nation'[sic] public broadcaster, accepts as its role both the reflection of society as it exists and has existed; and the depiction of the higher aspirations, standards and values of humankind.¹⁸

The CBC policies also require the willing effort and good judgement of its program personnel to interpret, depict, and apply program content with great sensitivities.¹⁹ The reputation of the CBC, and by proxy its reporters, leads to its viewership considering it to be an authority on the topics on which it reports. With its programming policies and reputation, the CBC empowers *The Fifth Estate* and Trish Wood, investigative reporter and host of “Karla Homolka”, to help build its ethos and set up what Canadians are expecting from the CBC as a national voice.

As *referent power* is gained through trust and association to influence people, Trish Wood possesses *referent power* with the audience because she (1) works for the respected and well-trusted CBC and, more specifically, the award-winning series, *The Fifth Estate*; (2) is an award-winning investigative journalist and interviewer, known for her unflinching interview style, and her “intrepid reporting [that] landed exclusive guests and won her fans, [and] accolades.”²⁰ She manifests the ethos of the CBC by using elevated and sophisticated language and adopting her program to follow *The Fifth Estate*’s documentary-style format with interviews of respected guests to leverage her *referent power* with the audience.

Under the CBC Journalistic Standards and Practices, Wood must “maintai[n] accuracy, integrity, balance, impartiality and fairness in [her] journalism.”²¹ As well, her values must be “open and straightforward when [she] present[s] interviewees and their statements [and] make every effort [...] to give the context and explanation necessary for the audience to judge the relevance and credibility of their statements.”²² The CBC requires Wood to recognize the value in her guests

¹⁸ CBC, “Program Policies: 1.1.6 Violence in Programming,” accessed December 5, 2021. <https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/vision/governance/programming-policies>.

¹⁹ CBC, “Program Policies: 1.1.6 Violence in Programming.”

²⁰ Trish Wood, “Trish Wood Is Critical,” accessed June 16, 2021. <https://www.trishwoodpodcast.com/>.

²¹ CBC, “Ombudsman,” accessed December 5, 2021. <https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/ombudsman>.

²² CBC, “Identification of Interviewees,” accessed December 5, 2021. <https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/vision/governance/journalistic-standards-and-practices>.

and confidential sources and their risks in sharing information. Thus, as part of the CBC, Wood, must acknowledge the importance of its relationship with, and take accountability in protecting, guests and confidential sources. At first glance, the Homolka episode appears to follow the CBC's documentary-style approach, and the information that Wood presents is factually accurate. However, she does not provide the complete context of the interviews for viewers to judge her interviewees' statements. Additionally, she does not appear to follow what is set forth by the CBC's stated vision and values of maintaining accuracy, impartiality, and fairness when she structures the documentary to unfairly present interviewees and their statements. Instead, Wood uses leading questions to prompt her interviewees to respond in a specific way; she intentionally frames her questions to elicit responses from her interviewees that sides with her viewpoint. For example, after Wood asks George Walker (Homolka's lawyer) if he believes "[Homolka] was abused from the beginning,"²³ she then asks him, "[D]id you tell Murray Siegel that when you started negotiating that it was a mitigating factor? [...] So, the two of you had discussed that prior to any psychiatrist confirming a diagnosis of this?"²⁴ Wood gives the false impression that Walker and Siegel, head of the Crown Attorney's office, are corrupt (or at least unethical) and conducted illegal negotiations and bribes in Homolka's plea bargain.

In comparison to her treatment of Walker, Wood uses sensational tactics in presenting Dr. Andrew Malcolm and his statements in the documentary. To use the terminology of Burke's *cluster criticism*, Wood "symbolically merges" Malcolm's term "influenced person"²⁵ with "offered up,"²⁶ "sexually assaulted,"²⁷ "videotaped,"²⁸ "jeopardy,"²⁹ and "killed"³⁰ so the audience will see his terminology as a kind of euphemism for the less clinical and more disturbing terms that Wood uses. As a result, her leading questions through suggestive words and narrative integration not only influence Dr. Malcolm's responses, but also the audience's attitude on Homolka.

²³ Watch CBC's *The Fifth Estate*, "Karla Homolka" episode: <https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/2653449772>. For the transcription of the episode, See [Appendix C](#), 162.

²⁴ See Appendix C, 162.

²⁵ See Appendix C, 155.

²⁶ See Appendix C, 155.

²⁷ See Appendix C, 155.

²⁸ See Appendix C, 155.

²⁹ See Appendix C, 155.

³⁰ See Appendix C, 155.

As the lead investigative reporter for *The Fifth Estate*, Wood shows a lack of effective leadership with the audience in the Homolka documentary. Rather than safeguard her guests and allow her audience to decide how to process the information, she abuses her *referent power*, as a manifestation of ethos, by damaging her interviewees' ethos with leading, presumptive, and coercive questions. In addition, Wood exploits sensationalism through entertainment to influence the audience to adopt her biased views of Walker and Dr. Malcolm in connection with Homolka. Effective leadership would involve Wood providing accurate information and straightforward, unbiased questions that clarify and probe. Where *referent power* influences people to model their behaviour on someone they trust and admire, *expert power* relies on expertise or skill that is respected by others in a specific subject matter or field.

2.1.3 Expert Power: Trish Wood is a Battle-Tested Trailblazer

The CBC gains credibility and trust from Canadians not only in the form of *legitimate* and *referent power*, but also *expert power* via professional ethos from its journalists. As a journalist, Wood has *expert power* because, in 1997, she has about nine years of investigative journalism and reporting experience working for the award-winning investigative series *The Fifth Estate*. Her skillset and history includes “spending years on the road, outworking, outthinking and during long nights away, outdrinking the men in her world. It [is] a formula for success.”³¹ As a skilled reporter for *The Fifth Estate*, she is a “television and radio trailblazer, [...] renowned for chasing organized crime bosses through Tokyo, exposing crooked religious cranks, dodging drunken teens with guns at checkpoints in war-torn Burundi, and setting free innocent men.”³² Encyclopedia.com describes how Wood has achieved popularity amongst CBC viewers and won awards for her expertise: Canadian Association of Journalists, Association of Canadian Science Writers, Radio and Television Directors Association, National Magazine, and New York Film Festival.³³ However, she damages and exploits the CBC's position of *legitimate power* through sensational methods to entertain the audience by excessively provoking pathos appeals. I will

³¹ Trish Wood, “Trish Wood is Critical.”

³² Trish Wood, “Trish Wood is Critical.”

³³ Encyclopedia.com, “Wood, Trish”, Contemporary Authors, accessed January 5, 2022.
<https://www.encyclopedia.com/arts/educational-magazines/wood-trish>.

discuss her sensational strategies further in Chapter 3. When Wood exploits her external resources (*legitimate, referent* and *expert power*) to get the audience to side with her biased view, she is, what Burns' leadership theory as a framework considers, a "power wielder," which will be discussed further in the next section.

2.2 Burns' Power Wielder: Leadership or Leader-sheep?

As a power wielder, Wood disempowers the audience by not allowing them to cultivate a critical attitude in terms of thinking how to process the truths of the documentary; instead, she frames the documentary to take on her viewpoint and build her leadership credibility. While Wood may recognize the need to inform the audience and give the appearance of providing what they want with what they want, she sacrifices journalistic quality and unbiased news reporting to satisfy her own agenda – which is to bolster her leadership authority. For example, she positions her guest interviewees into biased groups to influence the audience into identifying with her side. Wood creates an "us versus them" by exploiting stereotypes and archetypes,³⁴ with the dichotomy set up as Wood and her crony interviewees (psychologist, Homolka's colleague, Homolka-Bernardo friends, Crown attorney, Bernardo's lawyer, book author) versus her interviewees that were connected to Homolka's case (lead police inspector of the Homolka-Bernardo case, Homolka's psychiatrist and her lawyer). The interviewees, who support her side, "damned" Homolka and the Crown prosecutors for their "deal with the devil."³⁵ Wood "punishes" the interviewees who sided with Homolka by undermining their credibility and expertise to exert her authority over them and enhance her leadership ethos.

Wood gives the sense that she is helping the audience understand complicated issues and offering high-quality journalistic reporting on the Homolka case. However, since she leans on the CBC's authority (*legitimate* and *referent power*) and the adoration for her award-winning journalism (*expert power*), and she wants to maintain that status and popularity, she prioritizes

³⁴ I discuss this further in Chapter 3, under Kenneth Burke's *Cluster Criticism*.

³⁵ *The Fifth Estate*, "Karla Homolka", directed by Susan Teskey, aired November 25, 1997, on Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). <https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/2653449772>.

having high credentials over her responsibility to the audience, which is to educate them on information that is accurate, unbiased, and true.

Leadership theory is a useful approach to revealing how the CBC builds its ethos and sets up what Canadians are expecting from the CBC as a national leader and voice. Therefore, the next section provides a summary where I apply Kotter's leadership theory, *Bases of Power*, and use Burns' leadership theory to explore Kotter's *legitimate*, *referent* and *expert power*.

2.3 Wood a Good Leader Abuse Their Power?

The CBC is committed to providing a Canadian perspective and identity on public news and information. With its policies and reputation, the CBC builds its ethos through its *legitimate* (history and status as a national broadcaster influencing viewers across Canada), *referent* (awards and popularity amongst Canadians) and *expert power* (demonstrated domain knowledge and experience in news and current affairs). As a proxy for the CBC, *The Fifth Estate* and Wood have an obligation to provide safe, accurate, and trustworthy information, which they fail to uphold and consequently fail to build the ethos of the CBC. They, specifically Wood, are a power wielder who (1) abuses the CBC's *legitimate*, *referent* and *expert power* by using leading questions and provoking pathos appeals; (2) takes advantage of their interviewees/guests for self-enhancement. Effective investigative journalism involves empowering the audience, giving them the means to ask better questions and hold institutions accountable in effective ways. The public looks to Wood, as the face of *The Fifth Estate*, for leadership. She does not use her platform to cultivate a critical attitude in the audience in terms of thinking and processing information about the Homolka case, but instead exploits sensational tactics to appeal to a broader audience.

While leadership theory further sheds light on the ethos of the CBC and Trish Wood, rhetorical theory by Bitzer, Black, and Burke serves to identify how this reputable news source coaches the audience's attitude, by stooping to sensationalism, when portraying serial killers in the documentary, "Karla Homolka."

CHAPTER 3:

THE FIFTH ESTATE – “KARLA HOMOLKA” EPISODE

3.1 Introduction: The Fifth Estate’s Rhetorical Agenda

“If [Karla] Homolka wasn’t the victim the Crown said she was, then who was she?”¹ inquires *The Fifth Estate* host Trish Wood. That question sets the stage for the November 1997 “Karla Homolka” documentary, which appears to reveal the flaws in the Crown Prosecutor’s deal with Karla Homolka to provide evidence against her partner, Paul Bernardo. The documentary ostensibly questions the reasoning that the Crown used in the decision not to revisit the charges against Homolka once the video-tape evidence revealed her role in their horrendous crimes. However, *The Fifth Estate* has its own rhetorical agenda to expose the allegedly corrupt plea bargain between Homolka and Crown prosecutors, which is supported by the documentary’s emphasis on the stark contradictions between Homolka’s self-portrayal in police interview tapes and her demeanor in the home video tapes she made with Bernardo. Overtly, *The Fifth Estate*’s purpose is to inform and educate the audience about how the Crown Attorney’s office was “enthralled” by Homolka’s performance and made a “deal with the devil.” However, the program’s choices suggest another covert rhetorical purpose, which is to broaden its viewership through intensifying the audience’s emotional responses by turning a “news documentary” into a form of entertainment.

As I did in establishing Geraldo's "Manson: Psycho" as a baseline for media sensationalism, I will use concepts from Bitzer's “The Rhetorical Situation” to demonstrate the documentary’s commitment to exploiting the entertainment value of Homolka’s crimes. Moreover, I will contextualize the documentary as rhetorical situations where there is an agonistic relationship between the stated intentions of the documentary’s subject (to reveal the flawed plea-bargain

¹ See Appendix C, 180.

deal) and the motives of *The Fifth Estate* (to garner viewers). Bitzer's theory will enable me to focus on the exigences that the program addresses and the rhetorical constraints to which it responds, thereby shaping the audience's perception of the Crown's plea bargain to match that of *The Fifth Estate*.

The documentary's rhetorical agenda is to present the Crown's decision, to keep its "deal with the devil," as unjust and baffling. However, in the quest to make their case about the Crown, the documentary undermines the ethos of CBC's investigative journalism through their rhetorical choices. I will apply Black's rhetorical methods in this chapter to reveal *The Fifth Estate's* character portrayal and the "tokens" it offers up to the audience. Additionally, I will use Black's theories to analyze how an audience is called into being and groomed to not critique the justice system's decisions, but instead, to have its curiosity sated with salacious entertainment rather than a piece of investigative journalism.

I will use Burke's Cluster Criticism in this chapter to help me analyze the key word choices articulated by *The Fifth Estate's* host and investigative journalist, Trish Wood, and her interviewees. This analysis will show how the narrative, established in the interviews, coaches the audience's attitude to match *The Fifth Estate's* rhetorical purpose, involving the Crown's controversial plea bargain with Homolka.

Applying the rhetorical theories of Bitzer, Black, and Burke, I will examine the rhetorical choices that *The Fifth Estate's* "Karla Homolka" documentary uses to progress its rhetorical agenda. In the documentary, *The Fifth Estate* dismantles Homolka's "battered woman" identity (and defence) and rebuilds it with stereotypical feminine imagery. That imagery invites the audience to envision Homolka at various times as a sexualized schoolgirl, fairy tale princess, or an evil witch. *The Fifth Estate* made choices that undermined the CBC's ethos as an investigative journalistic source, where they used their narrative arc and stereotyped characterization to forge another identity for Homolka that was arguably as false as the one she presented to the police. But first, I will provide some context about how the Homolka case was covered by mainstream media, which ultimately shaped the narrative of the documentary.

3.2 Mainstream Media Context Surrounding Homolka

3.2.1 Media Publication Ban

The media coverage at the time provided the backdrop for *The Fifth Estate*'s "Karla Homolka" episode. The CBC picked up on many of the themes that other news outlets were using before the CBC began producing its documentary. During the Homolka trial, the media struggled to provide fact-based courtroom reporting because Ontario General Court Judge Francis Kovacs (who presided over the Homolka trial) imposed (on July 5, 1993) a publication ban on the trial proceedings, including its transcripts.² He only allowed Canadian journalists to report on the "indictment, joint submission as to sentence, whether a conviction was registered but not the plea, the sentence imposed, and a few other unrevealing aspects of the court's reasons."³ Although he allowed the Canadian press into the courtroom, he barred foreign media and the public at large from the courtroom.⁴

Judge Kovacs ruled the publication ban for the purpose of protecting Bernardo's right to a fair trial (May 4, 1994 delayed to May 18, 1995); he believed that the foreign media would be inadequate to protect the integrity of the trial process and could prejudice jurors with pre-trial publications.⁵ The ban had a secondary effect of protecting the privacy and dignity of the murdered victims, the survivors of the crimes, and the victims' families.⁶

Amidst the public interest in the case, the ban and exclusion order outraged news media outlets as it hindered journalists' obligation to keep the public informed.⁷ Lawyers, who represented major media outlets, appealed Judge Kovacs' publication ban and sought the Supreme Court to

² Jamie Cameron, *Victim Privacy and the Open Court Principle*. Government of Canada: Department of Justice Canada, accessed on January 6, 2022. https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/cj-jp/victim/rr03_vic1/rr03_vic1.pdf. 64.

³ Jamie Cameron, *Victim Privacy and the Open Court Principle*, 64.

⁴ Jamie Cameron, *Victim Privacy and the Open Court Principle*, 64.

⁵ Cameron, Jamie. *Victim Privacy and the Open Court Principle*, 64-5.

⁶ Cameron, Jamie. *Victim Privacy and the Open Court Principle*, 66.

⁷ Nick Pron, "Court of appeal lets media fight Homolka ban but final decision must await ruling by Supreme Court: [MET] edition," *Toronto Star* (February 2, 1994), accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/court-appeal-lets-media-fight-homolka-ban-final/docview/437009866/se-2?accountid=14739>.

overturn his order.⁸ Among those media outlets included the CBC, Toronto Star, Globe and Mail, and The Toronto Sun. Journalist Nick Pron, based on a remark from a media lawyer appealing the ban in court, asserts: “Public confidence in the criminal courts can only be achieved by letting the public know what goes on ‘inside the black box.’”⁹

3.2.2 The Media’s Obligation to Open Homolka’s “Black Box” for the Public

Despite the publication ban and exclusion order, news organizations (domestic and international) gained access to information and trial details about the Homolka case. These news organizations revealed the details “via fax, computer bulletin boards and a small British Columbia newspaper,”¹⁰ with the awareness of the trial “highest in Ontario (81 per cent) and strong across the country except in Quebec, where only 46 per cent said they had heard about the case.”¹¹ Even with the ban and order, details of the Homolka case spread to international news organizations, notes Leslie Regan Shade’s essay titled “Desperately Seeking Karla: the Case of alt.fan.karla.homolka”:

Homolka’s case [...] includ[ed] coverage in the *British Sunday Mirror* and *Manchester Guardian*, an article published by *The Washington Post* and reprinted in *The Buffalo News* and *The Detroit Free Press*, American television coverage on "A Current Affair", and Detroit area radio reports, the Canadian public was able [...] to glean details of the Homolka case. A retired Ontario police officer, Gordon Domm, was arrested for distributing copies of the *Sunday Mirror*. Residents of Southern Ontario streamed across the border to purchase or read copies of *The Buffalo News*. Canadian border officials turned back trucks that carried copies of *The Detroit News* that contained a story about the blackout. Detroit television stations who reported that they would provide details of

⁸ Nick Pron, “Court of appeal lets media fight Homolka ban but final decision must await ruling by Supreme Court: [MET edition]”; Nick Pron, “Media Try to Clarify Homolka Evidence Ban: [AM Edition],” *Toronto Star* (September 24, 1993), accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/media-try-clarify-homolka-evidence-ban/docview/436903211/se-2?accountid=14739>.

⁹ Nick Pron, “Court of appeal lets media fight Homolka ban but final decision must await ruling by Supreme Court: [MET edition].”

¹⁰ Stephen Bindman, “Homolka trial details spread through Ontario despite ban,” *The Gazette*, (Montreal, December 29, 1993), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/86796494/the-gazette/>.

¹¹ Stephen Bindman, “Homolka trial details spread through Ontario despite ban.”

the trial had their signals blacked out by some cable companies. And, “a *Buffalo disc jockey standing on the American side of the Peace Bridge used a loudspeaker to bellow out details from a Washington Post story.*”¹²

In addition to the Homolka-Bernardo details spreading worldwide, the coverage and content were highly controversial, and Jamie Cameron, professor of law at Osgoode Hall Law School, reported the following to the Department of Justice Canada:

At the time, the ban and closed hearing were enormously controversial. [...] The dynamics at play, including the media’s role, led to a public perception of the case as “an enormous collection of deceits and concealments.” [...] it looked as though the police were determined to keep the media and the public “from finding out about even inconsequential information”; it appeared that the police and Crown were making deals “against the public’s back”; and it was widely held that Homolka received an “unjustly light sentence.”¹³

Media organizations played a prominent role in the negative public perception of the ban on publicizing Homolka’s trial; the media controls the public dissemination of information. At the expense of integrity and truth, several media groups constructed various female stereotypes to promote a biased public perception to drive intense interest and concern.

3.2.3 Media Coverage Patterns: The Virgin and the Vamp

With the publication ban and sensationalist coverage of the case and trial of Homolka, news media outlets showed archetypal and stereotypical portrayals of Homolka. According to Cameron, he notes that the media reports sex crimes using a lens where individuals are “squeezed into one of two images: ‘she is either pure and innocent, a true victim attacked by monsters – [a virgin] or she is a wanton female who provoked the assailant with her sexuality – [the vamp].’”¹⁴ As Homolka committed sexual offences and crimes against her victims, the media established attitudes in the public by portraying her as both the virgin and vamp.

¹² Leslie Regan Shade, “Desperately Seeking Karla: The Case of alt.fan.karla.homolka,” *Proceedings of the Canadian Association for Information Science, 22nd Annual Conference* (McGill University: May 25-27, 1994), accessed on January 7, 2022. <https://groups.csail.mit.edu/mac/classes/6.805/articles/desperately-seeking-karla.html>.

¹³ Cameron, Jamie, *Victim Privacy and the Open Court Principle*, 65.

¹⁴ Cameron, Jamie, *Victim Privacy and the Open Court Principle*, 56.

News organizations presented Homolka as a pubescent girl – pure, young, innocent, and child-like. *The Ottawa Citizen* (“Deliver us from evil”¹⁵), *Nanaimo Daily News* (“Finally Karla had her say,”¹⁶ “Bernardo linked to stalkings,”¹⁷ and “Bernardo saga too sordid for film-makers”¹⁸), and *Maclean’s* (“Bride and Groom”¹⁹) saturated the news with images of Homolka wearing a white wedding dress, popularly symbolizing virginity, purity, innocence, and girlhood.

News magazine *Maclean’s* covered a series of columns on the Homolka case: “Unspeakable Crimes,” “The Homolka Enigma,” “The Homolka Ban,” “The two Faces of Karla Homolka,” “Karla Homolka faces the heat,” and “Bride and Groom.” *Maclean’s* article, “Bride and Groom,” describes Homolka as a “pretty middleclass girl [...] [who is] poised, elegantly groomed, her blond hair perfectly coiffed.”²⁰ *Maclean’s* states, based on an account by Homolka’s high school friend, how she is “pleasant,” an “animal lover,” and “loved her sisters.”²¹ *Maclean’s* discusses her innocent years as a high school girl and who belonged to a group called the Diamond Club, where they dream of marrying rich at a young age.²² The magazine progressed to detail Homolka’s young love story with Bernardo; her “wildest dream come true” of having a “lavish [wedding] affair complete with horse-drawn carriage and pheasant dinner” and honeymoon, as well as living in a “pretty pink house.”²³ Additionally, in 1995, *Maclean’s* “The Homolka Enigma” gave a day-by-day account of the court proceedings that took place between June 28,

¹⁵ MacQueen, Ken, “Deliver us from evil,” *The Ottawa Citizen* (Ottawa, Ontario, September 2, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/52899076/the-ottawa-citizen/>.

¹⁶ *Nanaimo Daily News*, “Finally Karla had her say,” (November 16, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17685250/nanaimo-daily-news/>.

¹⁷ *Nanaimo Daily News*, “Bernardo linked to stalkings,” (September 1, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17672897/nanaimo-daily-news/>.

¹⁸ *Nanaimo Daily News*, “Bernardo saga too sordid for film-makers,” (Nanaimo, British Columbia, September 7, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17684032/nanaimo-daily-news/>.

¹⁹ Mary Nemeth and Anne Marie Owens, “Bride and Groom,” *Maclean’s* (July 19, 1993), accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://archive.macleans.ca/article/1993/7/19/bride-and-groom>.

²⁰ Nemeth, Mary and Owens, Anne Marie. “Bride and Groom.”

²¹ Nemeth, Mary and Owens, Anne Marie. “Bride and Groom.”

²² Nemeth, Mary and Owens, Anne Marie. “Bride and Groom.”

²³ Nemeth, Mary and Owens, Anne Marie. “Bride and Groom.”

1993 and July 9, 1993 that led to Homolka's conviction.²⁴ Their cover story detailed Homolka's prison cell:

[D]ecorated with Mickey Mouse posters on the walls; her bedsheets sport characters from the Sesame Street children's TV show[.] [...] [S]he has written from her jail cell [...] discuss[ing] her hair, her nails, her diets, her ambitions[.][...] There seems no remorse. "I'm growing my bangs. Or at least trying to," she writes. [...] "[About Bernardo,] I'm going through some difficult times dealing with the death of our relationship," Homolka writes. "That's how I'm trying to treat it – like a death."²⁵

Similarly, *Nanaimo Daily News*' article states how Homolka "revels in her cell's décor: Mickey Mouse posters on the walls and bedsheets and towels emblazoned with Sesame Street insignia [and] [s]he watches a lot of [...] the Simpsons."²⁶ Furthering, *The Ottawa Citizen* wrote that Homolka "collects stuffed animals and gives them cute names."²⁷ While the news media builds the innocent virgin-girl in Homolka, they also report her victimhood.

The media details Homolka's story through a victim-focused lens. *Maclean's* presents the angle that Homolka contended she was trapped in a loveless relationship poisoned by sexual, physical and emotional abuse²⁸ and "paint[ed] herself as a victim of abuse."²⁹ Based on what was claimed by the jurors of the Bernardo trial, *Nanaimo Daily News* titled its article, "Homolka not a cold-blooded killer."³⁰ In the news report, the article quoted multiple jurors who claim that Homolka "was not in control of herself," "obsessed by, and subject to, the whims and desires of Bernardo," and "battered without a doubt."³¹ *Nanaimo Daily News* also reprinted the cover of *The Toronto Sun*, where the front cover illustrated an image of Homolka with bruising around

²⁴ Joe Chidley, "The Homolka Enigma," *Maclean's* (June 26, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://archive.macleans.ca/article/1995/6/26/the-homolka-enigma>.

²⁵ Joe Chidley, "The Homolka Enigma."

²⁶ *Nanaimo Daily Free Press*, "Homolka's life: Mickey Mouse posters and watching Donahue" (September 12, 1994), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17672703/nanaimo-daily-news/>.

²⁷ Ken MacQueen, "Deliver us from evil."

²⁸ D'Arcy Jenish, "Karla Homolka faces the heat," *Macleans* (July 17, 1995), accessed January 6, 2022. <http://archive.macleans.ca/article/1995/7/17/karla-homolka-faces-the-heat>.

²⁹ *Nanaimo Daily News*, "Homolka's stories lies to appear a victim: Bernardo" (August 22, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17669121/nanaimo-daily-news/>.

³⁰ *Nanaimo Daily Free Press*, "Homolka not a cold-blooded killer" (Nanaimo, British Columbia, September 21, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17684342/nanaimo-daily-news/>.

³¹ *Nanaimo Daily Free Press*, "Homolka not a cold-blooded killer."

both her eyes to give the impression that the Crown perceived her as a victim.³² Also, *Maclean's* stated that Homolka was “another of Bernardo’s victims” and “coerced.”³³

While the media describes Homolka’s girlishness and victimhood, it also frames its narrative of Homolka as a vamp. *Maclean's* provided an excerpt of a videotape conversation between Homolka and Bernardo (also known as the fireside chat) and described how Homolka “seems a willing – even enthusiastic – participant in her future husband’s fantasies. She declares that she ‘loved’ it when he had sex with Tammy, dons her dead sister’s clothes for Bernardo’s amusement – and suggests that they abduct other young virgins.”³⁴ *The Buffalo News* provided the same videotape excerpt but also includes that “Homolka [was] stalking, raping and sexually abusing the drugged and unconscious Tammy” and self-proclaiming that she is “keeper of virgins.”³⁵ Additionally, *The Buffalo News* claimed that defense attorney John Rosen argued Homolka was “into kinky sex”³⁶ and *United Press International (UPI) News* also mentioned said argument but added that she “passively engineered Bernardo’s fantasies.”³⁷ *U.S. Associated Press (AP) News* published in their columns how “Homolka wore a dog collar during sex. Bernardo said she bought the collar for their mutual pleasure.”³⁸

Mainstream media sensationally presented Homolka as an innocent virgin-girl, victim, and vamp. However, the Virgin and Vamp are strategic moves to develop the media’s main purpose, which is to show Homolka as archetypes of the princess and evil witch.

³² Nanaimo Daily News, “Bernardo Did This To Karla: Crown” (British Columbia. June 1, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17683929/nanaimo-daily-news/>.

³³ Nanaimo Daily News, “Bernardo Did This To Karla: Crown.”

³⁴ D’Arcy Jenish, “The two faces of Karla Homolka,” *Maclean's* (June 12, 1995), accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://archive.macleans.ca/article/1995/6/12/the-two-faces-of-karla-homolka>.

³⁵ Barry Brown, “Graphic Video Shows Sexual Activity Between Bernardo, Ex-Wife,” *The Buffalo News* (June 2, 1995), accessed on January 7, 2022. https://buffalonews.com/news/graphic-video-shows-sexual-activity-between-bernardo-ex-wife/article_3e3d8acc-63c8-50de-ad44-53b2fd1bd016.html.

³⁶ Barry Brown, “Homolka testifies she thought raping sister would not kill her,” *The Buffalo News* (July 6, 1995), accessed on January 7, 2022. https://buffalonews.com/news/homolka-testifies-she-thought-raping-sister-would-not-kill-her/article_88a43936-f08d-5c75-b274-bd2d97730568.html.

³⁷ Aviva Boxer, “Ex-wife’s Testimony in sex case ends,” *United Press International* (July 14, 1995), accessed on January 7, 2022. <https://www.upi.com/Archives/1995/07/14/Ex-wifes-testimony-in-sex-case-ends/6139805694400/>.

³⁸ *AP News*, “Prosecutors Cross-Examine Bernardo, Who Says He Enjoyed Raping Teen” (August 16, 1995), accessed on January 7, 2022. <https://apnews.com/article/41b992df5c5ccbd16c2df86eade20426>.

3.2.3 Archetypes in Media Coverage: Princess and Evil Witch

In the early 1990s, mainstream media presented fairy tale archetypes of good and evil in Homolka. The media exploits fairy tales and cultural myths to frame criminals in problematic ways; it gave the impression that Homolka is a perfect archetype of a fairy tale princess. Saturated in media coverage, news and entertainment show images of Homolka outfitted in a princess-style white wedding gown, or on a horse-drawn carriage, being held by a tuxedoed Bernardo.

Anne Swardson, of *The Washington Post*, published an article describing Homolka as “resplendent” with her “fairy-tale wedding dress.”³⁹ Swardson continued to detail that Homolka “wore white [...] [and] had [g]arlands of baby’s breath adorned [to] her hair and fluffy veil; her long flounced dress made her look like Cinderella. Her proud husband wore white tie and tails. The couple left the church near Niagara Falls in a horse-drawn carriage.”⁴⁰ *Democrat and Chronicle* reprinted Swardson’s article, however, they retitled it to “In this tale of evil, even Cinderella is a ghoul.”⁴¹ Stephen Williams, who wrote a book on the Homolka-Bernardo case, had a picture of the bride and groom (Homolka and Bernardo) sitting in a white horse-drawn carriage plastered on the cover of his book.⁴² In “Teale on Trial,” Fox Television program *A Current Affair* described the wedding as “a scene straight out of a fairy tale, a wedding in majestic Niagara-on-the-Lake.”⁴³ In *Maclean’s*, the news magazine told a tale of how Homolka met Bernardo, who she called her “prince”⁴⁴ or “king,”⁴⁵ and was her “handsome blond, blue-eyed boyfriend”⁴⁶ that “showered her with gifts, [and] charmed her with his easy manner.”⁴⁷ The

³⁹ Anne Swardson, “Unspeakable Crimes,” *Washington Post* (Washington, DC. November 23, 1993), accessed January 6, 2022. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1993/11/23/unspeakable-crimes/0b5070a4-37e0-45b5-b5c6-629db0fee5a6/>.

⁴⁰ Anne Swardson, “Unspeakable Crimes.”

⁴¹ *Democrat and Chronicle*, “In the tale of evil, even Cinderella was a ghoul” (Rochester, New York, November 25, 1993), accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/5392021/democrat-and-chronicle/>.

⁴² Stephen Williams, *Invisible Darkness: the strange case of Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka* (Toronto: Little Brown Book and Co., 1996).

⁴³ Mary Garofalo, *A Current Affair*, “Teale on Trial,” aired July 26, 1994 on Fox Television

⁴⁴ D’Arcy Jenish, “Karla Homolka faces the heat.”

⁴⁵ D’Arcy Jenish, “The two faces of Karla Homolka.”

⁴⁶ Mary Nemeth and Anne Marie Owens, “Bride and Groom.”

⁴⁷ Mary Nemeth and Anne Marie Owens, “Bride and Groom.”

magazine continued to call her “fairy-tale marriage to [him], in a storybook wedding, was her ‘wildest dream’ come true,”⁴⁸ in the following report:

[The wedding] was a lavish affair complete with horse-drawn carriage and a pheasant dinner, followed by a honeymoon in Hawaii. And they moved to St. Catharines’ upscale Port Dalhousie neighborhood, into a quaint pink clapboard Cape Cod-style house just three kilometres from the old trailer park where Karla used to live.⁴⁹

While the news media presented the fairy tale princess archetype, they also contrasted that character to depict Homolka as the evil witch.

Lynn Crosbie, Canadian novelist who wrote an article on the Homolka case, states that “[t]wo different portraits emerge from [media] sources, but both the mainstream and underground media draw from fairy-tale narratives to create their respective images of Homolka The Princess and Homolka The Witch.”⁵⁰ Witch archetypes are cultural stereotypes of women; witches are broad generalizations that mainstream media uses to explain its observation of womanhood. Witches are stereotypically viewed as evil beings – characterized as wearing black, being manipulative, and in cahoots with the devil⁵¹ – and very much exploited in the media coverage of Homolka.

Mainstream media used visual images that showed Homolka in a white wedding dress as mentioned above; however, its narrative emphasized that she often wore black to imply that she is an evil witch. *Maclean’s* articles, for example, showed Homolka in her white dress, but its narrative suggested to readers that Homolka is sinister because she “bucked the then-fashionable preppie style in her dress, opting instead for all-black or all-white outfits”⁵² and “preferred to dress in black or all white, never pink or frilly clothes.”⁵³ Additionally, the news magazine demonized Homolka by referencing “[o]ne of [Bernardo’s] lawyers, Ken Murray, [who] said

⁴⁸ Mary Nemeth and Anne Marie Owens, “Bride and Groom.”

⁴⁹ Mary Nemeth and Anne Marie Owens, “Bride and Groom.”

⁵⁰ Lynn Crosbie, “Women who love to kill too much: back to school with Karla Homolka,” *This Magazine* 28, no. 3 (September 1994): 54-57. Accessed January 6, 2022. <http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/magazines/women-who-love-kill-too-much-back-school-with/docview/203558630/se-2?accountid=14739>.

⁵¹ “History of Witches,” *History*, A&E Television Networks, 1997, accessed on January 8, 2022. <https://www.history.com/topics/folklore/history-of-witches>.

⁵² Joe Chidley, “The Homolka Enigma.”

⁵³ Mary Nemeth and Anne Marie Owens, “Bride and Groom.”

later that the Crown may have “made a deal with the devil” in return for Homolka’s testimony against her husband.”⁵⁴ Lastly, *Maclean’s* used words that encouraged readers to identify Homolka as the witch archetype, when it called Homolka “darkly romantic,” and noted how the victims’ “lives were becoming as saint-like as [Homolka and Bernardo’s] lives had been evil.”⁵⁵

The Washington Post called Homolka’s case, “the tale of evil,” and *Democrat and Chronicle’s* article title wrote Homolka is a “ghoul.” *The Ottawa Citizen* titled its article “Deliver us from evil” and called Homolka “[t]he fac[e] of evil.”⁵⁶ Moreover, the news article gave Homolka another name: “Evil has grown out her bangs while in prison, Evil should own stock in Hallmark cards for all the gushy notes it writes. Evil collects stuffed animals and gives them cute names. The frightening thing about evil, is that you would let it babysit your children.”⁵⁷

Whiles the publication ban attempted to protect due process and shelter the families, the media’s subsequent scrambling for the story created conditions favourable for the emergence of the binary stereotyping that came to characterize the discourse. CBC’s *The Fifth Estate*, for example, creates and disseminates a binary stereotype narrative in the episode “Karla Homolka,” which will be discussed further in the next section.

3.3 An Overview of the “Karla Homolka” Episode

(See [Appendix C: Transcription of *The Fifth Estate* – “Karla Homolka”](#))

The plea bargain reached in May 1993 meant that, in exchange for her testimony against Paul Bernardo, Homolka would serve only 12-years for her part in the crimes committed with Bernardo, spanning from December 24, 1990 to April 19, 1992.⁵⁸ Bernardo was charged with first degree murder, and the Crown believed it needed her testimony to garner a conviction against him. The Crown made the deal with Homolka in 1993, *before* video tapes surfaced that

⁵⁴ Joe Chidley, “The Homolka Enigma.”

⁵⁵ D’Arcy Jenish, “Tragic entertainment,” *Maclean’s* (November 21, 1994), accessed January 6, 2022. <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/1994/11/21/tragic-entertainment>.

⁵⁶ Ken MacQueen, “Deliver us from evil.”

⁵⁷ Ken MacQueen, “Deliver us from evil.”

⁵⁸ See Appendix D: Chronology for the Karla Homolka & Paul Bernardo Events.

provided evidence of the extent of Homolka's involvement. However, *The Fifth Estate* gained access to police interviews and the couple's home videos of their crimes in 1997 and, armed with these and their foreknowledge of the content of these video tapes, they present a narrative of female criminality that is underpinned by enthymematic assumptions about what a young, white, middle-class Canadian woman is capable of doing and being.

The Fifth Estate, equipped with video and audio evidence of Homolka and Bernardo, disseminates a narrative involving the justice system and Homolka. Trish Wood, investigative reporter for CBC, hosts the episode, wherein she dissects Homolka's manipulative tactics and holds one-on-one interviews with various professionals and Homolka's friends. The documentary unmask's Homolka's identity using her own words but using *The Fifth Estate's* own compilation and sequencing of the evidence. However, their reconstruction of her identity serves their rhetorical purposes. *The Fifth Estate's* portrayal of Homolka is a result of their understanding of the exigence that their documentary addresses.

3.4 Bitzer's Rhetorical Situation: Entertainment Deals and Biased Views

3.4.1 Rhetorical Exigence: Entertainment in the Corrupt Plea Deal

Lloyd Bitzer posits three main components to the "rhetorical situation,"⁵⁹ which are crucial to the discovery of the exigence, audience, and constraints within *The Fifth Estate's* documentary, "Karla Homolka." Previously in the *Geraldo* chapter, we observed, by using Bitzer's concept of rhetorical exigence, how Rivera drums up the Satanic Panic to capitalize on the public's anxiety and create a harmful society construct by exploiting sensationalistic tactics and emotional appeals. In *The Fifth Estate's* documentary, the overt exigence involves the public's loss of faith in the justice system due to the Crown's negotiations around Homolka's plea bargain. Patrick T. Galligan, who was the appointed judge to inquire into matters relating to Homolka, documented the public alarm at the bargain in his report:

The inquiry was established because of a profound and widely felt sense of public disquiet at the fact that Karla Homolka is serving only 12 years for her part in the

⁵⁹ Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation."

commission of horrible offences[,] [and] [a]t the heart of the issue are [...] decisions taken by the Crown with respect to Karla Homolka.⁶⁰

The Fifth Estate does not remediate its exigence in a responsible fashion when it claims that Homolka's "controversial plea bargain [was] endorsed by Ontario's Attorney General."⁶¹ Instead, the documentary implies that Homolka got away with her crimes and exploits pathos appeals that leave the audience alarmed, anxious, and suspicious that the plea bargain negotiations were unlawful or that justice was not served. When it comes to the topic of the plea bargain, Galligan posits:

In an ideal world, there would be perfect justice: all offenders would be brought to trial, they would be convicted of all offences which they had actually committed, and they would receive sentences fully reflective of the seriousness of their crimes. In the real world, however, some compromises have to be made. It is sometimes necessary to allow an accomplice to plead guilty to a reduced charge, and receive a reduced sentence, in order to ensure that the full measure of justice is meted out to the principal offender. [...] Negotiation with an accomplice to obtain his or her evidence against another perpetrator is always a very distasteful business. No one likes to do it. Unfortunately, it is a necessary and not infrequent part of the investigation and prosecution of crime. The events which follow must be reviewed with an appreciation that, as distasteful as the negotiations were, they were in accordance with the law.⁶²

Society commonly recognizes plea bargains as leniency or the reduction of a criminal charge; thus, when the justice system appears to mishandle a plea bargain, it can leave the impression of downplaying the seriousness of a crime and undermining the validity of the justice system. Homolka's plea bargain meant that she served only "twelve years [in prison], ten each for French and Mahaffy to be served concurrently. She got just two years for Tammy and was never charged in her sister's death."⁶³ *The Fifth Estate* suggests that the plea bargain was a miscarriage of justice by announcing Homolka's time served, which sets up the viewers to feel outraged and

⁶⁰ Patrick T. Galligan, "Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka," Toronto: Ministry of the Attorney General (1996), 7.

⁶¹ See Appendix C, 148.

⁶² Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 70-1.

⁶³ See Appendix C, 166.

impelled to condemn the justice system. This condemnation is the action that *The Fifth Estate* exhorts its audience to take to resolve their exigence, but there is no catharsis nor comfort for the audience in the Homolka documentary.

Homolka's lawyer George Walker and Crown Attorney Murray Segal are implicated by *The Fifth Estate* for the laxity of the plea bargain. According to *The Fifth Estate* episode, these individuals "bargain[ed] in local restaurants"⁶⁴ and "met over dinner at Auberge du Pommier in Toronto" to finalize the deal,⁶⁵ which meant the "[plea bargain] arrangement was made in secret, by men whose interests coincided."⁶⁶ *The Fifth Estate* documentary gives the impression that Walker and Segal were corrupt, meeting clandestinely and in secret, which urged the audience to conclude that the lawyers mishandled the plea bargain and were not to be taken seriously.

However, Galligan, in his report, advocates for the lawyers and outlines four important details relevant to the documentary. First, he argues that the plea negotiations between Segal and Walker "took place over a three-month period beginning on February 12, 1993."⁶⁷ Second, Galligan insists that the meetings between the two lawyers were conducted over numerous phone discussions,⁶⁸ held at "offices,"⁶⁹ the "court house,"⁷⁰ and various locations in Niagara Falls,⁷¹ St. Catharines,⁷² and Toronto.⁷³ Third, Galligan speaks to Segal's superiors – Michael Code (Assistant Deputy Attorney General – Criminal), George Thomson (Deputy Attorney General), and Marion Boyd (Attorney General) – and Galligan is completely satisfied that Segal "kept

⁶⁴ See Appendix C, 162.

⁶⁵ See Appendix C, 166.

⁶⁶ See Appendix C, 148.

⁶⁷ Patrick T. Galligan, "Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka," 52.

⁶⁸ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 61, 72, 81, 86.

⁶⁹ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 56, 85, 86.

⁷⁰ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 71

⁷¹ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 56, 73, 86.

⁷² Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 71

⁷³ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 82, 89.

them fully informed of what he was doing and why he was doing it and that they accepted his decision.”⁷⁴ Fourth and final, he provides his support for the lawyers and emphasizes the necessity for plea bargains:

[Segal and Walker] were not breaking new ground by seeking a resolution that would involve Karla Homolka offering cooperation and testimony in exchange for some form of lenient treatment with respect to the crimes which she had committed. The practice of using accomplices to give evidence for the prosecution is well established and is legally acceptable. [...] In Canada, the practice is less elegantly described in the vernacular as having the accomplice “roll over”. Those who work in the criminal justice system are familiar with this practice. Police officers, Crown Attorneys, defence counsel, and judges see it done almost daily. Many members of the public are aware of this practice. Those who work in the criminal justice system, and members of the public, recognize that, however distasteful, arrangements with accomplices form a necessary part of the prosecution of some criminal cases. The law has long recognized the existence of, and the need for, such arrangements.⁷⁵

In essence, Galligan’s argument is that Segal conducted the negotiations appropriately by following legal best practices, maintaining transparent communication with his superiors, and seeking legally acceptable arrangements in matters relating to Homolka.

To cement the audience’s anxiety, *The Fifth Estate* documentary continues to highlight the failings of the plea bargain by calling on videotape evidence of the Homolka-Bernardo sexual assaults, which the Crown did not possess when they made their decision in the plea bargain. The documentary invites the audience to dispute the plea bargain based on the evidence. Trish Wood claims that “[i]n many cases, [Homolka] appeared to be enjoying herself as she took her turn sexually assaulting the [...] young victims, including Jane Doe.”⁷⁶ According to *The Fifth Estate*, the videotape evidence also meant that Homolka broke the deal and could be charged with

⁷⁴ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 90.

⁷⁵ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 64.

⁷⁶ See Appendix C, 176.

attempted murder,⁷⁷ as well as be found “guilty of perjury and another sexual assault.”⁷⁸ In addition, the documentary presents the viewpoint that the plea bargain could have been rejected because Homolka’s “deal stipulated that if she stopped the breath of any of the girls, the deal was off [and] she [had] stopped the breath of her sister.”⁷⁹ Galligan argues, however, that (1) the Crown would never have entered into the plea deal with Homolka if the video tapes had been in the hands of the authorities on or before May 14, 1993;⁸⁰ (2) Segal would not have made the deal if they were not desperate in their pursuit to prosecute Bernardo for first degree murder;⁸¹ (3) a charge on Homolka would add, at most, two years to the total sentence,⁸² but there is a potential prejudicial effect and the risk was the successful prosecution of Bernardo;⁸³ (4) expert evidence from psychologists (Drs. Hans Arndt, Andrew Malcolm, Alan Long and Roy Brown) overwhelmingly supports Homolka’s opinion that she does not remember the sexual assaults, and that she was a severely abused and battered spouse who showed a number of symptoms including partial memory loss;⁸⁴ (5) Section 610(2) of the Criminal Code is an absolute bar to proceeding against Homolka for murder because she has the conviction of manslaughter.⁸⁵

The Fifth Estate episode similarly encourages the audience to question the credibility of its interviewee, Dr. Andrew Malcolm (Homolka’s psychologist) and Homolka’s psychiatric assessments. The documentary indicates that the Crown used the psychiatric assessment to help endorse the plea deal. In the following, Wood points out the concerns with Homolka’s psychiatric assessments:

[An image of Homolka with a bruised and battered face]

⁷⁷ See Appendix C, 177.

⁷⁸ See Appendix C, 176.

⁷⁹ See Appendix C, 171.

⁸⁰ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 89.

⁸¹ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 87-8.

⁸² Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 185.

⁸³ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 178.

⁸⁴ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 158, 181.

⁸⁵ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 197.

This was the Karla Homolka presented by police and prosecutors, a victim deserving of leniency. Homolka also convinced a legion of psychiatrists that she had committed unspeakable crimes, only because she was battered into it by an abusive husband. Leniency she got, through a controversial plea bargain endorsed by Ontario's Attorney General. The arrangement was made in secret, by men⁸⁶ whose interests coincided: as a result her psychiatric assessments were never tested in court. If they'd been publicly scrutinized, we might have had a glimpse of a different Karla Homolka. The one who appears when those psychiatric diagnoses are stripped away.⁸⁷

Wood claims that the justice system and psychiatric experts failed in their proceedings with Homolka. The documentary further suggests that Dr. Malcolm fell under Homolka's "spell" and swallowed her story whole without a shadow of doubt. However, Galligan reports that Homolka's medical diagnoses (spousal abuse, battered wife/woman syndrome, post-traumatic stress disorder, memory loss) are solidly and overwhelmingly supported.⁸⁸ He expands his argument on the medical evidence in the following:

[Homolka] ha[d] been under the care of consulting psychiatrist practicing in Kingston, Dr. Roy Brown. In addition, the police had her assessed by two psychiatrists and two psychologists of their choice. [...] Drs. Arndt, Malcolm and Long all examined and assessed [Homolka] [...] long before the issue of her failure to disclose the June 7, 1991 assault ever arose and before doctors were asked to comment on her memory loss. Each one of them noted in their reports that [Homolka] had memory problems. Dr. Arndt noted that, in some respects, her memory was not particularly good. Dr. Malcolm also noted a history of some memory loss which he thought could be attributed to "emotional anaesthesia". Dr. Long reported that psychological testing showed evidence of impaired memory function.

Dr. Brown, [Homolka's psychiatrist,] noted in his initial diagnosis that [Homolka] was experiencing dysthymia and post traumatic stress disorder. This diagnosis is consistent

⁸⁶ The documentary's use of this gendered noun is significant in this context because it anticipates my subsequent focus on how Homolka is portrayed as bewitching males.

⁸⁷ See Appendix C, 148.

⁸⁸ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 150-151.

with that made by the doctors who saw her earlier. [...] Dr. Hucker reviewed [...] and interviewed [Homolka] for ten hours. He concurred in the opinions expressed by the several other experts [...] that she was suffering from post traumatic stress disorder, resulting from spousal abuse. The memory loss which she reported was, in his opinion, consistent with that diagnosis. Dr. Hatcher examined [Homolka] for six hours[.] [...] He diagnosed her as demonstrating a high degree of disturbance consistent with an abused woman suffering from post traumatic stress disorder.

Dr. McDonald acknowledge that Drs. Arndt, Long, Malcolm and Hatcher had all diagnosed [Homolka] as experiencing post traumatic stress disorder and/or representing a case of battered wife syndrome.

Dr. Jaffe assessed [Homolka] [and] had two interviews with her which totaled ten hours. [...] He consulted with [...] leading experts in North America on battered women's syndrome. They were Dr. Angela Browne, Dr. Lenore Walker and Dr. Ewing[.] [...] Dr. Jaffe's ultimate conclusion after his assessment is: "In our opinion, Ms. Homolka exhibits all the signs and symptoms of a young woman who has been extremely traumatized by an abusive relationship. [...] In our view, she fits all the criteria for the battered woman's syndrome." ⁸⁹

The essence of Galligan's report refutes *The Fifth Estate's* claims that the psychiatric experts were deceived by Homolka's story. He argues that expert evidence and psychiatric assessments from multiple doctors are overwhelmingly consistent with Dr. Malcolm's diagnosis of Homolka.

In its attempt to claim ethos with the Homolka documentary, *The Fifth Estate* documentary undermines the institutional authority of the justice system. The episode explicitly addresses the alleged flaws of the plea bargain, as well as the supposed mishandling of the Crown's negotiation with Walker (Homolka's lawyer), while implying that the Crown was bewitched by Homolka's apparent docile femininity. As plea bargains cannot be changed or overturned, *The*

⁸⁹ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 151-156.

Fifth Estate interprets evidence that the Crown did not have, creating a sense of doubt in the justice system for the audience; a loss of faith in the justice system is the rhetorical exigence that can be addressed. The documentary oversteps a certain standard by making the audience believe they are empowered, while (in fact) *The Fifth Estate* directs the audience to understand the Homolka case based on its point of view. To exert influence on the audience, the television program develops its point of view by identifying its constraints, which will be the focus in the next section.

3.4.2 Rhetorical Constraints: Distortion of the Public's Views

Bitzer's rhetorical constraints have the power to constrain or limit the way the message is delivered or produced.⁹⁰ As when Rivera exploited social anxieties regarding the Satanic Panic at the expense of informing the audience in a meaningful way, the CBC, a national public broadcaster, creates a message that limits and problematizes the audience's understanding of the Homolka-Bernardo case. First, the CBC takes pride in its adherence to strict ethical standards and balanced perspectives; however, this public broadcaster fails to uphold its ethical standards. Through *The Fifth Estate*, the CBC provides a biased and sensational report of the documentary that does not equip the audience to ask the necessary questions, but rather stirs up anger as the end. Sensationalism in news journalism, especially investigative journalism, packaged as entertainment, can be harmful and dangerous to audiences because the information is often inaccurate or misleading, skews the audience's worldviews, and categorizes people; it distorts how the audience processes and understands information involving people and situations.

Second, the CBC has reputational constraints; this public broadcaster, and by proxy its television programs and reporters, has a reputation with the public as a leader and authority on the topics that it reports. The CBC empowers *The Fifth Estate* to lead its viewers through the exposé of the Homolka true crime story. With the responsibility to inform the public on current events, *The Fifth Estate* uses the Homolka episode to bolster its ethos by staging itself as a kind of "watchdog" figure on the judicial system instead. *The Fifth Estate* monitors the activities of the

⁹⁰ Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," 8.

justice system on behalf of the public to ensure the system met ethical and legal standards. However, the episode does not provide the context or explanation necessary for the audience to judge the relevance of the situation or take any positive action towards remediating the exigence. Instead, the documentary shows the audience its way of understanding the story – as sensational, biased, sexualized, and entertaining – to bolster its ethos, engage the audience and gain popularity. The documentary coaches them to take on the viewpoint of *The Fifth Estate* by using rhetorical tactics, including lurid details from evidence and guest interviews, that turn this documentary into a sensationalist piece of entertainment. Although *The Fifth Estate* has a reputation to maintain, the episode substitutes factual reporting with subtle and implicit sensationalism, giving the false impression that it is empowering its audience by uncovering the troubling plea bargain and providing an exposé of the justice system. The reality is that the Homolka documentary is an attempt by *The Fifth Estate* to expand their audience by capitalizing on a gruesome story with high visibility.

Third, the CBC neglects to inform the audience that plea bargains cannot be overturned, and it had evidentiary opportunities when the documentary was created, whereas the justice system did not have the same opportunities at that time. *The Fifth Estate* documentary showcases the Homolka-Bernardo home video tapes throughout the documentary, including certain tapes that incriminated Homolka. They give the false impression that the police and Crown prosecutors had all the evidence that they needed to prosecute both Homolka and Bernardo, but instead made the conscious decision (based on the interview with police inspector Vince Bevan) to not charge Homolka and move forward with the Homolka plea deal to prosecute Bernardo only.⁹¹ In his report, Galligan explains that the plea bargain cannot be overturned because Homolka fulfilled her deal to give truthful accounts of her participation in the crimes, and “[w]hile the videotapes graphically portrayed her carrying out her role, they did not change the disclosure which she had already made in respect to [the victims].”⁹² If proceedings were taken, Galligan puts it bluntly that “it would be found to be an abuse of process.”⁹³ He ultimately points out that “[e]ven if it

⁹¹ See Appendix C, 177.

⁹² Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 196.

⁹³ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 197.

were appropriate to take proceedings against her, it would not be feasible to do so because Section 610(2) of the Criminal Code is an absolute bar to proceeding against Homolka for murder because she has the conviction of manslaughter.⁹⁴ There may be rare cases that make an exception to this code, but overturning Homolka's plea deal would "tarnish, perhaps irremediably, the honour of the Crown and its reputation for rectitude [and] [...] would go against the wish of the victim [Jane Doe] in circumstances where her wish ought to be given very great weight. To do so would be contrary to the principle requiring finality to litigation."⁹⁵

The Fifth Estate deals with two exigences. First, the overt exigence is the public casting doubt on the Canadian justice system due to the Crown's negotiation surrounding Homolka's plea bargain. Second, the covert exigency involves *The Fifth Estate* turning a "news documentary" into a form of sensationalism by using archetypes and motifs to inform and educate the audience on how the justice system and psychiatric experts failed in their proceedings with Homolka. Although *The Fifth Estate*'s role is to inform the audience, the rhetorical constraints are that the message, a one-sided point of view, limits the audience's understanding of the criminal case; the audience is influenced to adopt the biased viewpoint of *The Fifth Estate*. To strengthen its ethos, the documentary exploits sensationalism and entertainment to whip up the audience into action, rather than give them the means to make some degree of independent thinking about the action they wanted to take. The documentary dismantles Homolka's identity (and defense) using archetypal female imagery to create another identity – one that involved enthymematic assumptions about "white Canadian women" and "middle-class" expectations. As such, Edwin Black's "The Second Persona" will provide further insight into the role or expectation that *The Fifth Estate* calls the audience into being, and enables a discussion of how the documentary's rhetorical constructs contained tokens of the author's attitudes.

⁹⁴ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 197.

⁹⁵ Patrick T. Galligan, *Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka*, 213.

3.5 Black's Second Persona: Enthymematic Tokens and Schoolgirl Persona

Told through a lens of gender and social status, *The Fifth Estate* showcases visual and verbal “tokens” or “external signs” of its “internal states.” In her essay, “Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla Homolka,” Romaine Smith Fullerton posits that “an overemphasis on elements of gender and class within [the] documentar[y][,] [...]uncover[ed] a romantic narrative that [could] be allocated within the genre of love-stories [and] produced through a fantasy-type lens.”⁹⁶ Where “Manson: Psycho” carries enthymematic “tokens” of middle-class children and sex tropes of schoolgirls to cue the audience to become anxious (even paranoid) parents possibly willing to go to extreme measures to fight and protect the traditional family unit, *The Fifth Estate* also showcases similar representations. To build the audience’s attitude in supporting its viewpoint, *The Fifth Estate* relies on enthymematic “tokens” – stereotypes of womanhood and social class – and its de/constructions highlighted Homolka’s schoolgirl persona.

3.5.1 Persona: Trish Wood, The Face of The Fifth Estate

With the persona of CBC’s *The Fifth Estate*, and journalist Trish Wood as its face, the documentary exhibits “external signs of internal states.”⁹⁷ *The Fifth Estate*’s desire to be the nation’s news source is the internal state and efforts to re/frame the documentary for shock value and salacious entertainment constitute external signs. The Fifth Estate’s message has “tokens”⁹⁸ that cue into their worldview, which are invitations for the audience not just to respond to it but become the kind of people who respond to titillation, sensationalism, and fantastical stories.

3.5.2 Second Persona: Attitude and Identity of the Audience

Wood, who herein will be interchangeable with *The Fifth Estate*, wants to influence the audience’s attitude; thus, Wood invites the audience to take on a new identity (not just to believe

⁹⁶ Romaine Smith Fullerton, “Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla,” *Atlantis* (2006), accessed on November 25, 2022.

<https://journals.msvu.ca/index.php/atlantis/article/view/742>.

⁹⁷ Edwin Black, “The Second Persona,” 110.

⁹⁸ Edwin Black, “The Second Persona,” 110.

something but to *become something*), in terms of Black's Second Persona.⁹⁹ *The Fifth Estate* encourages the audience to be the jury and to make the appropriate judgements, which (according to *The Fifth Estate*) the justice system did not. To build the state of mind and attitude in the audience that supports its viewpoint, *The Fifth Estate* relies on enthymemes – stereotypes of womanhood – and its de/constructions highlighted Homolka's sexually deviant schoolgirl persona. This next section addresses scenarios or visual tokens that explicitly invite the audience to respond in a certain way – inspired by shock and fear, seduced by prurience and pornography, and entertained by tragedy – that are not in keeping with a reputable national news service.

3.5.3 Token 1: Sexy Schoolgirl Painting Innocence Over Evil

The Fifth Estate shapes Homolka's identity into a schoolgirl and asks the audience to be inspired by fear, disgust, and shock. In a dramatic re-enactment of *The Fifth Estate* episode, an actor playing Homolka is painting her nails in a children's bedroom housed inside of a prison cell. A voiceover reads Homolka's letter telling her friend that she wants to look her "best" and make Bernardo "drool" when she testifies at his trial.¹⁰⁰ The act of painting one's nails is a visual token to hide imperfections, and the clear nail polish painted a pure and clean appearance (external sign) to indicate that Homolka hid her true, imperfect identity (internal state). The imagery of painted nails (an enhancement to one's appearance) in connection with "drool" (to show desire for an individual) refers to sexual desire – which asks the audience to be sickened by Homolka's sexual deviance. Additionally, the re-enactment is an explicit invitation for the audience to be shocked and inspired by fear because of the dramatic opposition between the "schoolgirl Karla" and "jailhouse Karla," as well as her motivations to have serial killer-rapist Bernardo desire her. The constructions of this re-enactment are smug because the audience is not tricked by her performances of girlish innocence.

To further reinforce the opposing imagery of innocence and corruption, *The Fifth Estate* stages Homolka's schoolgirl persona by placing childish interests, featuring cartoon and animal images (teddy bears, a Sesame Street bedspread, and a large picture frame of kittens), all around the

⁹⁹ Edwin Black, "The Second Persona," 111.

¹⁰⁰ See Appendix C, 147.

prison cell. Constructed for shock value and salacious entertainment, the re-enactment is a visual token that invites the audience to respond in disgust and shock for Homolka's lust for Bernardo, and lack of concern for her (and Bernardo's) violent crimes. To further shock as well as entertain the audience, *The Fifth Estate* uses this motif in other dramatic re-enactments.

3.5.4 Token 2: Homolka's Character in Her Own Lurid Words

The dramatic re-enactment is both a visual and verbal token that asks the audience to respond with shock and disgust for Homolka's callousness. In the re-enactment, a desk shows various items (teddy bears, dolls, wedding planner, and non-fiction true crime book) with the hands of the Homolka actor writing a letter to her friend. A voiceover reads Homolka's letter, involving her parents about money, her sister Tammy, moving out, and finally exclaiming – while the camera zooms in to focus on the written words – that her parents were “fucking me!”¹⁰¹ The various items on her desk portray Homolka as a pubescent schoolgirl, both innocent and criminal. The voiceover reading “fucking me!” concurrently with the writing of same words by the actor (playing Homolka) is emphasized. Since some widely held beliefs and assumptions indicated that “good” children and schoolgirls do not swear, *The Fifth Estate* stages these titillating words set against childlike items to deconstruct Homolka's false childlike innocence or schoolgirl persona. As a strategic move, *The Fifth Estate* curates this scene as an invitation for the audience to be horrified and shocked by Homolka's callousness – her concern regarding money while demonstrating an absence of care for her grieving father, and lack of remorse for the recent murder of her sister, Tammy. This scene is a rhetorical move by *The Fifth Estate* to accentuate and transition into the documentary's live footage of Homolka portraying the schoolgirl persona.

3.5.5 Token 3: Fashioning Homolka into a Schoolgirl Live on Television

One visual and verbal token is a police videotape that explicitly invites the audience to be seduced by pornographic elements and entertained by tragedy. “[S]he had chosen to dress as a

¹⁰¹ See Appendix C, 172.

schoolgirl,”¹⁰² declares Trish Wood in a voiceover during video footage of Homolka touring police through her home. The focus is on Homolka’s appearance in the footage, which shows Homolka in a schoolgirl uniform with a black vest over a white shirt, short plaid skirt with white tights, girls’ school shoes, and her blond hair styled in a neat braid. In a little girlish tone, Homolka describes and re-enacts her criminal acts against her victims. *The Fifth Estate* is given access to evidence that includes police interviews and home videos of Homolka’s crimes. Although *The Fifth Estate* is armed with this evidence, it presents a sensational narrative and image of Homolka as a schoolgirl – her outfit, girlish tone, “high school clique called the ‘Diamond Club,’”¹⁰³ girlish love and aspirations for Bernardo – to provoke public interest. To intensify the audience’s emotional response, *The Fifth Estate*’s schoolgirl construction of Homolka deliberately contrasts with Homolka’s criminal identity. Wood calling out Homolka’s schoolgirl outfit is intentionally shocking when it is incorporated with Homolka’s criminal identity, in which Homolka provides demonstrations of how she and Bernardo tortured the teenage girls,¹⁰⁴ cleaned the corpses,¹⁰⁵ and dismembered the bodies in the basement.¹⁰⁶ Wood continues to provoke a shock reaction from the audience when she provides a voiceover indicating that “two teenagers were murdered”¹⁰⁷ but Homolka’s concern and upset in the police videotape involved furniture, perfume, and a book.¹⁰⁸ *The Fifth Estate* uses shock value in the form of schoolgirl and pubescent child-woman constructions of Homolka to provoke a reaction and appeal to audiences.

3.5.6 Token 4: Schoolgirl Sex Tapes & Images

From Homolka’s schoolgirl uniform to her schoolgirl victims, *The Fifth Estate* shapes a sensational narrative that combines the schoolgirl identity with pornography to seduce the audience with prurient elements and entertain them with tragedy. The documentary takes

¹⁰² See Appendix C, 173.

¹⁰³ See Appendix C, 149.

¹⁰⁴ See Appendix C, 173.

¹⁰⁵ See Appendix C, 173.

¹⁰⁶ See Appendix C, 174.

¹⁰⁷ See Appendix C, 173.

¹⁰⁸ See Appendix C, 173.

sensationalism to an extreme by having Wood state that Homolka was into “kinky sex,”¹⁰⁹ even though Homolka claims she was sexually abused by Bernardo. For example, Wood showcases egregious actions in what appears to be a video of Homolka fondling Bernardo’s groin and making her way down to that area while making sexual sounds¹¹⁰ to explicitly invite the audience to be voyeuristic. As well, to show that Homolka is into “kinky sex,” and to elicit a shock response from the audience, Wood presents an interview with Kathy and Alex Ford (Homolka’s friends) where they remember Homolka wearing a dog spiked collar and handcuffs during coitus with Bernardo. In another example, *The Fifth Estate* exploits victims by presenting a blurred video clip that displays Jane Doe’s spread legs and crotch area,¹¹¹ and subsequently shows her lying on her back next to a spread-eagled dog.¹¹² It is true that *The Fifth Estate* is exposing Homolka’s heinous criminal actions; however, this specific video clip is child pornography. Jane Doe was a minor at the time and this video clip is not only sexualizing a drugged child, but also a surviving victim. Adding to sexually explicit imagery of schoolgirls, an image of Tammy’s corpse – which appears to be naked – with the prominent burn on her face¹¹³ is exploited for shock value in the documentary and invites the audience to be seduced by the pornographic elements. An emotional response to some information is to be expected; however, *The Fifth Estate* exploits the schoolgirl motif in Homolka and the victims simply to elicit a shock response from the audience as well as bolster its credibility as a news documentary.

As the covert exigency, *The Fifth Estate* turns a news documentary into a form of sensationalism to inform and educate the audience on how the justice system failed in their proceedings with Homolka. *The Fifth Estate*’s enthymematic argument centers on the assumption that feminine sexual desire is dangerous because the Crown’s decision was clouded by the danger Homolka exudes. The “symbolic tokens” of schoolgirl images (painting her nails, child’s bedroom, lurid words from a schoolgirl, schoolgirl uniform, sexualizing the victims) that *The Fifth Estate* deliberately invites association between violence and pornography. Thus, the documentary calls into existence an audience – to be judge, jury, and voyeur about the Crown’s incompetence – that

¹⁰⁹ See Appendix C, 152.

¹¹⁰ Watch *The Fifth Estate* “Karla Homolka” episode.

¹¹¹ Watch *The Fifth Estate* “Karla Homolka” episode.

¹¹² Watch *The Fifth Estate* “Karla Homolka” episode.

¹¹³ Watch *The Fifth Estate* “Karla Homolka” episode.

responds to those pornographic tokens on some level, be it with disgust or with titillation and curiosity.

While *The Fifth Estate* exploits the schoolgirl images in the episode, it also exploits fairy-tale motifs and archetypes to identify Homolka's false representation of herself as a fairy-tale princess. In the next section, Kenneth Burke's *Cluster Criticism* will help this paper further explore how *The Fifth Estate* coaches the audience, by taking two images that are connected but different from each other, and shapes their perception of Homolka as the fairy-tale princess only to dismantle and replace it with the evil witch archetype.

3.6 Burke's Cluster Criticism: The Complete Cast of a Fairy Tale

Burke posits that the speaker has a "set of implicit equations," key words, or clusters in their work that exhibit "what kinds of acts and images and personalities and situations go with [their] notion of heroism, villainy, consolation, despair, etc."¹¹⁴ In addition, Burke indicates that, although the speaker is conscious of their work, they "can not[sic] possibly be conscious of the interrelationships among all these equations."¹¹⁵ Fundamentally, the speaker's cluster of key term choices unconsciously clues into their attitude toward a situation – an incipient act.¹¹⁶

In "Manson: Psycho," we examined how Rivera's key term clusters cast Manson as biblical archetypes of the Devil and Christ to coach the audience's attitude of the imminent threat to the traditional family unit, strictly for the purpose of entertainment and viewership growth. Given Rivera's clusters, it is troubling to see *The Fifth Estate*'s clusters present Homolka's lustful and sinister acts alongside a fairy-tale story, so the audience can unfold their perceptions of the innocent girl version of Homolka and reveal a sadist who committed horrific crimes. *The Fifth Estate* produces a simplistic duality that aligns with sexist and misogynist stereotypes of women, where women fall into one of two categories – virgin or whore, schoolgirl or criminal, and fairy-tale princess or evil witch. For viewership at all costs, *The Fifth Estate* sensationalizes dual

¹¹⁴ Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, 20.

¹¹⁵ Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, 20.

¹¹⁶ Kenneth Burke, *Grammar of Motives*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1945), 20.

archetypes to identify Homolka's false representations of herself as a fairy-tale princess and replaces it with its own archetype of the evil witch. Before diving deeply into how *The Fifth Estate* has key word clusters that exhibited archetypes of the fairy-tale princess and evil witch in Homolka, it is important to understanding why *The Fifth Estate* uses the fairy tale motifs in its news documentary.

3.6.1 A Fairy-Tale Narrative the Audience can Digest

At the height of the Canadian and international media coverage of the Homolka-Bernardo case, the news media used identifiable fairy tale motifs and archetypes to present the case to the public. For example, in her essay, "Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla", Romaine Smith Fullerton points out the saturation of fairy tale motifs in news media:

[J]ournalists used aspects of popularized fairy tales to shape and give meaning to Homolka's life, personality and crimes, and these constructs created a discourse that limited, liberated and ultimately problematized the public's conception of Homolka.¹¹⁷

Many Homolka-Bernardo articles and reports in media outlets exploited fairy-tale motifs, and *The Fifth Estate* is no exception. *The Fifth Estate* uses fairy tales to help the audience easily understand the Homolka-Bernardo case, where they flatten the complexities out of the case and made it a linear (and biased) interpretation to clarify Homolka's monstrosity. In her essay, Fullerton explains the simplicities of using fairy tales in journalism:

[J]ournalists chose a story frame that was, from their perspective, easy for audiences to follow, because the general shape of "once upon a time" is naively thought to be understood in its implications. The fairy tale form - a more familiar and simpler style than the gothic - offered an outline or frame to both journalists and audiences alike.¹¹⁸

Rather than invite the audience to be critical thinkers or invested citizens so that they can decide for themselves, *The Fifth Estate* calls forth a judge and jury in the audience by explicitly presenting a simplified and biased fairy-tale narrative of Homolka as princess. The episode uses

¹¹⁷ Romaine Smith Fullerton, "Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla," 91.

¹¹⁸ Romaine Smith Fullerton, "Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla," 92.

this archetype to build up a false impression of Homolka, ensuring that the jury (or audience) convict her and react with a guilty verdict. In the next section, I use Burke's key term clusters as a framework to analyze how *The Fifth Estate* re/constructs a fairy-tale narrative of Homolka as a princess archetype only to expose her violent and conscienceless killings as an evil witch.

3.6.2 Archetypal Princess Bride: Till Death Do Us Part

Clusters of *The Fifth Estate*'s fairy-tale narrative unveils Homolka's lustful and sinister acts towards her victims alongside a fairy-tale story so that the audience will unfold their perceptions of the princess-like appearance to reveal the horrific crimes. According to Fullerton, "[B]roadcast media consistently framed their story angles around broad-based fairy tale themes, employing stock images and phrases from the general outlines of popularized fairy tales to explain, excuse, vilify, and ultimately, even to punish [Homolka]."¹¹⁹ As Wood is the face of *The Fifth Estate*, she emphasizes the fairy-tale princess narrative through her clusters of Homolka's "romantic encounter" with "handsome [...] Paul Bernardo," as well as highlighting a comment made by Jenny Black (Homolka's colleague) that Bernardo was Homolka's "knight in shining armor."¹²⁰ In altering and reproducing stereotypical imagery, *The Fifth Estate* primed the audience through fairy-tale storytelling to encourage the audience's visceral fear and shock of a murderous Homolka.

For sensational entertainment, Wood provides key word choices to demonstrate a fairy-tale and romantic narrative of the Homolka-Bernardo wedding. To coach the audience's attitude of Homolka as a fairy-tale princess, *The Fifth Estate* exploits the fairy-tale wedding through clusters of (1) "pre-wedding social whirl of showers, fittings, and parties,"¹²¹ (2) "Homolka and Bernardo parad[ing] their union through the storybook town of Niagara on the Lake,"¹²² (3) Wood directing the attention to re/constructed visual images of mannequins outfitted in a wedding dress and veil,¹²³ and finally (4) showing video footage of Homolka and Bernardo's

¹¹⁹ Romyne Smith Fullerton, "Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla," 92.

¹²⁰ See Appendix C, 150.

¹²¹ See Appendix C, 156.

¹²² See Appendix C, 156.

¹²³ Watch *The Fifth Estate* "Karla Homolka" episode.

extravagant wedding on a carriage waving at bystanders and holding up their wine glasses in cheers.¹²⁴ Wood appears to indicate that “judging appearance correctly can be one of the tests of wisdom [and] the audience ought to be cautious when assessing Homolka herself”;¹²⁵ thus, she takes the audience on a dark emotional rollercoaster by selecting a feminine archetype from popularized fairy-tale fantasies to de/construct Homolka’s identity and demonstrates how appearances can be deceiving. Fullerton also suggests that Wood has many fairy-tale archetypes and motifs in her narrative and imagery:

In much of the television footage, [...] the words were overpowered by a Cinderella-like set of images: fair Homolka and handsome Bernardo leaving their wedding ceremony in an open carriage. They wave their way through the streets of what Trish Wood, journalist for *The Fifth Estate*, called the “fairy tale village of Niagara-on-the-Lake” (Wood documentary) and then settled in Port Dalhousie in a “pink fairy tale house.”¹²⁶

In the driver’s seat of *The Fifth Estate* episode, Wood’s clusters of words and visual images fashion Homolka into a Cinderella-like princess, who met a handsome knight-in-shining-armor Bernardo and had a storybook wedding, then starkly contrast this fairy-tale image with her horrific crimes. With the deliberate contrast, *The Fifth Estate* develops enthymematic interpretations to frame a white and middle-class Canadian female criminal in problematic ways, by using stereotypes of women in fairy tales, to manage the audience’s response by simplifying a complex narrative through the use of tropes familiar to the audience from popular entertainment. The documentary intensifies the rhetorical and dramatic effect – to make Homolka seem more sinister and monstrous – by coaching the audience’s attitude to feel sickened and disgusted by identifying with its fairy-tale narrative. After establishing the fairy tale narrative, *The Fifth Estate* constructs the princess archetype only to replace it with its alternative archetype of the evil witch. I further utilize Burke’s key term clusters as a framework to help analyse how *The Fifth Estate* replaces the princess with the evil witch archetype.

¹²⁴ Watch *The Fifth Estate* “Karla Homolka” episode.

¹²⁵ Romayne Smith Fullerton, “Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla,” 93.

¹²⁶ Romayne Smith Fullerton, “Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla,” 92.

3.6.3 Archetypal Evil Witch: Homolka's Hex Appeal

The Fifth Estate makes explicit use of the evil woman with witch-like traits in identifying Homolka. In her essay, "A moral vacuity in her which is difficult if not impossible to explain," Anne McGillivray noted that Homolka had "a sort of witchery through pretended weakness, lies and manipulation, the successful use by an evil woman of obnoxious female traits."¹²⁷ The key term clusters of *The Fifth Estate* show concepts and archetypal motifs of the evil witch in Homolka's portrayal. Additionally, Fullerton points out that "[f]airy tales and news stories are not often linked; however, in many news stories, Canadian media depicted Karla Homolka as both passive princess and evil witch."¹²⁸ *The Fifth Estate*'s clusters sensationalize archetypes to entertain and coach the audience into shock and fear of monstrous Homolka.

The Fifth Estate re/constructs Homolka to look evil and demonic while characterizing her as a witch. With Burke's cluster criticism as a framework, charting the key terms and symbols in the documentary clarifies signals from *The Fifth Estate* to the audience that "Homolka's appearance ha[d] always belied the seriousness of her crimes and so [did] her demeanor."¹²⁹ To coach the audience to be fearful of Homolka evilness, the documentary makes her appear demonic by adjusting the camera lens to zoom into the red pupils of Homolka's photo – which is due to the red-eye defect from the camera. As well, Wood places Homolka's face – with a sinister and evil smile – on all five television monitors while she delivers a monologue about Homolka's life¹³⁰ to incite fear in the audience. When the documentary associates red eyes and the sinister smile images with clusters such as "conjure a range of personalities,"¹³¹ "spell,"¹³² "best 'shading,'"¹³³ "women [...] are equally capable of doing evil,"¹³⁴ and "she was death,"¹³⁵ the linkage is an invitation for the audience to identify Homolka as an evil witch. Moreover, key term clusters of

¹²⁷ Anne McGillivray, "'A moral vacuity in her which is difficult if not impossible to explain': law, psychiatry and the remaking of Karla Homolka," *International Journal of the Legal Profession* 5, no. 2/3(1998), 257.

¹²⁸ Romaine Smith Fullerton, "Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla," 91.

¹²⁹ See Appendix C, 147.

¹³⁰ Watch *The Fifth Estate* "Karla Homolka" episode.

¹³¹ See Appendix C, 149.

¹³² See Appendix C, 149.

¹³³ See Appendix C, 165.

¹³⁴ See Appendix C, 182.

¹³⁵ See Appendix C, 181.

Homolka's evil witch characteristics centre on Tammy (Homolka's sister) as the sacrificial lamb; for example, Homolka "offered up her sister in order to keep happy the man she wanted to marry,"¹³⁶ "wedding present,"¹³⁷ and "here's your virgin, Paul."¹³⁸ In M.A. Murray's journal article "Child-Sacrifice Among European Witches," he emphasizes: "[I]n studying the cult of the witches, [...] 'the Devil,' was considered by the witches themselves to be God incarnate as a man. To this deity they made sacrifices [...], the most important of such sacrific[es] being that of a child."¹³⁹ Basically, the clusters suggest that Tammy was a sacrificial offering from Homolka to Bernardo, inviting the audience to be shocked and sickened at Homolka's evil witch servitude to her "wonderful king"¹⁴⁰ Bernardo.

Wood claims that "Homolka's appearance ha[d] always belied the seriousness of her crimes and so [did] her demeanor."¹⁴¹ The claim seems to indicate that Homolka does not have the stereotypical feminine appearance of a serial killer-rapist. Homolka was considered an attractive woman by the media – a "pretty middleclass girl [...] [who was] poised, elegantly groomed, her blond hair perfectly coiffed."¹⁴² In "Karla Homolka – From a Woman in Danger to a Dangerous Woman: Chronicling the Shifts," Jennifer Kilty and Sylvie Frigon note that Homolka was far from being a stereotypical female criminal:

Homolka grew up in a small suburb in a middle-class family and was not exposed to any form of abuse until she met Bernardo. [...] [S]he did not fit the stereotypical construction of a violent woman offender. [Female criminals], who committed less serious crimes, were seen as characterizing the common portrait of violent women; that they are poor, uneducated, and have histories of abuse. [Homolka] does not fit the mould of typical female offenders, or those designated as dangerous offenders. Homolka's involvement in these crimes created a moral panic, and posed the question that if a white middle-class

¹³⁶ See Appendix C, 154.

¹³⁷ See Appendix C, 168.

¹³⁸ See Appendix C, 168.

¹³⁹ M.A. Murray, "34. Child-Sacrifice Among European Witches," *Man* 18 (1918), accessed January 6, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2788189>, 60.

¹⁴⁰ See Appendix C, 158.

¹⁴¹ See Appendix C, 147.

¹⁴² Mary Nemeth and Anne Marie Owens, "Bride and Groom."

woman from a good home could commit such crimes, then how are we supposed to differentiate between good and bad women?¹⁴³

Homolka was not a stereotypical female criminal and many people in society had difficulty in identifying a “pretty” white middle-class Canadian woman as capable of being a serial killer and rapist. Thus, *The Fifth Estate* presents a sensational figure of Homolka as a fairy tale princess only to tear the mask off to reveal an evil witch – the evil and demonic feminine relies on enthymemes. *The Fifth Estate*’s construction of Homolka is a sensational tactic that entertains and coaches the audience to become shocked and have a visceral fear of Homolka, while directing the audience (or jury) to convict Homolka. The evil Homolka versus judge-jury scenario seemingly casts a witch fantasy that turns into a witch hunt with pitchforks and torches to have Homolka burned at the stake.

The Fifth Estate’s covert exigency involves sensationalizing its news documentary using simplistic dual archetypes (fairy-tale princess and evil witch) to inform the audience and call into being a judge and jury that will deliver a guilty verdict to Homolka. However, *The Fifth Estate* also casts certain interviewees, whom it considers having a corrupt connection with Homolka, into archetypes. I will use Burke’s key term clusters in the next section to chart how the documentary exploits archetypes to give the audience the false assumption that specific interviewees worked alongside Homolka.

3.6.4 Fairy-Tale Archetypes of the Interviewees

The Fifth Estate’s framing and re-framing of the interviews demonstrates that it is classifying the interviewees into favourable and unfavourable archetypes. Wood represents *The Fifth Estate* when she classifies her interviewees, wherein she shapes a biased portrayal of her interviewees and creates a false sense of identity for the audience; she constructs an “us-versus-them” and gets the audience to corroborate with her. Wood sacrifices journalistic integrity, quality and unbiased news reporting because placing her interviewees into biased categories promotes and enhances

¹⁴³ Jennifer M. Kilty and Sylvie Frigon, “Karla Homolka – From a Woman in Danger to a Dangerous Woman: Chronicling the Shifts,” *Women and Criminal Justice* 17 (no. 4, 2006): 56-57.

how the audience identifies her and bolsters her perceived authority as a leader. Her constructs categorize the interviewees into stereotypical motifs and archetypes identified by folklore and fairy tale roles.

Wood exploits archetypes of the evil witch and gives a biased portrayal of Homolka's sinister nature, which are sensational tactics solely designed for entertainment to engage her audience. To show how *The Fifth Estate* portrays the interviewees as corroborating illicitly with Homolka to engage the audience in a sensational way, I will use Burke's cluster criticism to help me analyze the types of archetypes that Wood fashioned for her interviewees.

3.6.5 Archetypal Henchman: George Walker – Homolka's Lawyer

While Wood casts Homolka as both a princess and evil witch, she also casts certain interviewees into unfavourable archetypes for what she considers their corrupt connection with Homolka. Due to George Walker being Homolka's lawyer, Wood implicitly constructs a biased view of Walker. Her key term clusters characterize him as making "move[s],"¹⁴⁴ "kn[owing] the card he would play,"¹⁴⁵ and how he used Homolka's abuse as a "mitigating factor"¹⁴⁶ in his negotiations with Crown prosecutor Murray Siegal while they "bargain[ed] in local restaurants."¹⁴⁷ These "secret"¹⁴⁸ negotiations were done "prior to any psychiatrist confirming a [Battered Spouse Syndrome] diagnosis."¹⁴⁹ However, Walker has "physical evidence" and "something besides [Homolka's] word" that she was abused, but is unwilling to reveal it in the interview.¹⁵⁰ Because Walker had a legal obligation to Homolka as her attorney, Wood is prejudiced against him, and constructs him into a villainous archetype of the henchman – a sidekick who exists simply to serve Homolka and carry out her evil bidding, thus exiling him to the unfavourable group. In the interview with Walker, the audience is invited to set aside how they understand and critique information, especially in the context with the presumption of innocence and everyone's right to

¹⁴⁴ See Appendix C, 161.

¹⁴⁵ See Appendix C, 162.

¹⁴⁶ See Appendix C, 162.

¹⁴⁷ See Appendix C, 162.

¹⁴⁸ See Appendix C, 148.

¹⁴⁹ See Appendix C, 162.

¹⁵⁰ See Appendix C, 163.

a legal defence, even murderers. Instead, the audience receives the pre-digested critique from Wood in the form of biased information, character assassination, and sensational entertainment, including her prejudices and henchman archetype. She disempowers the audience by drawing the conclusions about Walker for them, rather than empowering them to establish sound and fact-based conclusions.

3.6.6 Archetypal Coward: Vince Bevan – Lead Police Inspector

Similarly, police inspector Vince Bevan is another example of Wood casting an unfavourable light of an interviewee for the audience. Wood depicts a negative view of him when he does not let Homolka's crimes "shade" his view of her because he does not question the first deal,¹⁵¹ and subsequently "went ahead and made another deal."¹⁵² With her narrative, Wood fit Bevan into a coward archetype and connects him with corrupt policing. While she names him the "man in charge of the investigation," her interview clips exhibit passive responses and behaviours from Bevan. To many of Wood's questions, he responds with a nondescript and evasive "mm-hmm," with nodding or shaking his head in many of the interview clips;¹⁵³ he bites his lip and nods in response to Wood's question about Homolka having intercourse with an unconscious victim and liking it.¹⁵⁴ When Wood asks him about the Crown's relationship with Homolka, he smiles mutely while telling her that he "do[es]n't know. [He] can't fill [her] in on that one."¹⁵⁵ Moreover, she indicates the archetypal coward with how Bevan shirks responsibility and duty for the Homolka case by casting fault on the Crown instead. In a discussion with Bevan regarding a letter from the Crown explaining that they would not charge Homolka, Wood shows how Bevan shifted the blame to the Crown:

Wood: Well, you're smiling, but does that disturb you? I mean, you got that letter initially...

Bevan: Going back to the earlier part of our conversation. Did I say I agreed with the advice? (Shakes head in a negative response)

¹⁵¹ See Appendix C, 164.

¹⁵² See Appendix C, 177.

¹⁵³ See Appendix C, 177.

¹⁵⁴ See Appendix C, 163.

¹⁵⁵ See Appendix C, 178.

Wood: But you didn't charge her, and you could've?

Bevan: (Nods affirmatively) Nope, yep. There is, uh ... further information that if a charge was laid, that it would not be proceeded with.

Wood: By the Crown?

Bevan: By the Crown.¹⁵⁶

Wood shapes the interview to give the impression that Bevan is cowardly because he redirects the blame from himself onto the Crown. Given that Bevan was the man in charge of the Homolka case, he indicates that the choices are unbiased even though he does not agree with them – he simply follows procedure from his superiors. Wood relies on a scapegoat for the corrupt plea bargain to simplify the problem for the audience, and Bevan meets those needs. That scapegoat drives the acceptance of what/who created the corrupt plea bargain (Bevan), and the attention from the systemic issues within the Canadian justice system that consequently led to the decisions of the corrupt plea bargain, which would be much more complex to expose. Wood makes no attempt to dig deeper or probe Bevan for more information about his superiors, instead her narrative implicitly undermines Bevan and gives the impression that he is cowardly. Bevan was lead police inspector who had authoritative power over law enforcement for the Homolka case, and Wood contrasts that image with the coward archetype in what ultimately equates to lazy leadership.

3.6.7 Archetypal Fool: Dr. Andrew Malcolm – Psychiatrist

The Fifth Estate exploits archetypal motifs in the interview between Wood and Homolka's psychologist, Dr. Andrew Malcolm. The television program shapes the function and structure of the interview to allow the audience to identify the folklore and fairy tale archetypes in the interviewees' discourse, as well as construct a stereotypical archetype in Dr. Malcolm. Wood showcases how he counters her evil witch archetype of Homolka with a damsel-in-distress and, simultaneously, positions himself as the hero archetype. For example, Dr. Malcolm claimed

¹⁵⁶ See Appendix C, 178.

Homolka was “dependent,”¹⁵⁷ “controlled,”¹⁵⁸ “rendered helpless,”¹⁵⁹ “overwhelmed,”¹⁶⁰ and “fall[en] into [Bernardo’s] thrall.”¹⁶¹ His words expose his perspective that Homolka needs to be rescued and how he gravitates towards establishing his position as Homolka’s saviour – the hero archetype. Their interview is a jousting match of archetypes and stereotypes between the two narrators; a duel of archetypes that resulted in Wood’s inclination to position Dr. Malcolm as an archetypal fool. Dr. Malcolm has a doctorate in psychology, and as Wood claims, he is a “respected forensic psychiatrist” who was brought in by Walker,¹⁶² “[t]o add weight to the [psychiatric] assessments.”¹⁶³ Despite Wood stating that he is an authority on the psyche, she reframes his identity for the audience by posing questions that leads him to say “[a]lthough [he had] been fooled before, now, and [he] might have been fooled by Karla too, [...] [he] do[esn’t] think so.”¹⁶⁴ Then, she exposes and discredits him by revealing his faults in her argument. She also invites Dr. Fred Berlin, a psychologist in criminal behaviour, to invalidate the same psychological assessments of Homolka that Dr. Malcolm examined, in order to humiliate him, as well as to fashion him into a fool archetype. She carefully assembles the interview clips to show how he, as a middle-aged professional man, exploits archetypes and stereotypes where he views women as helpless and incapable of terrible acts under their own agency. Additionally, the interview invites the audience to identify Wood as victorious in deploying the more persuasive Homolka archetype. Wood shows an interview clip where Dr. Malcolm is inclined to accept Wood’s premise when she shows him a letter about Homolka’s lack of remorse for Tammy’s death and he “wish[es] [he had] seen that before.”¹⁶⁵ Wood generates a certain perspective in Dr. Malcolm and coaches an attitude in him to accept that Homolka is a “perfect follower of [a] sadist, because she’s already along that direction herself.”¹⁶⁶ As a result, Wood cast him into the unfavourable category and as the archetype of the fool; she denies him the role he ascribes to

¹⁵⁷ See Appendix C, 151.

¹⁵⁸ See Appendix C, 151.

¹⁵⁹ See Appendix C, 151.

¹⁶⁰ See Appendix C, 149.

¹⁶¹ See Appendix C, 155.

¹⁶² See Appendix C, 164.

¹⁶³ See Appendix C, 164.

¹⁶⁴ See Appendix C, 165.

¹⁶⁵ See Appendix C, 172.

¹⁶⁶ See Appendix C, 173.

himself and Homolka, and debases Dr. Malcolm by making him recognize the fault in his diagnosis of Homolka.

Rather than providing the audience with the agency to analyze information from the psychiatric evaluation, Wood removes their agency in favour of battling archetypes of Homolka (evil witch vs. princess in distress) and Dr. Malcolm himself (fool vs. hero). As a result, Wood coaches the audience to be taken in by stereotypical archetypes, with her in the favourable position of controlling the narrative. Furthermore, she antagonizes Dr. Malcolm and goes after his credibility; she recruits Dr. Berlin to effectively invalidate Dr. Malcolm's assessment on-air, rather than simply present his interpretation of the psychiatric evaluation. Wood may have been more effective as a reporter if she had taken her findings from Dr. Berlin and presented that information to Dr. Malcolm – which gives Dr. Malcolm a chance to redeem and/or explain himself. She instead focuses an ad-hominem attack on Dr. Malcolm's traits and judgement to deflect the true issue of Homolka's psychiatric assessments.

While Wood demonizes the interviewees whom she feels were in a corrupt connection with Homolka, she shows favouritism in the remaining interviewees: John Rosen (Bernardo's lawyer), Mary Hall (Crown prosecutor for the Homolka case), and Dr. Fred Berlin (psychologist). Wood likens their perspective to work with her own rhetorical context. Although John Rosen had the least airtime of the interviewees, Wood intently listens, repeats his words in agreement, and accepts his responses that Homolka's "façade of the victim, of the battered Karla, was stripped away."¹⁶⁷ To battle and counter Dr. Malcolm, Wood brings in Dr. Berlin. She presents him as an "authority on criminal behaviour"¹⁶⁸ from "Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore,"¹⁶⁹ who "reviewed the psychiatric reports and much of the other evidence in [the] case."¹⁷⁰ His read on Homolka clearly corresponds with Wood's view because she displays interest without question or argument. When Wood interviews "Mary Hall[,] [...] Crown prosecutor involved in the case,"¹⁷¹ the interaction between them shows a strong and positive

¹⁶⁷ See Appendix C, 180.

¹⁶⁸ See Appendix C, 148.

¹⁶⁹ See Appendix C, 165.

¹⁷⁰ See Appendix C, 165.

¹⁷¹ See Appendix C, 149.

bond where they both have similar views and attitudes about distancing the prosecution from Homolka and treating her with “a certain amount of disdain.” Wood favours Rosen, Hall and Dr. Berlin because they represent the norms or collective image of Wood and her attitudes – to ensure they not only attribute her to the leadership role, but also coach the audience’s attitude to emulate and accept her statements as true.

The audience looks to *The Fifth Estate*, especially in its lead reporter Wood, to play a leadership role in terms of respectable investigative journalism and yet, in trying to court an audience, she uses sensational tactics and deals in stereotypes and norms. Wood creates an “us-versus-them,” where she exploits archetypes and motifs to present her biased ideations of her interviewees. She moves the audience from a measured consciousness that processes data – where they can understand and critique how the justice system works – to her biased portrayals and motifs of evil witch, henchman, coward, and fool archetypes. Wood packed the stereotypical archetypes of Homolka, Walker, Bevan, and Dr. Malcolm as entertainment. *The Fifth Estate* is not supposed to be entertainment television; the program supposedly investigates issues and informs the public on its findings – priding itself on safe and trustworthy news information. Wood, on an assignment for *The Fifth Estate*, emphasizes sensationalism for entertainment to garner more ratings. She takes advantage of her interviewees by shaping biased impressions and sensational archetypes in the Homolka documentary, to advance herself through the audience rather than state the facts of a situation for the audience to choose how they want to interpret them.

With the archetypes, she set herself up for the audience to indirectly classify her (as well as *The Fifth Estate*) as the leader – by leading the audience through her biased impressions and falsehoods of the manipulative Homolka (evil witch) and her deceitful lawyer Walker (henchman), submissive and passive inspector Bevan (coward), and feeble-minded psychologist Dr. Malcolm (fool).

3.7 The Fifth Estate: Viewership, Shock Value, Sensationalism, and Titillation

Bitzer’s rhetorical situation is crucial to exploring the exigences and constraints within the Homolka documentary. Two exigences are present in the documentary: (1) the overt exigence

that the public casts doubt on the Canadian justice system because of the Crown's plea bargain with Homolka; (2) the covert exigence which involves the news documentary turned sensationalistic by using archetypes to coach an attitude of outrage in the audience against the perceived failings of the justice system and psychiatric experts proceedings with Homolka. The rhetorical constraints are how *The Fifth Estate* presents a narrative that was one-sided and biased, which limits the audience's understanding of the Homolka case by using archetypal female imagery that involves enthymematic assumptions about what a white, middle-class Canadian woman is capable. To understand how the documentary constructs archetypes, Black's rhetorical framework helps this paper to reveal how *The Fifth Estate's* documentary is told through a lens of womanhood and social class stereotypes. With Wood or *The Fifth Estate* as the persona, the documentary exhibits enthymematic assumptions of middle-class women that invites the audience to not simply respond to it but become the kind of person who responds to titillating, sensationalist, and fantastical stories. *The Fifth Estate* exhibits sexually explicit imagery of the victims, who were minors at the time of the crimes. The television program introduces victims and constructions of Homolka as a schoolgirl and associates them with violence and pornography; thus, it calls an audience to be judge, jury, or voyeur that responds to the pornographic tokens on some level be it with shock, disgust, titillation, and curiosity.

Burke posits that a message has clusters of key term choices of the rhetor that unconsciously clue into their attitudes toward a situation. *The Fifth Estate* sensationalizes simplistic binary archetypes to identify Homolka's false representations of herself as a fairy-tale princess to only replace it with their archetype of the evil witch. As such, the documentary calls the audience to be judge and jury, and coaches their attitude to deliver Homolka a guilty verdict. Not only does *The Fifth Estate* frame and re-frame Homolka, but it also casts the interviewees, who were involved in corrupt proceedings with Homolka, into fairy-tale archetypes. Wood, as the face of *The Fifth Estate*, deals in womanhood stereotypes and norms, and coaches the audience to be taken in by her stereotypical archetypes. Rather than empower the audience to critique and establish sound conclusions, she disempowers them by drawing the conclusions for them. For viewership, shock value, sensationalism, and titillation – *The Fifth Estate* develops a way for the audience to easily follow a news documentary, by inviting the audience to re-imagine the Homolka case as a fairy-tale story.

The final chapter concludes the findings to my study, with a summary on leadership and rhetorical theory as frameworks to examine *Geraldo*'s "Manson: Psycho" as a baseline to expose *The Fifth Estate*'s "Karla Homolka."

CONCLUSION

Sensational Parallels Between Geraldo and The Fifth Estate

According to my analysis in this thesis, in media coverage regarding serial killers, otherwise credible news leaders, such as the CBC, will sometimes revert to sensational tactics comparable to those used by tabloid shows, such as *Geraldo*, to entertain and build intrigue with their audience. To come to this conclusion, I needed a comparison point to show sensational news reporting; therefore, I conducted a leadership and rhetorical analysis of *Geraldo*'s "Manson: Psycho" in my first chapter. As a framework, I applied leadership theories from Kotter and Burns, as well as rhetorical theories from Bitzer, Black, and Burke to help me uncover the leadership and rhetorical moves in the episode.

Leadership theory by Kotter and Burns helped show Rivera as having expert and referent power, but also revealed his failure to being an effective leader and instead a power wielder that undermined his ethos. Bitzer's rhetorical exigence and constraints provided insight into how Rivera took advantage of the public's trust and intensified public anxieties to boost viewership and television ratings, which induced a frenzy of panic and resulted in his public apology in 1995. Black's rhetorical approach helped uncover Rivera's enthymematic "tokens" of Manson, which invited the audience to be self-righteous (even paranoid) parents to fight and protect the sanctity of the family unit in response to a perception of Manson, and others inspired by him, "turning" their children to satanic cults. Burke's cluster criticism as a framework allowed me to uncover how Rivera enthymematically exploited biblical archetypes (Devil and Christ) to harmfully coach the audience's attitude to be entertained and avid consumers of serial killer narratives through the misuse of the pathos appeal.

The *Geraldo* episode is sensational tabloid television; Rivera constructed a harmful narrative of Manson by exploiting the Satanic Panic-era. He contributed to societal damage and incited fear

and anxiety in the audience to capitalize on viewership and television ratings. My analysis demonstrated how Rivera called it “educating” the audience when he effectively “resurrected” Manson (nearly twenty years from the past) from the dead to exclaim the danger of satanic ritual and sexual abuse in American society. While Rivera dealt in enthymemes and archetypes, my analysis also proved that the CBC, which is supposed to behave in an ethical manner as a reputable news source, deployed many similar sensationalistic tactics and emotional appeals to attract public attention and television ratings.

In the second chapter, I applied the same leadership theories from Kotter and Burns as a framework to analyse “Karla Homolka” from CBC’s *The Fifth Estate* investigative documentary series program. Leadership theory allowed me to explore the legitimate, referent and expert power of the CBC as a national and informational leader. The CBC has legitimate power due to its history and commitment to Canadian culture, identity, and unity. The CBC possesses referent power, as proven by my analysis, because of its popularity amongst Canadians, particularly with its award-winning series, *The Fifth Estate*, and award-winning journalist Wood. My analysis also uncovered that the CBC has expert power because Wood demonstrated domain knowledge and experience in news and current affairs. With her leadership role in shaping the audience’s attitudes, Wood failed to maintain the ethos of the CBC because she (1) used leading questions and provoked pathos appeals, and (2) took advantage of interviewees for self-enhancement. This chapter showed the CBC as a national leader in broadcasting; however, it undermined its ethos by utilizing rhetorical methods that undermined its own integrity, which was discussed in the third chapter.

The third chapter discussed the rhetorical agenda of *The Fifth Estate* – to present the Crown’s decision of keeping its “deal with the devil” as unjust and baffling. When I applied Bitzer’s rhetorical situation, my analysis identified two exigences: overt and covert. First, *The Fifth Estate*’s overt exigence was to invite the public to cast doubt on the Canadian justice system because of the Crown’s plea bargain with Homolka. Second, the covert exigence involved how *The Fifth Estate* was documentary-turned-sensationalist because it was using female stereotypes to inform the audience on the failings in the justice system and psychiatric experts’ dealings with Homolka. My analysis determined that *The Fifth Estate* presented a biased narrative,

constraining the audience's understanding of the Homolka case with its stereotypical female imagery that involved enthymematic assumptions about what behaviour a white, middle-class Canadian woman is capable of carrying out. To further unveil the constructions of female stereotypes in the documentary, I used Black's rhetorical methods to understand what the audience is called into being.

Black's rhetorical framework helped me to uncover how *The Fifth Estate's* documentary undermined the CBC's ethos by storytelling through a lens of womanhood and social class stereotypes. The program constructed a "schoolgirl Karla" and "schoolgirl victims" to seduce the audience with pornography and elicit a shock response from the audience – inviting them to be a judge, jury, and voyeur who responded to the pornographic tokens on some level, be it with shock, disgust, titillation, or curiosity. In addition to depicting Homolka and the victims as the schoolgirl stereotypes, *The Fifth Estate* used their narrative arc and focus on fairy tale archetypal female characteristics to create another identity, probably just as false as the one Homolka presented to the police.

According to my analysis using Burke's cluster criticism, *The Fifth Estate* sensationalized simplistic dual archetypes to identify Homolka's false representation as a fairy-tale princess and replace it with the evil witch to coach the audience to form judgements based on stereotypical archetypes. My analysis evidenced that not only did *The Fifth Estate* cast archetypes on Homolka, but it also cast certain interviewees into fairy-tale archetypes to give the impression that they were complicit in helping Homolka evade justice.

The CBC Undermined its Ethos with Sensationalism

The CBC is a national public broadcaster that takes pride in its adherence to strict ethical standards and balanced perspectives. The reputation of the CBC, and by proxy its reporters, leads to its viewership considering it to be an authority on the topics on which it reports. Despite its strict programming standards, the CBC disguised sensationalism as authoritative investigative journalism, as evidenced in my analysis. The CBC's sensationalism was harmful to audiences because it manipulated and misdirected their attitudes, decisions, and views – which could have

led to public moral panic over a supposed threat that was disparate to its potential harm or actual danger. CBC's *The Fifth Estate* informed the public of the controversies in the Homolka-Bernardo case with sufficient accuracy, and yet my analysis showed that the television program appeared to fail at leadership integrity or balancing the different perspectives of its guests for its audience. One of the problems with the archetypes used to characterize Homolka is that they create a certain mystique around her that potentially makes her an object of fascination in the public eye.

With Wood interpreting the Homolka content to the public, I concluded that she did not abide by the CBC policies of applying appropriate journalistic sensitivities and discernment either in approaching specific guests, or in portraying Bernardo and Homolka's victims or other individuals depicted in the documentary. She gave the Homolka episode the appearance of a bona fide documentary, claiming reliable information, but my analysis showed that she went on to sensationalize the details of the criminal case. Therefore, I argue that Wood failed to further the CBC's ethos with the Homolka documentary. Driven by the public's fascination with serial killers and the opportunity to capitalize on human anxieties, I conclude that the CBC compromised its ethos by transforming a true crime documentary into a source of titillation, sensationalism, and entertainment in a manner that lessened the gap between them and tabloid television.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Transcription of Geraldo – “Manson: Psycho”

Transcribed by Mimi Nguyen

Originally aired: May 9, 1988

SOURCE: *Manson: Psycho*. 1988. *Geraldo*. Accessed July 12, 2020.

<http://index.geraldo.com/page/manson-psycho>.

CAST:

Geraldo Rivera – Host of show

Charles Manson – Archive footage

Robert Ressler – FBI Agent

Jack Levin – Psychologist and Professor

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: Do you think I would still be here if I was guilty of anything? And look me in the eye, look me, look me straight away in the eye. Do I look like I'm guilty about anything?

Geraldo Rivera: You look more guilty than anyone I've ever looked in the eye in my life.

Charles Manson: Really? Really?

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: Others have killed more and they have done it more recently but Charles Manson is a name that has taken its place in American infamy. He is our most notorious mass murderer and yet he never personally killed anyone. This hippy cult leader, this self-proclaimed anti-Christ, this evil messiah. Convicted of ordering the death of nine innocent men and women. 19 years after his crimes he remains wacky and weird, fascinating, and repugnant. Today's program is a fresh look into the mind of an American monster. Manson, Sane or Psycho? That's our focus today on Geraldo.

[Applause] [Commercial Break]

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: Thank you. Earlier this spring, I interviewed Charles Manson for two and a half hours in California San Quentin Prison where he lives in isolation. Portions of that interview were broadcast during my recent special on murder. But most of what you are about to see has never been seen before. Over the course of the next hour with our experts, Robert Ressler of the FBI, and Professor Jack Levin of Northeastern University in Boston. We are going to probe the monster's mind. Is he a monster? Was Manson the first satanic cult leader? Does he expect to be paroled? Are crimes still being committed in his name? How did he come by his evil charisma? His ability to turn good kids horribly bad?

NEWS CONFERENCE

(Video Footage of Roman Polanski)

Roman Polanski: Sharon not only didn't use drugs, she didn't touch alcohol. She didn't even smoke cigarettes.

VARIOUS IMAGES

(Roman Polanski's Cielo Drive home)

Geraldo Rivera: Film Director Roman Polanski. In the immediate aftermath of the brutal
(Voiceover) bloody murder of his pregnant wife the actress, Sharon Tate, and four other innocent people. It happened here at Polanski's exclusive expensive home high on the hills above Los Angeles on a hot August night in 1969. And its gruesomeness was a kick in the nation's gut. Five victims, seven gunshot wounds, 169 stab wounds.

PAROLE HEARING

(Video Footage: Charles "Tex" Watson with Officers)

Geraldo Rivera: Chief assassin Charles "Tex" Watson seen here at a parole hearing from
(Voiceover) an MCA home video called "Death Diploma".

Officer: When she was hung, was she still alive?

Charles Watson: I don't, I don't remember that part. I don't remember hanging, I don't remember that.

Officer: You deny hanging her at that time.

Charles Watson: I haven't denied too much of the crimes that has been brought against me. I confessed to all of it. But there are some areas such as that that I cannot confess to because that would be a lie. I don't remember her being hung.

VIDEO FOOTAGE

(Charles Manson in cuffs and prison uniform)

Geraldo Rivera: Accused and ultimately convicted of masterminding that butcher and two
(Voiceover) other murders the following night was this man. Career criminal and con-man, Charles Manson. Here's Watson on Manson.

PAROLE HEARING

(Video Footage: Charles "Tex" Watson with Officers)

Charles Watson: I was the male at the crime but that time I did not consider myself a leader, I consider myself more of a follower of Charles Manson on carrying out his orders.

VARIOUS VIDEO FOOTAGE

(Manson cuffed in prison uniform, Manson's female followers in prison uniforms, video of Susan Atkins' face)

Geraldo Rivera: While Manson was the evil madman behind the plan, it was his ragtag
(Voiceover) bunch of followers. Watson and four young women, including Susan
Atkins, who actually committed the crimes.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Geraldo Rivera: Susan Atkins come home to you with bloody hands.

Charles Manson: Yeah.

Geraldo Rivera: She said, "Charlie look what I did for you."

Charles Manson: Yeah. I give you the world. I just killed myself and I give you the world.

Geraldo Rivera: So how did you react?

Charles Manson: I said you dumb [bleep], I already had the world. You just put me back in
jail again. *[Pause]* That's what she did, she put me right back in jail.

VARIOUS VIDEO FOOTAGE

(Manson, and Manson's female followers)

Geraldo Rivera: Manson and his followers were tried, convicted, and sentenced to death.
(Voiceover) Or life imprisonment without parole. Then in 1972, three years after the
crimes, the supreme court outlawed the death penalty. Now, incredibly,
all in the Manson family are eligible for parole. At one of his own parole
hearings, Manson spoke about his family of killers.

PAROLE HEARING

[Video Footage: Charles Manson]

Charles Manson: I don't want out of your prison, unless I can go with my brothers and sisters. If I have a world and not my family, I have nothing.

Geraldo Rivera: Manson's disciples mostly middle-class college aged kids were indeed the
(Voiceover) only family he could claim. Most of his life had been spent behind bars.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: I didn't have no parents. When you don't have any parents, you got nobody, there's no place that would take you off the street and throw you somewhere.

VARIOUS VIDEO FOOTAGE

(Charles Manson)

Geraldo Rivera: Shuffled from foster family to one institution or another, Manson even
(Voiceover) landed in Boys town in Omaha Nebraska, it was for him a brief stay. The bright-eyed 14-year-old was thrown out after just 3 days. It was a disciplinary problem.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: I've been in jail since 1943.

Geraldo Rivera: What year were you born?

Charles Manson: 34.

Geraldo Rivera: 9 years old.

Charles Manson: Yeah.

Geraldo Rivera: What was the first bust for?

Charles Manson: The first place?

Geraldo Rivera: The first bust?

Charles Manson: My mother got out of jail. My mother got out of the joint and put me in with the monks. In with the Catholic monks. The brother monks in Terre Haute Indiana.

Geraldo Rivera: Yeah? They treat you bad?

Charles Manson: No. They treat me like they treat all the other kids. But I see them as a bunch of old women. So, I ran off and escaped out of the hood. Got out of the hood. Went on, went to went to Chicago.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Geraldo Rivera: You were raised up?

Charles Manson: No, I wasn't. I raised myself up.

Geraldo Rivera: You're like a wolf boy.

Charles Manson: That's right. I raised myself up. Sure. Sure. I got a different way of doing everything. I got my own way. You know. Does that make me bad?

Geraldo Rivera: That makes you violent and bad. yeah.

Charles Manson: I'm only as violent as I have to be. If I don't have to be violent, I'm not, But I was raised up to where you didn't fight, you get [bleep]. Haha. If

you didn't fight, you got taken away and your stuff is taken away. And I got forty years of fight in here. I can't read and write but I can fight.

(Chuckles)

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: He can fight. Okay. Let me now more formally introduce our studio guest. Jack Levin, a professor of sociology at Northeastern University in Boston and the co-author of mass murder, America's growing menace book. Welcome.

[Applause]

And Robert Ressler, he is the supervis...supervisor, I should say, special agent with the FBI. He is an instructor and criminologist at the FBI academy in the Behavior Science Unit and the co-author of sexual homicide, patterns, and motives. Welcome.

[Applause]

Let me start with you first Bob. The wolf boy, I called him, as if from the old story of the baby raised by wolves, etc., etc. Manson said he essentially raised himself. Give us a little background on this guy.

Robert Ressler: Well Charlie is definitely a classic case of a person that had the wrong start in life, he was an individual who was born to a 16-year-old prostitute. He never knew his father. As he indicated he was in foster homes, things of that nature at a very young age. His mother was in jail. She gets out of jail. He looks to her as being the person he's going to have some family where she puts him into an institution he escapes from the institution, he returns to the mother after escaping from institution, she puts him back in the institution and from there on. from 8,9 years of age, Charlie spends a lifetime re-entering penitentiaries – he went from child institutions, reform schools. His criminal record is as long as your arm it's 4 or 5 pages I believe which is a lengthy record.

Geraldo Rivera: His crimes ranged from, aside from the murders. What else?

Robert Ressler: Well, the murders are the last thing on the records and that's the only murders that are involved. His crimes through his life have been car theft, he's stolen many cars, he was involved in pimping, prostitution, pimping, drugs, a lot of drug charges, there were a lot of business where he was cashing cheques on one occasion.

Geraldo Rivera: How well do you know him, Bob?

Robert Ressler: I interviewed him on three occasions. I followed his case from the day it went down. And I studied his case, I've interviewed many of the family members. I've looked at the crime scenes, talked to the police, investigated the case. I'm very familiar with the case.

Geraldo Rivera: Jack set the stage, it's the 60s. Okay. 68-69, the time of the awful murders. What's going on?

Jack Levin: Well, I think it's very important that we talk about this because don't forget, in the 60s half the population of the United States was under 25. We were very youth centred they were all in all the commercials, all the ads and the establishment was evil. And drugs were very easy to get and people were looking for a thrill and it was part of the drug sub culture. People were dropping in and out and there were communes where there are now condominiums. I think in a sense, what happened with Charles Manson could be said to be a perverted extension of a lot of the positive things that we remember about the 60s. Including the peace beads, the long hair, the beards, the hippy counterculture, the war against the war, and the war against the pigs. The pigs being in this case, anybody and everybody who didn't turn out to be a follower of Charles Manson.

Geraldo Rivera: Exactly. Okay. we'll talk about Manson's war against the pigs. We'll talk about him as the satanic cult leader or cult leader. Let's take another look at him as we go to this commercial break.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: They crowd me and I got this little space. My life is bigger than this little space. I live in the desert, I live in the mountains, man. I'm big. My mind is big. But everybody is trying crowd me down and push me down and make me into all these little things that they need me to be and that's not me at all, man. That's not me. I killed nobody, I broke no law.

[Commercial Break]

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: We're back, we're probing the mind of Charles Manson we'll be showing you portions of my interview of him throughout. Let's get a couple of questions before we do.

Male Audience: I was going to say, In the case of Charles Manson, would you say since the age of 9, he rebelled against society and disciplines this society as a whole

Geraldo Rivera: Was it an act of rebellion these murders, I don't know if I would call it...

Robert Ressler: I could take a shot of that because his record is replete with descriptions of anti-social and dissocial personality. Charles Manson has never fit into our society. He says that when you talk to him, I'm sure you've heard him. He says I don't belong in your society. And he's right. The man from child to adulthood has...he's spent most of his life in jail. He doesn't know how to be a normal citizen. His brief attempt back when these murders went down was very unsuccessful.

Geraldo Rivera: I'll say.

Female Audience: I was wondering too if the publicity and the shows like this and things giving him attention does that feed people like him with his ego and is...

Jack Levin: Yeah, I think he loves it. I think he's a master at presentation of self of managing the impression he gives to other people. And in fact, you know, he is now a card in the game Trivial Pursuit he's become a celebrity, people will remember him for decades to come and I think he loves it.

Male Audience: Yes, I have a question about Charles Manson's followers. I think should direct this to the FBI agent, I'm sorry I forgot your name. What kind of person would he have been without those followers that he had.

Robert Ressler: I think if Charlie did not have followers, I don't think there would ever have been murders. Because Manson himself is not a homicidal type of personality. I've interviewed quite a few homicidal individuals. Manson is not homicidal by himself. He has the ability to incite and in this instance, he created Frankenstein's monster that consumed him.

Geraldo Rivera: Okay. Let's focus on that issue. Satanic Cults. Was the Manson family the first? Is Manson still a cult leader? He claims to be the anti-Christ. He, yet at other times, he even calls himself Jesus. Let's take a look at this guy.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: What you can't understand, Mr. G. Is that I've been raised up in a different world than you've been raised up. I've been raised up in a penitentiary. There's no weakness in the penitentiary. There's no sorrow or remorse in the penitentiary. You come to the cell and you go in and you find Jesus or you don't. You either find Jesus or you run with the Devil.

Geraldo Rivera: Don't you think Jesus would be appalled that you were invoking his name?

Manson: I didn't invoke any name. They put that on me. The spirit laid that over my track.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: I'm a man in the mirror guy. If you like me, I like you. If you don't like me, I don't like you. You swing at me, I'll swing back. You dig? You cut me, I'll cut ya. You know, whatever you point to me, I'll get back to you.

Geraldo Rivera: But it's more than that though, isn't it Charlie?

Charles Manson: Well sure. I'm an army with God. That's just a word we don't, you know. We use the word God.

Geraldo Rivera: Or the Devil?

Charles Manson: Or the devil. You can use the word Devil. Or demons or whatever you want to call it.

Geraldo Rivera: Mostly the devil in your world, hey Charlie?

Charles Manson: Well okay. I'll play. I'll play. There's no game I can't play. Or haven't played.

Geraldo Rivera: And people say you are the Devil.

Charles Manson: Okay I'll be the devil then.

Geraldo Rivera: You like that?

Charles Manson: I don't like or dislike nothing. I see everything as it is.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: Your court rooms have convicted me for being Jesus Christ in one courtroom. And then in the other courtroom, you convicted me for being the devil. Now if you believe me in your courtrooms, you've convicted me for being the father of this country.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: Who say that I'm all these things that you say I am. Wouldn't that be more fearful then letting me try to be a nice guy? Would you want to make me into those things? Would you want me, do you need someone like that in your world? That's your judgement now, the judgement you making on this mirror man, you got to carry. You want to make me a terrible violent, no good so and so, vroom, vroom, run? When actually in reality, I'm a dead head, man. I've been dead since 1951.

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: Jack, what do you think of this guy?

Jack Levin: Well, Satanic cults have grown in this country for the past, over the past couple of decades. But I think here we we see a case of Charles Manson possibly being facetious with us. And playing us. And he admits it when he talks about a game. You know, too often, he may be right here. We use Satan, drugs, insanity, television, movies as an excuse for what people do that we don't like. And in the process, we distance ourselves by making him into a monster. If he's a monster, he's not like we are. It's Satan. So, we're human beings. We couldn't do anything like that.

Geraldo Rivera: But isn't he a monster?

Jack Levin: Yes, he is. He is in a sense, in my opinion, he's a sociopath. That is a person who lacks conscience. He doesn't feel remorse. He said it himself. He's not a person who feels guilty about what he did. And that's about as close as a human being can come to being a monster.

Geraldo Rivera: Bob?

Robert Ressler: I agree. I don't see Charles Manson as a devout Satanist. I don't see him as participating in any satanic rituals that he doesn't create himself. He's what I'd call self-styled Satanist. He embraces Satan as an excuse for the anti-social acts that he does. It's not a type of person that that really ascribes to anything or attached himself to anything at all. The guy really is becomes he symbolic of everything that we fear. And he says that himself. He says, I'm really a symbol of your boogeyman. I've become America's boogeyman. As far as Satan, he's not truly a Satanist.

Jack Levin: Could I weigh in on the case? That's for sure. Richard Ramirez was the Night Stalker in Los Angeles. When they caught him after he killed a number of people in their house. Terrorized the people in Los Angeles. He said that he did it because of Satan. It was an ACDC record highway to hell that inspired him. Well, the truth is he would have been inspired by a corn beef sandwich.

[Everyone laughs]

Geraldo Rivera: So would Manson. We'll be right back. More on the mind of the monster.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Geraldo Rivera: What planet is that?

Charles Manson: The one that I live on.

Geraldo Rivera: Do you think that this world San Quentin has any relation to the world outside?

Charles Manson: This world San Quentin is where all the children of God are. This is where you keep all your children that you don't want. The ones that you get to carry the heavy load.

[COMMERCIAL BREAK]

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: Question?

Male Audience: Yes, I'd like to direct this towards Jack. How do you feel that Charles Manson is able to motivate his followers and to do these acts against people?

Jack Levin: It sounds incredible that it could happen. After all, his followers were middle class young women who, one of whom, was voted most likely to succeed, and another had a master's degree in social work. Upstanding citizens. But the truth is they were very needy. Very needy people. They were young people who didn't get along well with their parents, in fact, had profound problems growing up. They weren't, quote, normal. They certainly weren't insane. But they were people who wanted to feel special. And Charles Manson gave them that feeling. In fact, he thought they were going to save the world in their own distorted view of things. So yeah, he did this. Let me point out that there is always another mad man around to motivate people. You know, Hitler didn't kill anybody either.

Geraldo Rivera: Good point. Okay. As long as we are talking about the followers. How did this ex-con coerce or seduce college educated middle class girls? And Watson to kill for him? What was the attraction? In this clip, he explains why and how his followers got involved.

VARIOUS VIDEO FOOTAGE

(Manson's followers)

Geraldo Rivera: With their long hair and sandaled feet, Manson's group on the surface
(Voiceover) seem like most other middle class college age kids of the 60s in fact before meeting Charlie, Patricia Krenwinkel had been a Sunday school teacher and planned to become a nun. Tex Watson had been student body president and voted most likely to succeed. Then they met Charlie.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: I get out of jail and these kids get around me. They say, "You're God, you have the voice of God." And I say uh-huh, there's a whole penitentiary guys like me. You know I'm nothing I'm just a messenger, a witness that's all. I'm just a poop butt that dropped out of the penitentiary and they see something in me I didn't see in me.

Geraldo Rivera: What did they see, Charlie?

Charles Manson: They seen a nice guy, and I'm not a nice guy.

Geraldo Rivera: I agree.

Charles Manson: But they seen that. So, I said, well, as long as they seen a nice guy I'll reflect a nice guy. I'll be the nice guy to them so I played as much nice guy as they could deal with, and I held the line of nice guy and I looked out for everybody, and I gave them places to stay and I kept all the other not so nice guys off of them.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: But our new kid Linda Kasabian I've seen her three times in my life maybe two minutes in my whole life I seen the broad. She come up to the ranch for about a week and she said, "Hey my name is Linda." I said, "Hello Linda," and she said, "Can I stay here?" I said "Can you stay here?" She said, "I like to live at the ranch." I said, "I'd like to live at the ranch." She said, "Well can I stay here?" I said, "Can I [bleep] you?" She says, "yeah." And I put my hand up her dress and I said, "Yeah okay you can stay around." That's my biggest thought in my head is getting into her body. I wouldn't think about sending her down to be no troops about saving nothing or stopping with nothing.

Geraldo Rivera: So, what'd they do?

Charles Manson: They did whatever they did. That's a dispensation of the Pope. It's the same thing he does with the Cardinal's, man. It's the same thing you do with the committee.

Geraldo Rivera: Did you tell those women to kill somebody?

Charles Manson: No. No.

Geraldo Rivera: [words unclear] or somebody? Someone who [words unclear] were drugged it?

Charles Manson: Hey, hey. Let me tell you something.

Geraldo Rivera: Tell me something.

Charles Manson: The women I got I don't got to tell them what to do if I got to tell them what to do, I send them up on the highway and get them away from me. I don't deal with women I got to tell them what to do. They know what to do. If they don't know what to do, they better get stay away from me.

Geraldo Rivera: And in your case, they knew to kill.

Charles Manson: They knew to take care of me.

Geraldo Rivera: They knew to kill for you.

Charles Manson: They knew to look out for number one.

Geraldo Rivera: They knew to kill for you.

Charles Manson: No. No. She...see... you're...*(Interrupted by Geraldo)*

Geraldo Rivera: They knew to kill a pregnant woman.

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: Bob? Why did they do it for him?

Robert Ressler: Well, one thing Charlie has is charisma. I think you probably perceive that, the guy has a lot of charisma, he has a lot of charm, He's a born con-artist. If he wasn't in jail for this, he'd be in for cheque scams or God knows what. He was a born con-artist. And that's just what he did to these kids. He got the kids to steal for him. He got the kids to bring drugs to him. He got sex from the girls. Anything he wanted. And they followed him because he was 30 some years old, they were in their teens. He represented some sort of, at that time I think Jack had indicated at that time, the nature of kids was to look for some sort of guru. He fit the bill, he had the beard, he had the guitar. He was what they wanted him to be. And he was very good at mirroring himself back at them. And that's what they wanted.

Female Audience: Is Charles Manson's background and youth typical of most mass murders?

Geraldo Rivera: Jack?

Jack Levin: Oh, there's a whole range, that's an excellent question and the answer is a little more complicated because, you see, a lot of these mass killers do have problems as children. But the problem with that is that millions of people have trouble growing up and most of them grow out of those problems and in fact, they are a source of strength. But from some reason, and I don't think we quite understand, a few go the way of mass murder.

Female Audience: Do people who follow the likes of Manson have a psychological profile...that is similar?

Robert Ressler: Sure. Yeah. People that follow a person like Manson definitely have a psychological set. A lot of people would avoid following a person like him, obviously. But the type of person that would follow Manson, and specifically I can think of one of the girl's I really couldn't name her, but she was really very susceptible to going with a religious group at that particular time and I personally feel that if Billy Graham had come along the same day that Manson approached her, she'd probably been a religious follower and probably doing very nice things today. The wrong guy came along. Very vulnerable and very susceptible people really create the profile.

Geraldo Rivera: I mean, to take knives and stick them in the bellies of a...

Robert Ressler: They wouldn't do it the first day. But after a period of months and months, the drugs, the rhetoric, I mean, Manson just lectured these people constantly and they got away from him, that's what they did.

Male Audience: Have you felt fear for this man since you've been talking to him all the time?

Robert Ressler: Me?

Male Audience: Yeah.

Robert Ressler: Charles Manson is about 5'4. And he is probably about 130 pounds or so. I have no fear of Manson anytime. And I don't think he could hurt me.

Geraldo Rivera: Half the time, I wanted to just smack him. This man with fear. The most asked question I've had really since that interview is if Manson is sane or is he a psycho. Is he sane and just play acting? or is he truly a madman? And we'll examine that question after this break.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: I was only the guy that cared. I was the one that picked the kids up out of the streets and given them a place to stay. But I learned better than that.

Geraldo Rivera: You give them a place to stay and then turn them loose.

Charles Manson: No, I didn't turn them loose. Yeah, I turned them loose, yeah in respect. You know.

Geraldo Rivera: And there's 9 bodies to show for it.

Charles Manson: No, there's more than that. They had become free in their minds. We started a rebirth movement.

Geraldo Rivera: Yeah, a re-death movement.

Charles Manson: No, No. A rebirth in Jesus.

[COMMERCIAL BREAK]

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: Question?

Female Audience: Yes, I do. I'd like to know. After almost 20 years, why is society still so obsessed with Charles Manson in the mass murders? I mean, He didn't actually kill someone, but I know it's satanic, but it's been almost 20 years, why is society still so crazy about this?

Geraldo Rivera: Why is he so notorious? Why does he have his special place in the hall of infamy?

Jack Levin: Well, I think that first of all, the Manson crimes occurred at the dawn of mass murder. It was during the middle 60s and this was quite a phenomenon. 66. 69. People hadn't heard of these kinds of grizzly atrocious crimes. And now mass murder has become really a growing mess. It's not an epidemic but it's not as rare as it was, and people are frightened. I think that's very much a part of it. People see it as something more real than they might have before.

Geraldo Rivera: Didn't Manson, isn't he almost the single reason to start the security industry? I mean certainly in southern California, you meet so many people paranoid that you never had the video cameras before Manson, you never had the high security gates, the armed guards, the armed response guards. It seems to me Bob, that this guy really touched of a wave of national paranoia.

Robert Ressler: He knocked off the lid on pandora's box when it comes to paranoia. The guy literally frightened the hell of the entire country. The idea of someone entering your home, slaughtering your family, breaking into your house, it's terrifying. And Manson himself is not that dangerous. But the potential of a guy like this frightens anyone for sure.

Male Audience: I think it's obvious he is not playing with a full deck. Has anybody ever done any physical, how far have they dealt with his brain for example? Cat scans things like that. what is he playing with? How bad is this guy?

Geraldo Rivera: Okay. Before. Let's take a look at some video tape. We'll talk about Manson's "deck". Is he Sane or Psycho? We'll check that after this.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: You got to realize that I live in a very violent world. You know. The violence is always been around me in the eye of been in it all my life. So I keep it off of me with motions and force fields. Dig? In other words, I don't really get involved in that because I don't lie.

[Cut Scene]

I sit in that cell 18 years. If you sit in that cell 2 weeks, you'd be banging your head on the wall.

Geraldo Rivera: You're right!

Charles Manson: Yeah, yeah. You know. So, you come live with yourself in a little old square box for 18 years with everyone getting down on you. And they haven't touched me man because I know what I did. I don't break laws. I make laws, I'm the law maker. I'm the one that lay the track down. They drive the train. I lay the track. I make the laws. If I take this chair and knock that light down. I make a whole new procedure with it. I make the laws from here. *(Manson performs a bunch of body movements, snaps his fingers, waves his arms)*

This is me. *(Manson makes the peace sign with both his hands spread wide)* Nixon was only playing with them.

(One fist is raised up as high as he can) That's me. Now I admit, I influenced everybody out there at the ranch. I take responsibility for those nine people getting killed.

Geraldo Rivera: Do you feel remorse?

Charles Manson: I don't know what that is.

Geraldo Rivera: You know what I think? I think that you are an evil person.

Charles Manson: Right, I'm evil. I'm terrible.

Geraldo Rivera: You are terrible.

Charles Manson: Oh yeah, I'm awful. I'm awful.

Geraldo Rivera: You're a murdering dog.

Charles Manson: Oh, I'm a terrible dog. I'm a fiend.

Geraldo Rivera: You're a mass murdering dog.

Charles Manson: A mass murdering dog. And where did you get these ideas?

Geraldo Rivera: What if I said Charlie, you're physical being is free as of right now? You go outside the gate, your body. Where would you go? What would you do?

Charles Manson: Would probably look for a place to sit down.

Geraldo Rivera: What would you do?

Charles Manson: I'd give you anything I got for a little piece of mine.

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: Is he nuts, Jack? Is he sane?

Jack Levin: Well, he gave us a wonderful song and dance act didn't he? He's a...he plays games better than most people we know. And that's exactly what he did. You know when people hear about 9 murders they say, you gotta be crazy to kill 9 people. Well of course, of course. But in psychiatry and in law insanity does not refer to behaviour it refers to the state of mind of the offender does this guy know that what he did was wrong? Does he know the difference between right and wrong. Those are the relevant questions. Could he have controlled his behaviour? The answer is yes. He is therefore not insane. He's certainly not psychotic. That means he would be out of touch with reality. He would hear voices in an empty room, hear a dog give directions. And that's not what's happening here at all. In fact, he knows very well what he is doing and he's having a great time doing it.

Geraldo Rivera: Is he evil?

Jack Levin: I think that's an appropriate way, it's not great social science. It's not wonderful behavioural science. Psychologists would be angry with me for saying it, but I don't see any other way of characterizing his behaviour. He's evil.

Robert Ressler: The courts have stated that Charles Manson is sane. Under law he is sane. Okay? He knew right from wrong, he doesn't care. Okay? Now from the standpoint of psychiatry/psychology, Charles Manson, I've seen his psychiatric records in penitentiaries, I've seen them all. There's a, really there's no clear-cut determination of his disorder. Some say he's paranoid, schizophrenic some say he's suffered from paranoia. Some say, undifferentiated schizophrenia, but most of the part, they really agree on is that he is anti-social, he doesn't really care what he does, he understands, but just doesn't care.

Geraldo Rivera: My diagnosis, he's evil.

Robert Ressler: He's evil.

Geraldo Rivera: And we're going to talk about he got all those people to kill for him.

Robert Ressler: I agree.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: I'm a lizard on a rock, man. I'm a coyote. Or a bug in the bushes, man. Why I got to be...I don't live in that world you live in. I wouldn't, you know, I don't have nothing to do with that world. I drove them Cadillacs through town, you dig?

[COMMERCIAL BREAK]

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Male Audience: Yeah, as crazy as Charlie is suppose to be, why didn't he actually have a hand in these murders, I mean, was he trying to prove something? Was there some psychological underlying thing that he had to like couldn't prove that he was a man or something.

Geraldo Rivera: A puppet master.

Male Audience: Why didn't he actually go in there and stab these people with the people that actually did the murder?

Jack Levin: That is a good question. I mean, I don't know that he has the capacity to actually kill. I have no idea. And anyway, why should he when he can get somebody else to do it for him. He doesn't feel culpable. Even today he doesn't really take responsibility for it, which is really a shame.

Male Audience: I thought he said that he...

Jack Levin: Well, he's responsible because he has an influence on people, but he really denies having issue the command. But he did issue the command. He gave the orders. And in that, because of that, he's just as guilty as they are. In fact, maybe more guilty. The same time, he never mesmerized or hypnotized those women and that man. I think we have to give they must share responsibility for these murders.

Geraldo Rivera: Who's more dangerous, Bob?

Robert Ressler: Well...

Geraldo Rivera: Manson or Watson?

Robert Ressler: Yeah, you'll have to really look at that question. Watson killed 9 people. Manson told him to do it allegedly. Now whether Manson verbalized it. Charlie...Tex...Watson go out and do that, or whether he gave the body language and the non-verbal instructions. One guy did it, one guy ordered it. If I had to let one of them go, Charlie would be out.

Geraldo Rivera: Oh God, I'm glad you don't have to let anybody out. I think he'd be looking for me.

Robert Ressler: Would you let the guy out who specifically killed 9 people?

Geraldo Rivera: Well, I think there's plenty of room for both of them. And they'd be the last people I'd let out.

Robert Ressler: Well, you asked if I had to let one go.

Geraldo Rivera: That's definitely a tough one's choice. Of course, Manson was convicted of inspiring to kill on 9 counts, he was originally sentenced to death even though he wasn't the actual trigger person because he ordered it. But under the law, under which he was condemned, well that later was declared unconstitutional in California indeed throughout the United States. Here's how Charlie, it's interesting, feels about the death penalty.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: And you need to go out and give me my rights in a courtroom or you're not going to have no court room.

Geraldo Rivera: Why is...

Charles Manson: You're going to have to give me my rights.

Geraldo Rivera: I heard that already, I heard that. (*Pause*) Murder.

Charles Manson: Murder.

Geraldo Rivera: Why is it so common?

Charles Manson: Because you're out of balance. Your social consciousness is out of balance.

Geraldo Rivera: Don't give me that line, please.

Charles Manson: The premise of your reality sits on the judge's bench, man. The judge's benches represent crime, the police represent they do the will of the judge. The attorney general does the will of that, the governor does the will of that, all the way up to the pentagon, all the way up to the bombs drop off onto the rice farmers. It all starts down here in the court room.

Geraldo Rivera: Is it easy to take a life?

Charles Manson: I never taken anybody's life.

Geraldo Rivera: Is it easy to stick a knife in somebody's body?

Charles Manson: I usually don't stick people, I cut them a couple times first to make them show that I can. But I never really stuck anybody not stuck my knife in them. I cut them a couple times to show that I could and then tell them, you know, don't make me do this no more.

Geraldo Rivera: Help me understand something Charlie. Why did people murder? Why did those girls murder for you? Why did Tex Watson murder for you?

Charles Manson: They didn't murder for me.

Geraldo Rivera: You told them to.

Charles Manson: No, no, no, no. Come back, DA, come back. That's not reality.

Geraldo Rivera: What is?

Charles Manson: No, the reality is they did what they did. They're responsible for their own actions. I'm responsible for my actions.

Geraldo Rivera: Ever kill anybody?

Charles Manson: Hmmmm...I've come awfully close a few times.

Geraldo Rivera: Come on, didn't you Charlie?

Charles Manson: What do you mean, "Come on, didn't you", man? I ain't lying to you, if you think I'm lying to you, wasting my time and your time.

Geraldo Rivera: Okay then, let's not lie. Let's tell the truth then. Let's be straight. What are you guilty of?

Charles Manson: I'm guilty of...what am I guilty of? I'm guilty of thinking that I had rights in a court room. That's what I'm guilty of thinking.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Geraldo Rivera: You left a trail of dead bodies.

Charles Manson: I didn't [bleep] leave a trail of dead bodies.

Geraldo Rivera: Come on. Stop [bleep] with me.

Charles Manson: Okay.

Geraldo Rivera: Really.

Charles Manson: Okay.

Geraldo Rivera: You are a [bleep] evil person and you're a [bleep] murderer.

Charles Manson: Come on. Come on. Scream.

Geraldo Rivera: No, man. I get pissed off. I could play. But I get pissed off.

Charles Manson: Get him, get him, get him, get him, get him, get him, ghost.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Geraldo Rivera: Let me ask you a question. What do you think of the death penalty?

Charles Manson: I don't think really that I think it belongs to God.

Geraldo Rivera: Explain.

Charles Manson: God gives life and God takes life.

Geraldo Rivera: But how come you didn't live your life with that commandment.

Charles Manson: I did.

Geraldo Rivera: That's not what I heard.

Charles Manson: Well, that's what you heard. it's a little different from what you heard and what is.

Geraldo Rivera: Do you feel fortunate that you survived because the law was declared unconstitutional?

Charles Manson: There's no doubt in my mind I would survive. I'm in harmony with the truth. I didn't kill anyone.

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: He's so full of crap, isn't he? He really is. He's...he's...What were you going...I heard a statement here. Stand up sir, please.

Male Audience: This man is a fox. He's just putting on a big act on an ego trip.

Geraldo Rivera: An ego trip.

Male Audience: That's right.

Geraldo Rivera: Diagnose sir. Diagnose him a little more. Let's analyze this brain. This smart as a fox thing.

Robert Ressler: I'm not a psychiatrist, I'm not a psychologist I'm not qualified to diagnose. but I know certainly enough about Manson to know he is not insane under law. he is not psychotic or crazy under medical definition. What you got with this guy is a long term develop sociopathic or psychopathic personality. Today it's they call it anti-social personality disorder. He is feels no responsibility for anything that goes on around him only what he does himself. If he saw a guy laying on the street, bleeding with a knife sticking from his stomach from a robbery. Charlie

would look at him, we'd go and call the police, we'd call the ambulance. Charlie would say, "okay buddy too bad about that".

Female Audience: That was exactly my question. Other than his masterminding it. What's his difference from the guy that actually commits the murders himself, those other mass murderers?

Robert Ressler: Under law, there's no difference. He was part of the conspiracy.

Jack Levin Yeah. This is...*(Interrupted by Robert Ressler)*

Robert Ressler He is where he belongs. Make no, make no mistake he's where he belongs.

Geraldo Rivera: Jack, hold on one sec. We'll take a break and be right back.

[COMMERCIAL BREAK]

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: I chopped off nine hogs and I'm going to chop up some more you [bleep] I'm going to kill as many as I can. I'm going to pile you up to the sky. I figured by 50 million if I can get about 50 million of you, I might be able to save my trees, my air, my water, my wildlife.

Geraldo Rivera: You want to kill 50 million people?

Charles Manson: Well, that's just a drop in the bucket to what's really coming.

[COMMERCIAL BREAK]

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Male Audience: My question is how does a guy like Charles Manson compare to somebody like Jim Jones who is a professed cult leader and also a mass murderer.

Jack Levin: I think they share similarities. I think in both cases we're talking about mass killers who were able to persuade a lot of people to do things they might not otherwise have done. You know, we'd like to think that mass killer as a glassy-eyed lunatic. Like kind of like Jason in Friday the 13th. You know? But and it's scary to think he isn't like that. It's very scary and it's even scarier to think that maybe the craziness is in society. A society which produces models like do your own thing and love the one you're with. That didn't work out too well and may...

Geraldo Rivera: But you can't blame society, Jack. You don't blame society for Manson. Come on.

Jack Levin: Who me? (*Scoffs*) Yes, I do. In part, what I'm saying is maybe...

Geraldo Rivera: Society produced everybody in this studio audience. I mean nobody here...

Jack Levin: Society does good things, society does bad things. There is a certain point in society...

Geraldo Rivera: But doesn't that help him ease out from under the burden of his guilt.

Jack Levin: Good, we don't want that to happen. and I agree completely with you. But in part, society helped him succeed. I don't think Charles Manson would succeed today. I don't think he would find the followers that he was able to follow in the late 60s.

[Applause]

Male Audience: Everyone says Manson is insane, exactly how smart is Charles Manson?

Robert Ressler: I can answer that. He was from his record in his files, Manson is a bright young man or was a young man, he is a bright older man now, he tested between 111-130 IQ test which puts him on the range of a bright individual.

Geraldo Rivera: Another sailor, the fleet in town staying at the hotel.

Male Audience: Yeah, I'd like to ask the FBI guy, is it possible that Charles Manson's building an army behind the prison right now?

Robert Ressler: Manson in prison was big in the area and nation area in brotherhood.

Geraldo Rivera: Neo-Nazi, he changed the cross to a swastika.

Robert Ressler: Yeah, he's big on the Nazi business, he...

Geraldo Rivera: That's when three of the Hispanic prisoners threw lighter fluid on him and started to make a little torch of him. Justly deserved I might add.

Robert Ressler: White power sort of thing. You know. As far as building of any legitimate or serious following inside or out the prison, I'd say no.

Geraldo Rivera: You know, he lives in isolation now. Ever since that incident where he was lit on fire. He's serving a life sentence because the death penalty was declared unconstitutional. But he is eligible for parole now. Will he be release? Should he be released? He, interestingly enough, thinks so.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Geraldo Rivera: Charlie, I gotta ask. You're going to die in prison.

Charles Manson: *(Chuckles)* Die in prison. Boy oh boy.

Geraldo Rivera: You're going to die.

Charles Manson: Again, there you go. You're going to die in your mind.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: My life is not important, man.

Geraldo Rivera: I want to know about your life here.

Charles Manson: My life here is just sitting in a cell.

Geraldo Rivera: How are you treated here?

Charles Manson: I'm treated here differently on different levels. The first level is pretty good. The younger man are got alot of respect. The fat ones and the ones that hide around the corner, they're sloppy and they lie and they're incompetent but there's alot of good ones. It's like any other, any other place, man. There's good and there's bad.

Geraldo Rivera: You seem to abuse the correction officers.

Charles Manson: I do. I get off on something terrible and they get off on me something terrible. I've had my teeth knocked out, my bones...

Geraldo Rivera: But don't you make your life miserable by being that hostile?

Charles Manson: Man, I don't know what misery is. What the hell ever meant. that's weakness, I ain't got no misery in me. I'm in paradise, man.

Geraldo Rivera: Got any friends here?

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: if I was guilty of something and after all the pressure they put on me. And they put that medication on me and all the doctors and drugged me up down the hallways and done everything they can do to kill me. I've had this whole country down on me trying to murder me for all kinds of different everything they don't understand, what don't know what they can't realise. Every little insecurity they got here they can't bring to me. And I got to carry on my back. Do you think I would still be here if I was guilty of anything?

Geraldo Rivera: Well you'd still be here.

Charles Manson: And look me in the eye, look me, look me straight away in the eye. Do I look like I'm guilty about anything?

Geraldo Rivera: You look more guilty than anyone I've ever looked in the eye in my life.

Charles Manson: Really? Really?

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: Yeah. You see what I'm saying? The guys you're trying to make me into is impossible. What you're doing is creating a legend. You're creating a beast. You're creating whatever you are judging yourselves with into the word Manson. And that's not me at all.

Geraldo Rivera: You're not a beast, Charlie? You are a beast.

Charles Manson: See, I'm whatever you need me to be for you. And whatever you make me is what you carry the rest of your life and forever.

Geraldo Rivera: You named yourself, Charlie. It's right there. (Points to the swastika symbol on Manson's forehead)

Charles Manson: No, no, no. You don't even know what that means.

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: I know what it means. And so does he. Hitler was one of his idols that he confessed while I was in there. Comment on what we saw.

Robert Ressler: I think Manson, I feel very sorry for Charles Manson. I feel a lot of empathy and sympathy for Charles Manson the boy. The boy that grew up the boy that emergent adolescence. Once into adolescence, he made conscious choices to break the law and live a life of lawlessness. Charles Manson is where he created, and it's where he belongs.

Geraldo Rivera: Take a break. Be right back.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: They've been trying to kill me for 20 years and they haven't been able to do it yet, would you like to try?

[COMMERCIAL BREAK]

GERALDO STUDIO

(Geraldo Rivera, Jack Levin, Robert Ressler, and audience)

Geraldo Rivera: Is there a message in Manson? Is there something you want people to remember from this discussion, Professor Levin?

Jack Levin: I think that when we look for craziness, we sometimes find it not in the mind of the murderer. Maybe we don't have to put the murderer's brain in a bottle and examine it. Instead, we have to remember this was a group phenomenon. There were a lot of people killing. It's not the first time in history that that happened. It won't be the last. And that's really a frightening thing to think of.

Geraldo Rivera: I hope it's the last. But I think you're right. Thank you both for being with us. And thank you all folks.

[Applause]

We'll see you next time. Thank you for watching.

INTERVIEW

(Video Footage: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Geraldo Rivera: Have a good rest of your life, Charlie.

Charles Manson: You didn't bring the guitar.

Geraldo Rivera: They wouldn't let us.

Charles Manson: They wouldn't let you?

Geraldo Rivera: But we brought it. But they wouldn't let us bring it.

Charles Manson: These locks work for you, man.

SCENE TRANSITION

(Interview: Geraldo Rivera with Charles Manson)

Charles Manson: *(Manson is handcuffed by officers)* Hey, hey! *(Mumbles)*

Still no communicate. Hey, we talked about what I did. We talk about what I could do? I could do just about anything I want on my row. I can send for your head and put in a box if I wanted. I wouldn't. But I could, just like you could.

Appendix B: Chronology for the Charles Manson Events

November 12, 1934	Charles Manson is born and lives in Cincinnati, Ohio with his mother Kathleen Maddox, who was 16-years old at the time. Manson never met his father.
1939	Maddox, Manson's mother, is sentenced to prison for armed robbery.
1947	Maddox attempts to send Manson to a foster home. A court order sends him to the Gibault School for Boys in Terre Haute, Indiana.
December 14, 1948	Manson commits his first known crime, a burglary of a grocery store. He is caught and sent to a juvenile detention centre. He escapes and commits two armed robberies. When he is apprehended, Manson is sent to the Indiana School for Boys in Plainfield, where he spends the next three years.
December 15, 1951	Manson escapes from the School for Boys and heads west in a stolen car, burglarizing 15-20 gas stations along the way. He is caught in Utah and sent to the National Training School for Boys in Washington, D.C. A psychiatrist calls Manson a "slick" but extremely sensitive" boy.
1952	For his criminal act against another boy, he is transferred to Federal Reformatory at Petersburg, Virginia. Later in 1952, Manson is moved to a more secure reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio.
1955	Manson marries Rosalie Willis, a waitress from Wheeling. The couple gives birth to his first child, Charles, Jr.
October 15, 1955	Manson is arrested for auto theft and sentenced to 5-years with probation.

December 15, 1956	Manson violates his probation and sentenced to 3 years in prison at San Pedro, California for violating the terms of his 1955 probation.
1958	Willis divorces Manson after he is jailed for failing to appear in court charged with car theft. She retains custody of their child. Manson is released on parole and becomes a pimp in Southern California
July 15, 1959	Manson is arrested for forging a treasury check. He is given a 10-year sentence that had been suspended in 1959.
1959	Manson's second marriage to a 19-year-old prostitute, Leona "Candy" Stevens.
April 1960	Manson is indicted on the Federal Mann Act charges. He is arrested in Laredo and brought back to California where he is to serve the 10-year sentence that has been suspended in 1959.
September 1960	Manson father's a second son, Charles Luther Manson.
1963	Manson and Stevens divorce.
January 1, 1964	Manson becomes obsessed by the music of the Beatles. He learns to play a steel guitar.
1966	Manson aspires to be a song writer and devotes most of his spare time in prison to the task.
March 1 OR 21, 1967	Manson asks prison officials to let him remain in prison, but having completed a 10-year prison term, he is released. He heads for San Francisco.
April 1967	Manson meets Mary Brunner, a librarian at Berkeley, the first of his "Family" recruits. He moves in with her.

May 1967 Manson picks up 18-year old Lynette Fromme (also known as “Squeaky”) on Venice Beach and brings her back to Mary’s place. He meets Ruth Anne Moorhouse when her father Dean picks him up hitch-hiking and brings him over for dinner. She runs off with Charlie, but she’s underage. When the cops bust him, he gives his occupation as “minister”.

Summer 1967 More troubled young girls follow. 19-year-old Patricia Krenwinkel and 20-year old Susan Atkins, who Manson meets in the Haight-Ashbury district while he’s playing his guitar. Mary becomes pregnant.

Fall 1967 Charlie packs the girls into a Volkswagen minibus and moves to Los Angeles, California. He looks to make connections in the music world, offering his girls as bait to lure promising males. They wander around Los Angeles and Topanga, scrounging food from dumpsters. Manson gets his first record-company audition, a 3-hour session, but doesn’t get signed. Susan becomes pregnant.

March 1968 Mary gives birth to a son, the first of many “Family” babies. Manson names the baby Valentine, after the hero of Stranger In a Strange Land. A couple of the girls meet Dennis Wilson of the Beach Boys, who picks them up hitch-hiking on the Sunset Strip. Manson and the girls move in with Dennis and meet Los Angeles scenesters like producer Terry Melcher.

June 1, 1968 “The Family” – Manson and number of his follwers move into Spahn Ranch.

Summer 1968 Manson does more studio sessions, hoping for a record deal with the Beach boys’ label. Brian Wilson apparently isn’t impressed. The family – now a couple dozen – moves to Spahn Ranch, a movie set owned by the elderly George Spahn. Whose sex sessions with

Fromme give her the nickname. Manson and several of his followers, now called “The Family”, move into Spahn ranch in southern California.

September 1968 The Beach Boys record Manson’s song “Cease To Exist” which dennis has rev ied and retitled “Never learn not to love” for their next album, 20/20. It comes out in December as the B-side to “Bluebirds over the Mountain” which peaks on the charts at Number 61.

December 1968 The Beatles release their White Album, which proves to be a great influence on Manson’s thinking.

March 23, 1969 Manson visits 10050 Cielo Drive (Tate residence) looking for Terry Melcher, who he hoped will publish his music.

July 1, 1969 deal to sell 25 kilos of pot he doesn’t have, hustling \$2500 out of a black dealer named Bernard “Lotsapoppa” Crowe. Watson takes the money and runs. When Crowe demans his money back, Manson arranges a meeting at Crowe’s apartment – and shoots him in the chest.

July 25, 1969 Bobby Beausoleil, a friend of Charlie’s, gets burned in another drug deal gone bad, this one involving Gary Hinman and a biker gang, the Straight Satans. Burned from a thousand dollars, Beausoleil goes to Hinman’s home with a handgun, a knife and a few Family accomplices: Atkins, Brunner, Bruce Davis and Manson, who cuts off Hinman’s ear. After Beausoleil shoots him dead, Atkins writes “POLITICAL PIGGY” on the wall in Hinman’s blood.

July 31, 1969 A music teacher named Gary Hinman is stabbed to death. On the wall near the body, in Hinman’s blood, was printed “political piggy”.

August 6, 1969	Beausoleil is booked for Hinman's murder after he tries to make his getaway in the dead man's car. They catch him on the highway and also find a bloody knife hidden in the tire well.
August 8, 1969	Manson tells Family members, "Now is the time for Helter Skelter." That evening he tells Patricia Krenwinkel, Susan Atkins, Tex Watson, and Linda Kasabian to get knives and changes of clothes. As he sends them from the ranch on their mission, he tells them "to leave a sign --something witchy." Watson drives to the Tate residence.
August 9, 1969	The Tate murders at Cielo Drive. Shortly after midnight, the brutal attack on residents at the Tate residence begins. 102 stab wounds are inflicted on 4 victims; a 5 th victim is shot. Sharon Tate, Jay Sebring, Voytek Frykowski, Abigail Folger, and Steven Parent are left dead. The murders are discovered by housekeeper Winifred Chapman the next morning. The 4 family members return to Spahn ranch, where Manson criticizes them for doing a messy job. That night, Manson, along with Patricia Krenwinkel, Text Watson, Leslie Van Houten, Linda Kasabian cruise around, looking for potential victims.
August 10, 1969	The LaBianca murders at Waverly Drive. In the early morning hours, family members stab to death Leno and Rosemary LaBianca. The words "Death to Pigs" and "Healter[sic] Skelter" are found printed on a wall and a refrigerator door.
August 16, 1969	The cops raid the ranch, looking for stolen dune buggies, Charges get dropped a couple days later. The LAPD continues to treat the Cielo and Waverly killings as unrelated.
September 1, 1969	Under a bush near his home, a 10-year-old boy finds the gun used in the Tate murders. The boy's father turns the gun over to the LAPD. The LAPD fails to do a proper investigation.

October 1969	At Spahn Ranch, the police arrests 27 people for car theft. Manson is booked under the name, “Manson, Charles M., aka Jesus Christ, God”. Manson is also arrested at Barker Ranch in Death Valley and charged with grand theft auto.
November 1969	Watson surrenders to the local sheriff, who is his cousin. He stays in Texas for almost a year.
November 6, 1969	While incarcerated in Los Angeles on other charges, Susan Atkins tells/boasts to a fellow inmate, Virginia Castro (Graham), that she participated in the Tate murders. She tells Castro of a “death list” of celebrities targeted by the Family, including Elizabeth Taylor, Richard Burton, Tom Jones, Steve McQueen, and Frank Sinatra.
November 12, 1969	Al Springer, a visitor to the Spahn Ranch, tells LAPD detectives that on August 11 or 12, Manson had bragged about “knocking off five” pigs the other night.
November 17, 1969	Danny DeCarlo talks to police and implicates Manson in the Spahn Rang murder of Shorty Shea, and also suggests that persons at the Spahn ranch might also have been responsible for the Tate murders, but, he tells detectives, he would be afraid to testify.
December 4, 1969	Susan Atkins agrees to cooperate and makes a deal with prosecutors. Her attorney negotiates a lucrative book contract. Over the following days, her grand-jury testimony makes it into the newspaper.
December 6, 1969	The Altamont disaster, just as the Atkins story starts to make the news, provides journalists with handy death-of-the-Sixties metaphors ever since.
December 19, 1969	Life magazine does a cover story on Manson, just in time for Christmas, giving him his first nationwide notoriety. Life presents

the prosecution's version of the murders, introducing America to the official story of Manson and Helter Skelter.

July 1970 Manson carves an X on his forehead, announcing, "I have Xed myself from the world. No man or lawyer is speaking for me". The three girls carve Xs on their own foreheads.

July 24, 1970 The Tate-LaBianca murder trial, with defendants Charles Manson, Susan Atkins, Patricia Krenwinkel, and Leslie Van Houten, opens in Los Angeles.

August 3, 1970 President Nixon, giving a speech in Denver, brings up Manson, complaining the liberal media is trying to "glorify" Manson and other criminals. Nixon says, "Here is a man who was guilty, directly and indirectly, of eight murders without reason". Prosecutors hope to keep the jury from finding out, to avoid a mistrial, but in court, Manson flashes them a copy of the Los Angeles Times headline: "Manson Guilty, Nixon Declares". The next day, Manson waves his own sign, which says: "Nixon Guilty".

August 1970 In return for agreeing to appear as the prosecution's star witness at the Manson trial, Judge Older grants Linda Kasabian immunity from prosecution for the Tate-LaBianca murders.

November 16, 1970 The state rests its case in the Manson trial.

November 17, 1970 Charles Manson Testifies, which lasts over an hour. He testifies first without the jury being present. As he walks by the counsel table, he tells his 3 co-defendants, "You don't have to testify now".

November 19, 1970 The defense announces, without having presented any evidence, that it also rests.

November 20, 1970	Manson announces that he wishes to testify. He makes a strange statement saying, “The children that come at you with knives are your children. You taught them. I didn’t teach them. I just tried to help them stand up”. On cross-examination, Bugliosi asks Manson if he thinks he is Jesus Christ.
November 30, 1970	Defense attorney Ronald Hughes fails to show up in court. He is never seen again, leading to speculation he was murdered by The Family.
January 15, 1971	Vincent Bugliosi presents the prosecution’s closing argument in the Manson trial.
January 25, 1971	After 10 days of deliberation, the jury convicts all Tate-LaBianca defendants of 1 st degree murder.
March 29, 1971	Concluding the penalty phase of the trial, the jury fixes the penalty as death for all four Tate-LaBianca defendants.
April 19, 1971	Judge Older sentences Manson to death. Manson is sent to San Quentin’s death row.
August 1971	Watson finally goes on trial, two years after the murders. He pleads not guilty by reason of insanity, but he’s found guilty. He eventually becomes a Christian minister.
October 1971	Charles “Tex” Watson is convicted on 7 counts of 1 st degree murder.
February 18, 1972	The California Supreme Court declares the death penalty unconstitutional and Manson’s sentence is automatically reduced to life in prison.
October 1972	Manson is transferred to Folsom Prison.

September 5, 1975 Squeaky Fromme, wearing a red nun's habit, points a Colt .45 at President Gerald Ford on his way to the California state capitol. It doesn't go off. She makes the cover of Time with the headline, "The Girl Who Almost Killed Ford".

May 1976 Manson is sent to Vacaville prison, where he remains for the next 9 years.

September 25, 1984 Another inmate, claiming "God told. Me to kill Manson", sets Manson on fire, causing serious burns on large parts of his body.

July 1985 Manson is transferred to San Quentin Prison.

1988 The Manson story officially enters a new phase when N.W.A. release Straight Outta Compton. In the opening minute, Ice Cube declares, "Here's a murder rap to keep you dancin'/With a crime record like Charles Manson".

May 9, 1988 In a television interview with Geraldo Rivera, Manson warns, "I'm going to chop up more of you mother fuckers. I'm going to kill as many of you as I can. I'm going to pile you up to the sky".

March 1989 Manson is transferred to Corcoran Prison

March 1997 Manson is denied parole (for the 9th time) in a hearing broadcast live on Court TV. Manson responds by saying, "That's cool. I'm not saying I wasn't involved [in Helter Skelter]. I'm just saying that I did not break God's law. Thank you".

April 2002 Manson is refused parole for the 10th time at a hearing he refused to attend.

May 23, 2007 Manson is refused parole for the 11th time. Manson, now 72, will next be up for parole in 2012.

July 15, 2008 The parole board denies Susan Atkin's request, because she has terminal brain cancer and only months to live, for a compassionate release. Atkins will now almost certainly die in prison.

September 24, 2009 Atkins dies. Her husband releases the following statement: "Susan passed away peacefully surrounded by friends and loved ones. Her last whispered word was 'Amen'. No one on the face of the earth worked as hard as Susan did to right an unrightable wrong".

November 19, 2017 Manson dies at 83-years old in Kern County, California hospital due to natural causes.

Appendix C: Transcription of The Fifth Estate – “Karla Homolka”

Transcribed by Mimi Nguyen

Originally aired: November 25, 1997

SOURCE: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). “The Fifth Estate: Karla Homolka.”

Aired November 25, 1997. Accessed July 12, 2020.

<https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/2653449772>.

CAST:

Dr. Fred Berlin – Psychologist

Paul Bernardo – Archive footage

Vince Bevan – Police Inspector

Jenny Black – Colleague of Karla Homolka

Jane Doe – Archive footage (blurred)

Alex Ford – Friend of Karla Homolka

Kathy Ford – Friend of Karla Homolka

Mary Hall – Crown Attorney

Karla Homolka – Archive footage

Tammy Homolka – Archive footage

Dr. Andrew Malcolm – Psychiatrist

John Rosen – Lawyer for Paul Bernardo

Murray Siegel – Archive footage

George F. Walker – Lawyer for Karla Homolka

Stephen Williams – Author of *Invisible Darkness*

Trish Wood – Host

DRAMATIC RE-ENACTMENT

(Karla Homolka actor in a prison cell)

Female Voiceover: Dear Wendy, I'm letting my bangs grow. After all, I want to look my absolute best when I go to court and see Paul. I want him to drool when he sees me.

(Various images and videos of Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka)

Trish Wood: In July 1995, Paul Bernardo went on trial in Toronto for the abduction, rape, and murder of teenagers Leslie Mahaffy and Kristen French. The prosecution's star witness, his former wife, Karla Homolka. Already in prison for her part in those crimes and in the death of her sister.

Male Voiceover: It's all part of the deal she struck with the Crown, in exchange for one thing, her testimony against Paul Bernardo.

Trish Wood: Homolka's appearance has always belied the seriousness of her crimes and so does her demeanor. In police interview tapes obtained by the Fifth Estate, she describes her role as both victimizer and victim.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators interview Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: If I didn't turn the water tap off completely, he'd hit me. If, if I didn't say the right thing, he'd hit me. He held knives to my throat. He told me I better watch my back. He said, "Always watch your back with me".

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators interview Karla Homolka – Different day)

Karla Homolka: Her feet were tied with that electrical, electrical cord, that he used to kill Leslie. And there was electrical cord around her neck (motioning toward her own neck and continues). He anally raped her, and then he strangled her after he was done. It stands out really clear in my mind because, the night before I left him, he did the exact same thing to me, only he didn't kill me.

ROOM WITH TRISH WOOD

(Room has seven televisions. The television shows the same image of Karla Homolka with a battered face)

Trish Wood: This was the Karla Homolka presented by police and prosecutors, a victim deserving of leniency. Homolka also convinced a legion of psychiatrists that she had committed unspeakable crimes, only because she was battered into it by an abusive husband. Leniency she got, through a controversial plea bargain endorsed by Ontario's Attorney General. The arrangement was made in secret, by men whose interests coincided, as a result her psychiatric assessments were never tested in court. If they'd been publicly scrutinized, we might have had a glimpse of a different Karla Homolka. The one who appears when those psychiatric diagnoses are stripped away. Dr. Fred Berlin is an authority on criminal behaviour.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Dr. Fred Berlin)

Dr. Berlin: I don't accept the Battered Woman Syndrome, that's not what this was about. This was about innocent people suffering, people who had done absolutely nothing that would justify Karla lashing out or doing something that would hurt them. To make the leap from being battered and getting back at your batterer to killing innocent victims, is a leap that I'm not prepared to make.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Mary Hall)

Mary Hall: I considered her to be very dangerous.

Trish Wood: Mary Hall was a Crown prosecutor involved in the case.

(Voiceover)

Mary Hall: I had some real doubts about the Battered Spouse Syndrome, and the fact that she had been acting under duress in relation to what she admitted she did.

(Image of Karla Homolka)

Trish Wood: Karla Homolka is an enigma. Seemingly able to conjure a range of
(Voiceover) personalities. Police, prosecutors and psychiatrists saw a vulnerable young woman, and a half dozen confidential psychiatric reports explained her criminal behaviour by suggesting she'd been terrorized into committing crimes she'd found abhorrent. One of those reports was done by Dr. Andrew Malcom. He suggested Bernardo had Homolka under his spell, almost from the beginning.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Dr. Andrew Malcolm)

Dr. Malcolm: She was a naive, simple, innocent, helpless child, who was impressed by what her parents thought of her "catch" and what her little girlfriends thought of her "catch." She was overwhelmed by this fellow.

(Various images of Karla Homolka)

Trish Wood: But people close to her remember a strong-willed Karla Homolka. An
(Voiceover) independent young woman who worked part-time in a pet store. In her high school clique called the "Diamond Club", Homolka was number one, according to member Kathy Ford and her husband, Alex.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Kathy and Alex Ford)

Kathy Ford: She was the tough one, of the friendship- of our friendships. And well, you didn't want to get in a fight with Karla because she was going to win.

Trish Wood: Leader or follower, Miss Homolka?

Kathy Ford: Leader. Yep.

Alex Ford: Leader. Definitely.

(Image of the Howard Johnson hotel)

Trish Wood: It was an unlikely setting for a romantic encounter, a pet food show at a
(Voiceover) suburban hotel, but it was here that 17-year-old Homolka met a handsome 23-year-old Junior Accountant named Paul Bernardo. The attraction was instant, says Homolka's co-worker, Jenny Black.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Jenny Black)

Jenny Black: Oh, he was her knight in shining armor. He, and I mean, we looked at him like that. He treated her well. He took care of her. He took her places. He just seemed to be wonderful for her. She was in love, head over heels.

(Home video of Karla Homolka and Paul Bernardo)

Trish Wood: Their home video documents a holiday Bernardo and Homolka took in
(Voiceover) Florida in the summer of 1988. They look like any other happy, goofy, young couple in love. Later, Homolka would tell her psychiatrist Bernardo was already tightening his grip and that he'd begun hitting her.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Dr. Andrew Malcolm)

Dr. Malcolm: Karla told me that she had been physically abused by him that a very important element in that abuse is psychological abuse, which doesn't leave any marks on the body whatsoever. She was rendered helpless by him in the course of the first six or seven or so months of their association (Trish Wood interrupts him).

Trish Wood: But in what way was she rendered helpless by him in the first seven months?

Dr. Malcolm: She came to (Trish Wood interrupts him).

Trish Wood: Because people said they were in-love and happy together. She was living at home. How did he render her helpless in the first seven months?

Dr. Malcolm: She became dependent on him. He controlled her. He advised her that she was worthless.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Jenny Black)

Trish Wood: But Jenny Black says she saw no signs of it.
(Voiceover)

Jenny Black: (Shakes head) No. I didn't notice anything, no. I was happy for her.

Trish Wood: And did she seem happy?

Jenny Black: (Nods head) She seemed very happy, and he seemed very happy. I mean, they were all over each other when they were together, they were just, together.

(Home video of Paul Bernardo filming Karla Homolka - inaudible)

Trish Wood: They certainly were.

Trish Wood: But Homolka convinced her psychiatrist she'd been sexually abused by
(Voiceover) Bernardo, suggesting their kinky sex life was not consensual.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Kathy and Alex Ford)

Trish Wood: Their friends, at the time, remember it differently.
(Voiceover)

Kathy Ford: (Motioning towards her neck) They had a little dog chain too, like a dog
necklace, with little spikes on, not spikes but, the little... (looking at
Alex)

Alex Ford: A dog collar.

Kathy Ford: Dog collar, and... (Trish Wood interrupts her)

Trish Wood: That she wore?

Kathy Ford: That she wore it, very submissive.

Alex Ford: She wore it, and, interestingly enough, you'd walk into a room and on the
back door would be a laced teddy and a pair of handcuffs.

Trish Wood: Did she talk about this in a horrible way, like, I hate this kind of sex we're
having?

Kathy Ford: (Shakes head) No. No. No.

Alex Ford: No.

Trish Wood: What did she say about it?

Kathy Ford: It was just matter-of-fact.

Alex Ford: It was just the best thing in the world.

(Image of Karla Homolka's letter to the Toronto Star with a waterfalls background)

Trish Wood: In December 1989, the best thing in Homolka's world got better, in a (Voiceover) rhapsodic letter to the Toronto Star, Homolka described the romantic evening by Niagara Falls, when Bernardo proposed.

Jenny Black: She wanted to marry this man. This was her man, and she was going to marry him and that was that.

ROOM WITH TRISH WOOD

(On the five television screens are images of Paul Bernardo; two show a smiling Bernardo, and three show the composite sketch of Bernardo)

Trish Wood: Seven months before the wedding, the man who would be Homolka's perfect husband, was called in by police for questioning in a series of rapes in Scarborough, near Toronto. Homolka knew her future perfect husband was a perfect match for the police composite. She also knew her fiancée was obsessed with attractive teenaged girls, including one, Karla Homolka knew very well.

(Home video footage of Paul Bernardo filming Tammy Homolka)

It was her 15-year-old sister Tammy. Bernardo convinced Karla to help him satisfy his obsession with Tammy by aiding him in a clandestine sexual assault on the teenager. Homolka didn't lift a finger to save her sister from Bernardo.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators interviewing Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: He was being physically and verbally abusive to me at that time, as you know. He kept on pushing and pushing and pushing and I said, finally, I said, "Okay". And thinking that it would, it wouldn't be, you know, that it would just, be one time, that's it, it'll shut him up. And he would stop bothering me and stop hurting me.

(Home video of Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka at Christmas time)

Trish Wood: This Christmas video was shot just hours before the attack.

(Voiceover)

(Home video of Paul Bernardo filming Tammy Homolka, and photo of Tammy)

Paul Bernardo: Are you in the Christmas spirit, that all I wanted to know?

(In video)

Trish Wood: Tammy is already woozy from tranquilizer spiked drinks that would soon render her unconscious. While being sexually assaulted by her big sister and Bernardo, Tammy would choke and die. At the time, the couple's lies convinced police Tammy's death was an accident, but it would return to haunt Karla.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Dr. Andrew Malcolm)

Trish Wood: She offered up her sister in order to keep happy the man she wanted to marry.

Dr. Malcolm: Yes.

Trish Wood: Offering up her sister is not explainable by Battered Wife Syndrome. She was living at home at the time, they weren't married.

Dr. Malcolm: Well, I don't think she was a full-blown battered wife at that point, but I think the earliest beginnings of it were already under way. She was already following, falling into his thrall at that point. That was my opinion, when I saw her, that she was in fact, an influenced person.

Trish Wood: "Influenced person". That's not Battered Wife Syndrome, at that time. What was she suffering from, if anything, at the time she offered up her sister to be sexually assaulted, videotaped, and to be put in jeopardy, which eventually killed her?

Dr. Malcolm: (Long pause) I can't really answer that. I think that it was an outrageous act.

(Images of Karla Homolka and Paul Bernardo)

Trish Wood: Karla Homolka herself has told a number of stories about her state of
(Voiceover) mind at the time of Tammy's death. In an audiotaped interview with police before she became implicated in the murders, she says the couple's first three years were happy ones.

Karla Homolka: It was great, it was really good, it was pretty well the same all the way
(audiotaped) through except we became emotionally closer, and there were never any problems, very rarely any problems. We had a couple of arguments but just normal arguments.

(Image of mannequin's face in a wedding veil and dress, and home video of a house party)

Trish Wood: In fact, she moved in with Bernardo. And seeming to forget her sister's
(Voiceover) death, continued her pre-wedding social whirl of showers, fittings, and parties.

(Home video of Karla Homolka and Paul Bernardo cutting a cake)

Male voice: Who's ever dominant in this relationship...
(in home video)

(Image of mannequin in a wedding veil and dress)

Trish Wood: At the end of June 1991, Homolka married the man she would later claim
(Voiceover) had abused her so badly.

(Video footage of Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka in their wedding outfits on a carriage)

Trish Wood: As Homolka and Bernardo paraded their union through the storybook
(Voiceover) town of Niagara on the Lake, a nightmare was discovered in nearby Lake Gibson.

(Footage of the location Leslie Mahaffy's body was found)

Trish Wood: Entombed in eight concrete blocks, the dismembered body of 14-year-old
(Voiceover) Leslie Mahaffy.

(Video footage of Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka on their wedding)

Trish Wood: What no one knew was that the newlyweds were already bound by ties
(Voiceover) stronger than marriage, the killing of two innocent teenage girls.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators interview Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: And then, she took a breath, and that freaked me out even more...

Trish Wood: When we return, Homolka tells police about the murders.
(Voiceover)

Karla Homolka: So, he went over to her and he did the same thing, he strangled her more, and I think I watched that time 'cause what the hell, she's dead anyway.

[COMMERCIAL BREAK]

(Video footage of Karla Homolka's exterior and interior house)

Trish Wood: Homolka's evidence was that two weeks before the wedding, Bernardo
(Voiceover) had awakened her with the news that he'd kidnapped a teenage girl and brought her home. Homolka's response was to go back to sleep. The next day, while Bernardo raped Leslie Mahaffy in the guest room, Homolka passed the time reading and walking their dog, Buddy. Homolka was upset, but not for Mahaffy.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: Oh, and I was really mad too, because when I took Buddy out, there were two champagne glasses on the dining room table. And we had these really expensive champagne glasses from France, which we never used. He had those out, the two of them had been drinking champagne from those glasses, and I was really mad. This is stupid...

Trish Wood: Homolka seemed matter-of-fact as she recounted her version of how
(Voiceover) Leslie Mahaffy met her death.

Karla Homolka: And then she took a breath and that freaked me out even more, he should have slapped me in the face 'cause I was really hysterical then. So, he went over to her and he did the same thing, he strangled her more and I think I watched that time, 'cause what the hell, she's dead anyways.

(Paul Bernardo filming Karla Homolka on their honeymoon)

Trish Wood: Two weeks later they were married and went on their honeymoon.
(Voiceover) Homolka later claimed to police and psychiatrists that Bernardo had cruelly destroyed her wedding night, by telling her he was the Scarborough Rapist. Although she had already been involved in two deaths, Homolka would call this the worst night of her life.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Police interviews Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: He, he wasn't loving, he acted like he didn't care that we got married. He told me that he was the Scarborough Rapist. And it was just not like, the kind of wedding night that I've dreamed of having.

(Image of Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka)

Trish Wood: After the honeymoon, Homolka told the police the marriage went well.
(Voiceover)

(image of Karla Homolka's love notes/letters to Paul Bernardo)

Trish Wood: There was nothing for quite a while, just small verbal arguments and
(Voiceover) things. And every day, she labored over love notes for Bernardo's pillow, including this one, written just before they kidnapped Kristen French.

Female Voiceover: It's Easter soon, and do you know what that means? A day off for Karly
Voiceover: Curls to spend with her wonderful King, isn't that great? Love you.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: He kept saying "go through what we're gonna do. So I said, well, if we see a girl we're gonna stop, I'm gonna ask her for directions, I'm gonna try and get her over to the car..."

(Photo of Kristen French)

Trish Wood: As Kristen French was on her way home from school, for the long Easter
(Voiceover) weekend, they put their plan into effect.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: So, he wanted her right beside him, so he could hold the knife to her, and
I sat in the back seat, actually more in the middle, of the two of the front
seats and I held her hair and I held her head down.

*(Footage of Bayview Drive and Karla Homolka and Paul Bernardo's
home)*

Trish Wood: French was taken to the couple's home near St. Catharines. Homolka
(Voiceover) unplugged the phones, closed the blinds and locked the doors. Three days
of sexual degradation of the 15-year-old schoolgirl had begun. When
Bernardo left on an errand, Homolka didn't release Kristen. Instead, while
guarding the bound teenager with a rubber mallet, she carried on, what
she described as a "chat between girlfriends".

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: I never should have gotten to know Kristen, because you get emotionally
involved with these people, and it really hurts. It hurts a lot more because
I felt like I was friends with both of them, especially Kristen. Because we
did so much stuff together, we put makeup on together, we talked you
know, just girl-talk, Paul was, while Paul was gone getting us food. And it
just made it hurt even more...

Trish Wood: What Homolka didn't reveal in that interview was that later she had raped
(Voiceover) her new friend with a wine bottle as Paul Bernardo watched.

(Footage of the location Kristen French's body was discovered)

Trish Wood: Two weeks later, the frantic search for the teenager came to an end.
(Voiceover)

(Video footage of Karla Homolka's house and various images of Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka)

Trish Wood: No one suspected it was the attractive young couple next door, who with
(Voiceover) three killings behind them, were beginning to unravel. Now friends often saw bruises on Homolka but said nothing. Then just after Christmas, he gave her a savage beating that left marks no one could ignore. The beating left her head swollen, the Doctor described her blackened eyes as resembling a raccoon and said it was the worst case of abuse he'd ever seen. But within weeks Homolka had recovered, and within a month she'd filed for a divorce, hit the bars, and taken a lover.

ROOM WITH TRISH WOOD

(On the four television screens were the same images Karla Homolka's smiling face)

Trish Wood: Karla Homolka's exciting life as a newly single woman came to an abrupt
(Voiceover) end in February 1993. Almost two and a half years after they questioned Bernardo, the police now had DNA results confirming that he was the Scarborough Rapist. Officers located Homolka and she was cooperative until she realized they had connected her husband to the Mahaffy and French murders, that meant Karla Homolka was in trouble too.

(Video footage of the signage "George F. Walker, Q.C.")

Trish Wood: Homolka headed straight for Niagara Falls and criminal lawyer, George
(Voiceover) Walker. She told him her version of what happened to Tammy, Leslie, and Kristen.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with George Walker)

Trish Wood: Were you broadsided by what she said that day?

George Walker: Basically, yeah. Yeah. (pauses) And, but not broadsided enough to figure out that I'd better get to somebody quick.

Trish Wood: You thought she might be arrested quickly?

George Walker: Certainly did.

Trish Wood: So, you had to make a move?

George Walker: I had to make a move. In the quandary I had, I wanted to make the right move.

(Footage of Police building and various police images)

Trish Wood: Walker didn't even need to pick-up the phone, police were on his
(Voiceover) doorstep that same night, wanting to make a deal.

(Footage of Paul Bernardo's arrest)

Trish Wood: After nine months and 11 million dollars, all they had against Bernardo
(Voiceover) was Homolka. The community wanted an arrest and Bernardo was picked up.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Jenny Black)

Jenny Black: Your world stops for a second, your...you can't believe...I cried when they found Kristen and I cried, with Leslie, and then to find out it was someone that I knew and trusted. (Shakes head)

(Background image of letters from Karla Homolka, various photos of Karla Homolka, George Walker, and Murray Siegel)

Trish Wood: Homolka wanted to avoid punishment and asked Walker to seek blanket
(Voiceover) immunity for her role in the crimes. Walker and the head of the Crown
law office, Murray Siegel, started to bargain in local restaurants. Walker
already knew the card he would play.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with George Walker)

Trish Wood: You believe she was abused from the beginning?

George Walker: Yeah, I do.

Trish Wood: And did you tell Murray Siegel that when you started negotiating that it
was a mitigating factor?

George Walker: Yes.

Trish Wood: You did?

George Walker: I did.

Trish Wood: So, the two of you had discussed that prior to any psychiatrist confirming
a diagnosis of this?

George Walker: Yes.

Trish Wood: Was there physical evidence beside the raccoon eyes, that you saw that
would... (George Walker interrupt her)

George Walker: Yes.

Trish Wood: What was there?

George Walker: (Shakes head in a negative manner) I'm not to...(inaudible)

Trish Wood: And you had something besides her word?

George Walker: Yes.

(Footage of investigators in Karla Homolka's house and Vince Bevan)

Trish Wood: Police had begun an intensive search of the couple's home. They
(Voiceover) discovered a profoundly disturbing two-minute video. The man in-charge
of the investigation, Inspector Vince Bevan, was on the scene.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Vince Bevan)

Trish Wood: My understanding of that tape is that in the scene, with the woman that
you believe to be Kristen French, Karla Homolka is enjoying herself.

Vince Bevan: (Nods) Mm hmm, yup, certainly gives that impression. (Nods again)

Trish Wood: Having sex with an unconscious, girl?

Vince Bevan: Mm hmm.

Trish Wood: And you thought that was Kristen French.

Vince Bevan: We thought that, well, we thought it could be.

Trish Wood: But what you knew from that tape was that she was having sex with an
unconscious girl and liking it.

Vince Bevan: (Bites lip as he nods affirmatively)

Trish Wood: Didn't that shade your view of her enough to question going ahead with that first deal?

Vince Bevan: Did we want to do this? Or, did we need to do this? We were in a situation where, we needed to do it.

(Video footage of George Walker's office street and building, images of a written letter from George Walker, and a hospital sign)

Trish Wood: A few days after the home-movie was found, Walker and Homolka met.

(Voiceover) Notes from their meeting show Walker was concerned about witnesses coming forward to give examples of kinky sex, and "we both felt that the beatings and abuse she suffered, would only go so far." Shortly after that, Homolka was hospitalized for seven weeks at Northwestern Hospital in Toronto. Dr. Hans Arndt was engaged by Walker to make a psychiatric assessment. Dr. Arndt concluded, Homolka's experience since age 17, equaled that of a concentration camp survivor. A psychologist concluded that Homolka was herself a victim. To add weight to those assessments, Walker brought in a respected forensic psychiatrist, Dr. Andrew Malcom.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Dr. Andrew Malcolm)

Dr. Malcolm: This girl was convincing to me when I saw her. She gave me an outline of abuse going back for some five years, and she was extraordinarily convincing as she gave me this story.

Trish Wood: What evidence did you have that there were other instances of battering? What corroboration did you have for that?

Dr. Malcolm: None at all. (Shifts in his seat)

Trish Wood: She had been involved in the deaths of three people, isn't someone in that circumstance going to be self-serving? Aren't they going to put the best "shading" on it that they can?

Dr. Malcolm: Oh, but of course. People are self-serving, and they want to make themselves look as good as they can. Although I've been fooled before, now, and I might have been fooled by Karla too, but I don't think so.

Trish Wood: You don't.

Dr. Malcolm: No.

Trish Wood: Is four hours enough time to have spent with her?

Dr. Malcolm: Sure, it is. You can tell some, somebody is lying in a very few minutes.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Dr. Fred Berlin)

Trish Wood: Dr. Fred Berlin of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore has reviewed (Voiceover) the psychiatric reports and much of the other evidence in this case. He's concerned that some of Homolka's stories weren't corroborated.

Dr. Berlin: The Crown presumably believed that they needed Karla's evidence in order to get at Paul and therefore wanted support for the idea of having her as a witness. As a psychiatrist, I have concerns that they supported that through psychiatric evidence that I feel is very lacking in credibility.

(Footage of the Auberge du Pommier restaurant)

Trish Wood: Walker and Siegel met over dinner at Auberge du Pommier in Toronto.

(Voiceover) With the psychiatric assessments completed, Homolka's deal was finalized. She would get twelve years, ten each for French and Mahaffy to be served concurrently. She got just two years for Tammy and was never charged in her sister's death.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Kathy and Alex Ford)

Alex Ford: I don't know how you can put that in years, how do you put it in terms. It seems like Tammy was like a clause or a, you know, an extra throw-in just to, to make sure that it wouldn't become an issue in future cases and I just feel that that's so sad that someone, who was loved by so many people, has been so pushed under the carpet and been left behind.

(Photo of Karla Homolka)

Trish Wood: When we return, we'll examine Homolka's role in the killings.

(Voiceover)

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: He wanted to keep her for longer and I didn't want to, like I was going to work, I didn't want to go to work knowing that this girl was in my house and she could...escape so easily. And I didn't, I was afraid.

[COMMERCIAL BREAK]

ROOM WITH TRISH WOOD

(All seven screens are the same image of Tammy Homolka)

Trish Wood: To this day, there are troubling questions about Homolka's involvement
(Voiceover) in the death of her little sister, Tammy. Karla Homolka's motive for participating in the drugging, rape and killing of her own flesh and blood, might defy even the most exotic psychiatric diagnosis. Inexplicably, Tammy's body wasn't exhumed until two weeks after Karla Homolka's plea bargain and sentence had been sanctioned by a judge. Even so, through her autopsy report, Tammy Homolka would testify from the grave against her older sister.

(Photo of a smiling Tammy Homolka)

Trish Wood: Tammy was just fifteen years old when she died.
(Voiceover)

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: He, you know, he talked about how he really liked her, and she was getting really cute, things like that at first. And I would say, "Yeah she is" 'cause she was a beautiful girl.

(Photo of Tammy Homolka)

Trish Wood: Tammy was becoming a rival for Bernardo's affections. Karla had told
(Voiceover) her lawyer, George Walker about a pool party in 1990 when Bernardo and Tammy disappeared for hours.

(Photo of Tammy Homolka in a pool, photo of Karla Homolka, and image of Karla's writing)

Trish Wood: (Reading Karla Homolka's writing on the screen) "I was very angry (Voiceover) because I looked foolish because everybody left the party before they got back. I was alone outside waiting, angry, drinking wine." She then admitted something she never admitted to police and would deny under oath. That she was "a little bit jealous" of Tammy. Karla claimed she was battered into the assault on Tammy, but she told her friends something more sinister.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Kathy and Alex Ford)

Kathy Ford: This was her wedding present.

Alex Ford: This was her way of saying, "Here's your virgin, Paul."

Trish Wood: She did this to keep Paul to marry her?

Kathy & Alex: That's what she told us.

Kathy Ford: After.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka The plan was for me to get sleeping pills and so I picked up the Halcion, it seemed to be, the least side effects and death was not listed.

(Footage of a “compendium of pharmaceuticals”)

Trish Wood: In fact, the compendium of pharmaceuticals Homolka reviewed is replete
(Voiceover) with warnings of potentially lethal outcomes when the drug is misused. In combination with alcohol, it may cause severe central nervous system depression. Tammy’s dose was served in cocktails and combined with a powerful general anesthetic.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: I don’t know who decided that we needed the Halothane. I guess it would probably be me, knowing more about anesthetics. And the fact that the sleeping pills might not keep her completely asleep.

(Footage of a “compendium of pharmaceuticals”)

Trish Wood: The CPS warns that non-clinical use of Halothane, which she stole from
(Voiceover) the vet clinic where she worked, is dangerous. Nausea, vomiting, and cardiac arrest are among the adverse effects. Her lawyer’s notes reveal she knew that what she was about to do was dangerous. (Image of written words: “It was too dangerous!!!”) That was another fact she denied under oath. But she did let slip to police that she’d covered her tracks.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: What I did, this was my idea, not his. Was to call the drug store and tell them that I needed it for clinic use. The reason I told them for clinic use was because that way I didn’t have to give a name all I had to do was give a doctor’s name.

(Home video of Paul Bernardo filming Tammy Homolka)

Trish Wood: The night of the attack, Karla watched as Tammy grew woozy from the
(Voiceover) Halcion laced after-dinner drinks. Karla knew that combination plus the
anesthetic, halothane, on a full stomach, were risky. When Tammy passed
out, Karla held a Halothane soaked cloth over her sister's mouth during
the assault. Tammy choked on vomit and stopped breathing; she couldn't
be revived.

(Image of Tammy Homolka's corpse with a burn on her face)

Trish Wood: Two coroners who reviewed the case, one officially and one for The Fifth
(Voiceover) Estate, believe there was enough Halothane on the cloth to have caused
this burn on Tammy's face.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Interrogation room: Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Investigator: Those burns are possibly chemical in nature and ante-mortem.

Karla Homolka: The only chemical that was near her was... the Halothane. It was not
placed on her face directly, it was held as I said (holds out a hand about 1
foot apart, facing inward) Like this...this far away...(video paused)

Trish Wood: Homolka is lying to police. A videotape of the assault recovered later,
(Voiceover) clearly shows Homolka holding the soaked cloth either very close to or
directly on Tammy's face.

(Footage of Tammy Homolka's casket)

Trish Wood: The coroner's report, done when Tammy's body was exhumed, makes
(Voiceover) that lie especially significant. The report suggests, among other things,
that she may have been smothered during the application of Halothane to
her face. A condition of Homolka's deal was that she not stop the life of
any of the girls.

INTERVIEW

(Interview: Trish Wood with Vince Bevan)

Trish Wood: Why didn't you have those facts available for the sentencing?

Vince Bevan: This...nothing turned on it, there was no, nothing material that was going to change what happened with Homolka, as the result of the exhumation of Tammy's body.

Trish Wood: But I thought her deal stipulated that if she stopped the breath of any of the girls, the deal was off.

Vince Bevan: Mm-hmm. (Nods)

Trish Wood: So, he's saying it looks like she stopped the breath of her sister.

Vince Bevan: Contributed to her death.

Trish Wood: Not contributing, the report says that Tammy Homolka died as a result of the aspiration of stomach contents, while unconscious, due to the application of Halcion and Halothane. Who applied the Halothane to Tammy Homolka's face?

Vince Bevan: Karla Homolka. (Nods)

Trish Wood: His other hypothesis is that she could have died of asphyxia due to smothering during the application of some fluid to the face. Who applied the Halothane to Tammy Homolka's face?

Vince Bevan: Karla Homolka.

Trish Wood: What he's suggesting is that Karla Homolka did stop the breath of her sister.

Vince Bevan: I don't think that's what he's saying.

Trish Wood: Six weeks after Tammy's death, Karla wrote this letter to a friend...
(Voiceover)

DRAMATIC RE-ENACTMENT

(Karla Homolka actor sitting at her desk writing)

Female Voiceover: Dear Deb, Fuck my parents! First, they took away half the wedding money, then they kicked us out. My father doesn't even want us to have a wedding anymore. Screw that! We're having a good time. If my father wants to sit at home and be miserable, he's welcome to. He's only worked a day since Tammy died, he's wallowing in his own misery and fucking me!

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Dr. Andrew Malcolm)

Dr. Malcolm: It's just appalling. It appears to me to be absolutely callous, and totally unconcerned about the fact that her sister had died significantly through her own actions only a couple months earlier. She doesn't care that her father is grieving about the loss of his daughter. This is really quite a shocking thing.

Trish Wood: And there's no remorse in there about Tammy, I mean it's just...

Dr. Malcolm: There's no remorse about Tammy, in this letter whatsoever.

Trish Wood: Do you wish you'd seen that before?

Dr. Malcolm: Sure, I do.

Trish Wood: But does it make you more concerned about what might've been going on, inside the head of that young woman?

Dr. Malcolm: It may have made it a little easier for her to be a perfect follower for this particular sadist, because she's already along that direction herself.

DRAMATIC RE-ENACTMENT

(Karla Homolka actor writing a letter)

Female Voiceover: Dear Christy, I'm cooperating with the police fully, they're being very nice to me and treating me like the victim I am...

(Police footage of Karla Homolka in her house with the police)

Karla Homolka: God it feels weird to be back in here.

Trish Wood: The victim was matter-of-fact when she toured police through her (Voiceover) Bayview Avenue home, where two teenagers were murdered. She had chosen to dress as a schoolgirl. Homolka's response to being back in one of the rooms where Leslie Mahaffy was attacked, was to ask police about her furniture.

Karla Homolka: Can you answer a question for me? Was any of the furniture damaged as the result of the investigation?

Police: Not that I'm aware of. No.

Karla Homolka: Okay. Good. 'Cause I'm asking for it.

Trish Wood: And upstairs in the bathroom where they cleansed Kristen French's body (Voiceover) of evidence, Homolka inquired after her perfume samples.

Karla Homolka: But I don't have any of that stuff.

Police: Do you know where all of those articles went?

Karla Homolka: Wherever Paul's lawyer took them.

Police: You're saying Paul's lawyer took a number of articles from here?

Karla Homolka: Well, from what I understand, his lawyer took... basically everything.

(Clip of police and Karla Homolka walking down the basement stairs)

Karla Homolka: This is where we carried her down, carried Leslie down the stairs.

Trish Wood: And in the basement where Leslie Mahaffy was dismembered, she had yet
(Voiceover) another inquiry on behalf of her other sister, Lori.

Karla Homolka: Can I ask you a question? Can I have...

Police: I'm afraid I can't answer too many more of your questions.

Karla Homolka: Can I have that book, my sister wants it. Or does it have to stay here?

Police: That has to stay here for now, but we can make those arrangements

Karla Homolka: Okay, thank you...(sound becomes inaudible)

(Image of prison window)

Trish Wood: In July 1993, Karla began serving her sentence at P4W in a segregated
(Voiceover) cell, surrounded by her favorite cartoon characters. Three months into it,
Homolka claimed she remembered another assault, she wrote to her
lawyer about a victim we'll call Jane Doe.

DRAMATIC RE-ENACTMENT

(Karla Homolka actor in a prison cell)

Female Voiceover: Dear George, Hi, I'm having a major problem. I remembered something else, Paul raped Jane Doe, a friend of mine. What I'm really afraid of is that I was more involved than I can remember. I have to tell them, but what if they nail me for this too? Can you do something to make sure they don't? Thanks George, Karla.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Stephen Williams)

Trish Wood: Stephen Williams spent three and a half years reviewing the evidence in (Voiceover) this case. He says Homolka had good reason to be worried.

Stephen Williams: So just before they get married, and before Leslie Mahaffy was kidnapped, two weeks before, she did exactly to Jane Doe, what she did to her sister. Rendered her unconscious, by, with a mixture of Halothane and Halcion. And she calls her, fiancé on his car phone and says, "Come home dear, I have a surprise for you."

(Blurred home video of Jane Doe laying on the floor playing with Buddy, the dog)

Trish Wood: The surprise was the girl in this video, shot by Homolka hours before the (Voiceover) assault. It was the first of two assaults and the one that was Homolka's idea. But she only told police about the second assault, which happened months later and which Bernardo initiated.

ROOM WITH TRISH WOOD

(Television screens are blank)

Trish Wood: Sixteen months after Homolka's deal, Bernardo's original counsel finally
(Voiceover) turned over important evidence against his client. Videotapes documenting the sexual assaults of Tammy Homolka, Leslie Mahaffy and Kristen French. As evidence against Bernardo they were as good as a smoking gun, but they also exposed something sinister about Karla Homolka. In many cases, she appeared to be enjoying herself as she took her turn sexually assaulting the couple's young victims, including Jane Doe. The tapes also suggested Karla's memory lapse about Jane Doe, might have been one of convenience. That she might be guilty of perjury and another sexual assault.

DRAMATIC RE-ENACTMENT

(Karla Homolka actor is writing a letter in her prison cell)

Trish Wood: The Crown's star witness was in trouble, so another psychologist was
(Voiceover) brought in all the way from California. Homolka had showed a remarkable facility for detail, but Dr. Chris Hatcher said she had a form of amnesia as a result of the abuse she had suffered. And the Crown accepted that Homolka had genuinely forgotten about the Jane Doe assault in June.

(Footage of Mary Hall sitting at her desk)

Trish Wood: Even so, she'd committed the assault, and former Crown prosecutor Mary
(Voiceover) Hall thought she should be charged with, among other things, attempted murder.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Mary Hall)

Mary Hall: She could have died. I mean they did the same thing to, to Jane, that they did to Tammy Homolka and we, we all know that Tammy died.

Trish Wood: It does seem, based on the evidence, that Ms. Homolka was driving that train, that she had initiated the assault.

Mary Hall: Quite frankly, her evidence was the same on everything, wasn't it? That "Paul made me do it." (Smiles)

(Footage of the Ministry of Attorney General building, and image of a letter from the Attorney General's office)

Trish Wood: Senior Crown attorneys met several times to determine Homolka's fate, (Voiceover) they decided that although they could charge her with the assault on Jane Doe, that it was in the public interest not to do so now. In this letter to Inspector Vince Bevan, the Attorney General's office explains their decision, saying that charges might suggest that Homolka's initial sentence was inadequate. And charges would also reduce Homolka's effectiveness as a witness.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Vince Bevan)

Trish Wood: Everybody said you wouldn't have made the deal with Ms. Homolka, if you didn't have the videotapes.

Vince Bevan: Mm-hmm. (Nods)

Trish Wood: Now, it looks like she's broken the deal and you've got the videotapes, don't you?

Vince Bevan: Yes. (Nods)

Trish Wood: And yet, you went ahead and made another deal.

Vince Bevan: Mm-hmm. (Nods)

Trish Wood: She wasn't needed as a witness anymore.

Vince Bevan: No. (Shakes head)

Trish Wood: The Crown says that there's little doubt that she would feel that she'd been unfairly dealt with, if she had been charged. Who cares what she thinks?

Vince Bevan: (Nods) Yeah, I agree with you.

Trish Wood: What does that say about the Crown's relationship with Karla Homolka?

Vince Bevan: I don't know, I can't fill you in on that one. (Grins widely)

Trish Wood: Well, you're smiling, but does that disturb you? I mean, you got that letter initially...

Vince Bevan: Going back to the earlier part of our conversation. Did I say I agreed with the advice? (Shakes head in a negative response)

Trish Wood: But you didn't charge her, and you could've?

Vince Bevan: (Nods affirmatively) Nope, yep. There is further information that if a charge was laid, that it would not be proceeded with.

Trish Wood: By the Crown?

Vince Bevan: By the Crown.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Mary Hall)

Trish Wood: Mary Hall suggests the Crown could've handled Homolka very
(Voiceover) differently.

Mary Hall: There's another way of dealing with an accomplice, who gives evidence and that is to try to distance the prosecution from the witness and actually treat that witness with a certain amount of disdain, that members of the jury "I'm sorry I have to call this kind of evidence but we do and..." and call it.

Trish Wood: And not wrapping them in this fuzzy blanket of being a victim.

Mary Hall: Yes.

Trish Wood: That she was a victim too.

Mary Hall: I had some difficulty putting Karla Homolka on that same level, as what I believe were the true victims.

Trish Wood: In the summer of 1995, Karla Homolka testified against Paul Bernardo at
(Voiceover) his trial. Bernardo's Lawyer was John Rosen.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with John Rosen)

John Rosen: I would pound her with, with terrible stuff, and she would get stronger and stronger and stronger. And in the end of it, no one in that room, or anybody following the trial, would ever believe that she suffered from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder, or that she was a battered spouse or that she didn't have the intestinal fortitude to walk out and blow the whistle and save herself, never mind the victims.

Trish Wood: Because the tougher you got, the stronger she got?

John Rosen: Exactly, exactly. And so, the façade was of the victim, of the battered Karla, was stripped away. And the true, tough little girl from St. Catharines was revealed.

ROOM WITH TRISH WOOD

(On the screens were eight different photos of Karla Homolka smiling)

Trish Wood: In March of 1996, Justice Patrick Galligan published what was meant to
(Voiceover) be the last word on what was termed a distasteful but necessary alliance between the Crown and Karla Homolka. He agreed prosecutors behaved properly in not charging her with the attack on Jane Doe, saying, among other things, that it would have damaged her credibility as a witness against Paul Bernardo. It would be saying, he wrote, her credibility was not worth supporting in the first place, a point on which Homolka's critics might agree. Justice Galligan and all of the Crown attorneys who supported Homolka's deal, declined our request for interviews. As did the Crown's psychiatrist, citing a confidentiality agreement, the Crown is still enforcing.

(Image of Homolka sleeping)

Trish Wood: If Homolka wasn't the victim the Crown said she was, then who was she?
(Voiceover) One psychiatrist who examined Homolka said she was "the perfect female accomplice" because of her plea bargain, her role in the deaths of the girls, was never fully explored. *Invisible Darkness*, a book by Stephen Williams, examines what he believes is the true nature of Karla Homolka.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Stephen Williams)

Stephen Williams: I think she was death, desperately afraid of getting caught, and desperately afraid of going to jail. The motivation for these murders, everyone agrees, was not sexual, the only possible motivation was to conceal crimes, there's no one who disagrees with that. What the Crown wants us to believe is that it was Paul Bernardo, who was the murdering force who wanted these girls' dead.

Trish Wood: And you think?

Stephen Williams: And I think it's exactly the opposite. Because, Paul Bernardo had no history of killing anyone to conceal his crimes, he didn't think he would ever get caught.

INTERROGATION ROOM

(Investigators with Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: I said well, we have to go to my parents for, for Easter dinner and he said "well why don't we just...not go" and I said, "Well, I don't think it would look very good, I mean, we're supposed to go to my parents for Easter dinner and we don't go, and I said "well, how's it going to look if this girl's missing and we have no alibi. We haven't gone anywhere, we haven't done anything. And he said, well I guess you're right. And... 'cause he wanted to keep her for longer, and I didn't want to, like I was going to work. I didn't want to go to work knowing this girl was in my house, and she could...escape so easily and I didn't...I was afraid. (Swallows) So...So I didn't suggest to him that we kill her on Sunday, but I knew that she...I knew that she had to...be gone.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with Stephen Williams)

Stephen Williams: When Paul Bernardo was alone with numerous victims and had the opportunity, he never killed any of them. The only time that people ended up dead, is when Paul was in the presence of his wife. I don't know who did the killing, I do know that women and men are equally capable of doing evil and doing wrong and that in this particular instance, I'm not so certain that that fact was appreciated.

INTERVIEW

(Trish Wood with George Walker)

Trish Wood: It was justice served in your view this case?

George Walker: Yes.

Trish Wood: Three dead girls.

George Walker: (Nods) Yes. Three dead girls.

Trish Wood: She could've helped them and didn't.

George Walker: Yes.

Trish Wood: Involved in the death of her sister.

George Walker: Mm-hmm.

Trish Wood: Could have stopped it.

George Walker: (Nods affirmatively)

Trish Wood: Didn't.

George Walker: Mm-hmm. (Bites lip and nods)

Trish Wood: Is that justice what she got?

George Walker: Well, do you want to talk in terms of retribution? I, I...and I'll be criticized for it, but I do believe that justice was served.

Trish Wood: So does Karla Homolka, who will be released from prison less than 4
(Voiceover) years from now under mandatory supervision. She's considered a model prisoner, and according to her psychiatric reports, poses no danger to the public.

(Image of a smiling Karla Homolka)

Karla Homolka: He was already talking about going out and doing it again, and, I said
(audiotaped) there's no way I'm going through another murder again, no way. My parents, he, the lease on the car was running out, my parents were going to co-sign a loan for \$10,000. I was going to do something before that loan was co-signed. Before he made me go through, to murder another girl. There was no way I was going to go through either of those... events.

ROOM WITH GILLIAN FINDLEY

(The television screen has the CBC symbol and "The Fifth Estate" logo)

Gillian Findley: That's our show for this week, for everyone here at The Fifth Estate, I'm Gillian Findley.

[CREDITS]

Appendix D: Chronology for the Karla Homolka & Paul Bernardo Events

August 27, 1964	Paul Bernardo is born and lives in Scarborough, Ontario.
May 4, 1970	Karla Homolka is born and lives in St. Catharines, Ontario.
May 4, 1987 – April 6, 1991	Bernardo commits a series of sexual assaults against women around Scarborough, Ontario.
October 17, 1987	Homolka attends a pet store conference and meets Bernardo in a hotel restaurant in Scarborough.
Summer 1989	Homolka befriends Jane Doe, while working in a pet store.
December 5, 1989	Homolka starts her job as Veterinary Technician at Martindale Animal Clinic.
December 24, 1989	Homolka and Bernardo are engaged.
May 27, 1990	Composite sketches of the Scarborough Rapist, which bear a strong facial resemblance to Bernardo, begin to appear in the Toronto Star.
July 1990	Homolka, with help from Bernardo, drugs her younger sister Tammy by serving spaghetti laced with Valium stolen from Homolka's workplace. Bernardo sexually violates Tammy but stops when she suddenly regains consciousness.
Autumn 1990	Homolka and Bernardo discuss stealing anesthetics to facilitate the sexual assault of Tammy.
November 20, 1990	Bernardo is interviewed by Metropolitan Toronto police as part of the investigation into the Scarborough Rapist. Hair, blood, and saliva samples are taken voluntarily from Bernardo.

December 1990	Homolka steals Halcion and Halothane from her workplace.
December 23, 1990	Homolka and Bernardo lace Tammy's drinks with drugs from Homolka's work. Bernardo and Homolka take turns sexually assaulting an unconscious Tammy. Tammy chokes on her own vomit and dies. The coroner rules her death an accident.
December 27, 1990	Tammy's funeral.
December 28, 1990	Homolka is ordered by Bernardo to obtain more Halcion. Homolka claims she has insomnia to Dr. Valerie Jaeger, who provides a Halcion prescription.
January 12-16, 1991	Bernardo picks up a young female hitchhiker, brings her back to Homolka's parents' home while they are away, and rapes her. The woman leaves the home alive.
Mid-January 1991	Homolka's parents ask Bernardo to move out of their home.
February 1, 1991	Homolka and Bernardo move into 57 Bayview Drive, Port Dalhousie.
March 25, 1991	Homolka visits Dr. Jaeger to get a Halcion prescription for her insomnia. Homolka claims that the drugs were ordered by Bernardo.
June 6-7, 1991	Jane Doe (Real name concealed) spends the night at the Homolka-Bernardo home. The couple drug (with Halcion) and sexually assault Doe.
June 14-16, 1991	Homolka and Bernardo sexually assault and murder Leslie Mahaffy.
June 17-18, 1991	Homolka and Bernardo dismember Mahaffy's and encase the body parts in eight concrete slabs. They dispose the body in Lake Gibson, Ontario.

June 29, 1991	Homolka and Bernardo are married. Homolka finds out that Bernardo is the Scarborough Rapist. Mahaffy's body parts are found at Lake Gibson.
August 10, 1991	Homolka drug and sexually assault Doe with Bernardo at their home. Doe stops breathing and Homolka dials 911 but cancels the call shortly after. Doe leaves the residence alive.
April 16-19, 1992	Homolka and Bernardo kidnap Kristen French. They sexually violate, murder, and leave her naked body in a ditch near Burlington, Ontario with her hair cut off.
April 30, 1992	French's naked body is discovered.
May 12, 1992	Police interview Bernardo at his home.
June 19, 1992	Homolka leaves Bernardo but returns when he threatens to expose her role in Tammy's death.
December 1992	Centre of Forensic Sciences conducts DNA tests on the samples Bernardo voluntarily provided in 1990.
January 5, 1993	Bernardo beats Homolka with a flashlight that causes her two black eyes. She leaves their home and goes to the hospital. She files charges against him.
January 9, 1993	Homolka is discharged from the hospital and goes to live with her aunt and uncle.
February 1, 1993	The Centre of Forensic Sciences advises police that there is a match between Bernardo's DNA and some of the Scarborough rapes.
February 3, 1993	Police start their 24-hour surveillance of Bernardo.

February 5-13, 1993 Homolka meets with police on February 9, 1993. They interview Homolka with her lawyer and aunt. She states that Bernardo is the Scarborough Rapist and responsible for the deaths of French and Mahaffy. Homolka has her lawyer seek immunity. Total immunity is refused.

February 16, 1993 Police interview Doe as a possible witness.

February 17, 1993 Police arrest Bernardo. They violate Bernardo's charter rights by not allowing him to call a lawyer despite his repeated requests, which makes his initial 8-hour interrogation inadmissible as evidence.

February 19, 1993 Police have a 71-day search warrant for the couple's home. Police find a video showing Homolka sexually assaulting an unconscious female. They fail to find videotapes of the sexual assaults of Mahaffy, French, Tammy and other victims.

March 5, 1993 Homolka is admitted to Northwestern General Hospital in Toronto for a psychiatric assessment by Dr. Hans Arnd. She remains in the hospital until April 23, 1993.

April 30, 1993 The search warrant for the Homolka-Bernardo Bayview home expires.

May 6, 1993 Bernardo's lawyer, Ken Murray, gains access to the Bayview home and retrieves the home videotapes of the sexual assaults hid above a ceiling light fixture in the upstairs bathroom. Murray holds onto the tapes for 16 months.

May 14, 1993 Crown prosecutors finalize their plea deal with Homolka's lawyer. Homolka provides a detailed statement to police.

May 15-17, 1993 Homolka gives cautioned statements to the police.

May 18, 1993	Police arrest Homolka. Police charge her with 2 counts of manslaughter, waives her right to a preliminary hearing, and commits her for trial. She is freed on bail.
May 19, 1993	Police charge Bernardo of 2 counts of 1 st -degree murder for Mahaffy and French, and 1 count of indignity to a body.
June 17, 1993	Homolka gives police a “tour” of the Bayview home.
June 28, 1993	Homolka’s trial begins.
July 5, 1993	Justice Frances Kovacs imposes a ban on publication of the trial details and plea bargain to ensure a fair trial for Bernardo. Some media organizations oppose the ban.
July 6, 1993	Homolka pleads guilty and sentenced to 12-years in prison at the Prison for Women in Kingston, Ontario.
October 6, 1993	Homolka writes about Doe to her lawyer George Walker. He, with her permission, provides the letter to the police.
December 6, 1993	Homolka discloses to police her recollection of the sexual assault on Doe and making a 911 call.
February 2, 1994	Police interview Homolka on the sexual assault of Doe.
February – March 1994	Police interview Homolka for 5-weeks to prepare her for the preliminary hearing on charges against Bernardo.
March 30, 1994	Attorney General files a preferred indictment against Bernardo for the murders.
April 4, 1994	Preliminary hearing for Bernardo is cancelled and to be replaced by preferred indictment.

May 2, 1994	Attorney General files preferred indictments against Bernardo for the Scarborough rapes, manslaughter of Tammy, and sexual assaults on Doe and another victim.
May 4, 1994	Bernardo pleads not guilty to the 9 charges, and the trial was originally set to begin this day but ends up being delayed to May 18, 1995.
May 30, 1994	Murray cross-examines Homolka till July 1994.
September 2-12, 1994	Murray applies and is granted to withdraw from the case. He hands over the Homolka-Bernardo videotapes to Jack Rosen, Bernardo's new lawyer.
September 22, 1994	Rosen turns over the videotapes to the police.
September 28 – October 6, 1994	Police review the Homolka-Bernardo videotapes in detail.
February 8, 1995	Police tell Homolka's lawyer that they will seek advice as to possible criminal charges against Homolka for Doe.
February 20, 1995	Police interview Homolka about Doe's sexual assault and show her the relevant videotape.
May 1, 1995	Jury selection for Bernardo's trial begins.
May 18, 1995	Bernardo's trial begins. Police decide, in the public interest, to not lay charges on Homolka for crimes against Doe.
June 19, 1995	Homolka starts testifying against Bernardo at his trial.
September 1, 1995	Bernardo is found guilty and convicted of 2 counts of 1 st -degree murder for French and Mahaffy. He appeals.

September 15, 1995	Bernardo is sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole for 25-years.
November 3, 1995	The justice system declares Bernardo as a dangerous offender and detains him in a penitentiary for an indefinite time.
March 1996	A Homolka report is published called “The Galligan Report”.
April 1996	Judge Kovacs rules that the Homolka-Bernardo home videotapes, showing the sexual crimes of the victims, will be destroyed once they are no longer needed for legal purposes.
July 1996	A Bernardo report is published called “The Campbell Report”.
September 1996	Stephen Williams publishes <i>Invisible Darkness</i> . His “true crime” account of the Bernardo-Homolka case.
January 1997	Failing to turn over the Homolka-Bernardo videotapes, the police charge Murray with obstruction of justice, conspiracy to obstruct justice, possession of child pornography, making obscene materials for withholding, and copying the tapes.
Summer 1997	Homolka is transferred to Joliette Institution in Quebec due to the scheduled closure of Kingston Prison for Women.
November 25, 1997	Canadian Broadcasting Company’s (CBC) <i>The Fifth Estate</i> airs a true crime episode with host Trish Wood, called “Karla Homolka”.
February 1988	Mahaffy and French families seek a permanent ban on the publication and broadcasting of the couple’s videotapes. The Ontario Court Appeal rules against the families.
March 2000	The Ontario Court of Appeal dismiss Bernardo’s request for a new trial.

June 13, 2000	Murray is acquitted of all charges for his failure to turn over the Homolka-Bernardo videotapes.
September 21, 2000	The Supreme Court of Canada deny Bernardo the leave to appeal.
October 9, 2000	Homolka is transferred to the Saskatoon maximum-security prison for a psychiatric examination.
January 2001	Homolka is transferred to the Montreal psychiatric hospital to undergo treatment.
December 2001	6 of the Homolka-Bernardo videotapes are destroyed, which depicts the sexual assaults of the victims.
December 16, 2004	As ruled by the National Parole Board, Homolka must stay in prison for her full term.
July 4, 2005	Homolka is released after serving 12-years in prison. Homolka grants an interview to Société Radio-Canada (SRC), CBC's French language service, in Montreal.
July 5, 2005	Bernardo, through his lawyer, reveals that Homolka attempted to kill Mahaffy to prevent her from identifying them after they sexually assaulted her. Bernardo states that his intention was to release Mahaffy.
August 2005	Homolka works for a hardware store in Longueuil, Quebec. Homolka quits her job and goes into hiding after her boss, Richer Lapointe, reveals Homolka's location to media.
November 30, 2005	Justice James Brunton lifts 14 restrictions imposed on Homolka under provisions of the Criminal Code.

January 20, 2006	The movie, <i>Karla</i> , opens in theatres across Canada, which is based on the Homolka-Bernardo crimes.
December 17, 2007	Homolka, her husband (married sometime in 2005) and son leave Canada to live in the Caribbean.
June 16, 2010	Canadian Senate passes a bill that prevents criminals like Homolka from applying for a pardon.
2014	Homolka moves back to Canada with her family (husband and three children), where she resides in Chateauguay, a suburb of Montreal. She is also known as Leanne Teale and Leanne Bordelais.
2016	Chateauguay residents express their concern over Homolka living in their town.
October 17, 2018	National Parole Board officials deny Bernardo's bid for parole.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AP News. “Prosecutors Cross-Examine Bernardo, Who Says He Enjoyed Raping Teen.” August 16, 1995. Accessed on January 7, 2022.

<https://apnews.com/article/41b992df5c5ccbd16c2df86eade20426>.

Aristotle. “The Rhetoric.” *Rhetoric and on Poetics*, Ed. Friedrich Solmsen. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. Franklin, Pennsylvania: The Franklin Library, 1954.

Barr, Jeremy and Elahe Izadi. “How Geraldo Rivera, the sensationalist showman of ’80s TV, became the voice of election reason on Fox News.” *The Washington Post*. Accessed on June 4, 2022. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/media/2020/12/17/geraldo-rivera-fox-news-voice-of-election-reason/>.

Bindman, Stephen. “Homolka trial details spread through Ontario despite ban”. *The Gazette*. Montreal, December 29, 1993. Accessed on January 6, 2022.

<https://www.newspapers.com/clip/86796494/the-gazette/>.

Bitzer, Lloyd. “The Rhetorical Situation”. *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1, no. 1 (1968): 1-14.

Black, Edwin. “The Second Persona”. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 56, no. 2 (1970): 109-119.

“Broadcasting Act.” Minister of Justice. Accessed on January 5, 2022. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/B-9.01.pdf>.

Brown, Barry. “Graphic Video Shows Sexual Activity Between Bernardo, Ex-Wife.” *The Buffalo News*. June 2, 1995. Accessed on January 7, 2022.

https://buffalonews.com/news/graphic-video-shows-sexual-activity-between-bernardo-ex-wife/article_3e3d8acc-63c8-50de-ad44-53b2fd1bd016.html.

---. "Homolka testifies she thought raping sister would not kill her." *The Buffalo News*. July 6, 1995. Accessed on January 7, 2022. https://buffalonews.com/news/homolka-testifies-she-thought-raping-sister-would-not-kill-her/article_88a43936-f08d-5c75-b274-bd2d97730568.html.

Brummett, Barry. *Rhetoric in Popular Culture*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications, 2015.

Boxer, Aviva. "Ex-wife's Testimony in sex case ends." *United Press International*. July 14, 1995. Accessed on January 7, 2022. <https://www.upi.com/Archives/1995/07/14/Ex-wifes-testimony-in-sex-case-ends/6139805694400/>.

Burke, Kenneth. *Dramatism and Development*. Clark University Press, 1972.

---. *Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1945.

---. *Language as Symbolic Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

---. *Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

---. *Attitudes towards History*, 2nd rev. ed. Los Altos: Hermes Publications (1959): 254-256.

---. *The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941.

Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership*. Open Road Media, 2012.

Cameron, Jamie. *Victim Privacy and the Open Court Principle*. Government of Canada: Department of Justice Canada. Accessed on January 6, 2022. https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/cj-jp/victim/rr03_vic1/rr03_vic1.pdf.

- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC). “CBC Annual Report 1996-1997.” Accessed on January 5, 2022. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/radio-canada-cbc/BC1-1997-1-eng.pdf.
- . “Identification of Interviewees.” Accessed December 5, 2021. <https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/vision/governance/journalistic-standards-and-practices>.
- . “When CBC news took to the air,” Accessed on January 5, 2022. <https://www.cbc.ca/archives/when-cbc-radio-took-to-the-air-1.4884273>.
- . “Notes to Financial Statements: For the year ended March 31, 1998,” CBC Annual Report 1997-1998. Accessed January 5, 2022. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2013/radio-canada-cbc/BC1-1998-5-eng.pdf.
- . “Ombudsman.” Accessed December 5, 2021. <https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/ombudsman>.
- . “Program Policies: 1.1.6 Violence in Programming”. Accessed December 5, 2021. <https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/vision/governance/programming-policies>.
- . “The Fifth Estate About the Show.” Accessed December 5, 2021, <https://www.cbc.ca/mediacentre/program/the-fifth-estate>.
- . “The Fifth Estate: Karla Homolka.” Aired November 25, 1997. Accessed July 12, 2020, <https://www.cbc.ca/player/play/2653449772>.
- . “The story of The Fifth Estate: The Early Years Page 1.” Accessed on January 5, 2022. <https://www.cbc.ca/fifth/history/early.html>.
- . “The story of The Fifth Estate: The Early Years Page 2.” Accessed on January 5, 2022. <https://www.cbc.ca/fifth/history/earlytwo.html>.

---. "Through the Years." Accessed January 5, 2022. <https://cbc.radio-canada.ca/en/your-public-broadcaster/history>.

Chidley, Joe. "The Homolka Enigma." *Maclean's*. June 26, 1995. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://archive.macleans.ca/article/1995/6/26/the-homolka-enigma>.

Cress, Stacy, and Kevin D. Rapert. "Talk Show Viewing Motives: Does Gender Make a Difference?" *Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association*. San Diego, 1996.

Crosbie, Lynn. "Women who love to kill too much: back to school with Karla Homolka". *This Magazine* 28, no. 3 (September 1994): 54-57. Accessed January 6, 2022. <http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/magazines/women-who-love-kill-too-much-back-school-with/docview/203558630/se-2?accountid=14739>.

Democrat and Chronicle. "In the tale of evil, even Cinderella was a ghoul." Rochester, New York. November 25, 1993. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/5392021/democrat-and-chronicle/>.

Heir, Sean. "Almost famous: Peter Woodcock, media framing, and obscurity in the cultural construction of a serial killer." *Crime, Media, Culture*. 16 (2020): 375-394. Accessed June 4, 2022. doi:[10.1177/1741659019874171](https://doi.org/10.1177/1741659019874171).

Jenish, D'Arcy. "Karla Homolka faces the heat." *Macleans*. July 17, 1995. Accessed January 6, 2022. <http://archive.macleans.ca/article/1995/7/17/karla-homolka-faces-the-heat>.

---. "The two faces of Karla Homolka". *Maclean's*. June 12, 1995. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://archive.macleans.ca/article/1995/6/12/the-two-faces-of-karla-homolka>.

---. "Tragic entertainment." *Maclean's*. November 21, 1994. Accessed January 6, 2022. <https://archive.macleans.ca/article/1994/11/21/tragic-entertainment>.

Encyclopedia.com. "Wood, Trish." Contemporary Authors. Accessed January 5, 2022.
<https://www.encyclopedia.com/arts/educational-magazines/wood-trish>.

Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism*, 3rd ed. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, 2004.

Fox News Network. "Geraldo Rivera." Accessed on June 4, 2022.
<https://www.foxnews.com/person/r/geraldo-rivera>.

Fullerton, Romyne Smith. "Representing the Reprehensible: Fairy Tales, News Stories & the Monstrous Karla." *Atlantis*. 2006. Accessed on November 25, 2021.
<https://journals.msvu.ca/index.php/atlantis/article/view/742>.

Galligan, Patrick T. "Report to the Attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka." Toronto: Ministry of the Attorney General, 1996.

Garofalo, Mary. "Teale on Trial." *A Current Affair*. Aired July 26, 1994, on Fox Television.

Grint, Keith. *Leadership: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: OUP, 2010.

Hart, Roderick, and Suzanne Daughton. *Modern Rhetorical Criticism*. New York: Pearson Education, 2005.

"History of Witches". *History*. A&E Television Networks. 1997. Accessed on January 8, 2022.
<https://www.history.com/topics/folklore/history-of-witches>.

Hughes, Sarah. "American Monsters: Tabloid Media and the Satanic Panic, 1970–2000." *Journal of American Studies* 51, no. 3 (2017): 691–719.
doi:10.1017/S0021875816001298.

Kotter, John P. *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*. New York: London: Free Press; Collier Macmillan, 1990.

---. *Accelerate: Building Strategic Agility for a Faster-Moving World*. Harvard Business Review Press, 2014.

Kilty, Jennifer M. And Sylvie Frigon. "Karla Homolka – From a Woman in Danger to a Dangerous Woman: Chronicling the Shifts." *Women and Criminal Justice* 17, no. 4 (2006): 37-61.

MacQueen, Ken. "Deliver us from evil." *The Ottawa Citizen*. Ottawa, Ontario. September 2, 1995. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/52899076/the-ottawa-citizen/>.

Mathews, David. "Revisiting the Satanic Panic television specials of the 1980s and '90s". *Splinter*. October 29, 2015. Accessed June 4, 2022. <https://splinternews.com/revisiting-the-satanic-panic-television-specials-of-the-1793852408>.

McGillivray, Anne. "A moral vacuity in her which is difficult if not impossible to explain': law, psychiatry and the remaking of Karla Homolka." *International Journal of the Legal Profession* 5, no. 2/3 (1998): 255-288.

"Most trusted Brand in Canada Gustavson School of Business University of Victoria". Media Solutions. Accessed January 5, 2022. <https://solutionsmedia.cbrc.ca/en/news/cbc-named-most-trusted-media-entertainment-brand/>.

Murray, M.A. "34. Child-Sacrifice Among European Witches." *Man* 18 (1918): 60-62. Accessed January 6, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2788189>.

Nanaimo Daily Free Press. "Homolka's life: Mickey Mouse posters and watching Donahue." September 12, 1994 Accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17672703/nanaimo-daily-news/>.

- . "Homolka not a cold-blooded killer." Nanaimo, British Columbia, September 21, 1995. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17684342/nanaimo-daily-news/>.
- Nanaimo Daily News. "Bernardo Did This To Karla: Crown." British Columbia. June 1, 1995. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17683929/nanaimo-daily-news/>.
- . "Bernardo linked to stalkings." September 1, 1995. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17672897/nanaimo-daily-news/>.
- . "Finally Karla had her say." November 16, 1995. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17685250/nanaimo-daily-news/>.
- . "Homolka's stories lies to appear a victim: Bernardo." August 22, 1995. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <https://www.newspapers.com/clip/17669121/nanaimo-daily-news/>.
- Nemeth, Mary and Anne Marie Owens. "Bride and Groom". *Maclean's*. July 19, 1993. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://archive.macleans.ca/article/1993/7/19/bride-and-groom>.
- Northouse, Peter G. *Leadership: Theory and Practice*, 6th ed. LA: Sage, 2013. 10-11.
- Ott, Brian and Robert L. Mack. *Critical Media Studies: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- Pace, April. "Serial killers in popular media: A content analysis of sensationalism and support for capital punishment." Online Theses and Dissertations. 2019. <https://encompass.eku.edu/etd/637>.
- Paquet, Lili. "Literary Forensic Rhetoric: Maps, Emotional Assent, and Rhetorical Space in Serial and Making a Murderer." *Law and Humanities*, 12, no. 1 (2018): 71-92.

Powell, Larry. "Geraldo Rivera." Encyclopedia Britannica. Accessed January 13, 2022.

<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Geraldo-Rivera>.

Pron, Nick. "Court of appeal lets media fight Homolka ban but final decision must await ruling by Supreme Court: [MET] edition". *Toronto Star*, February 2, 1994. Accessed on January 6, 2022. <http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/court-appeal-lets-media-fight-homolka-ban-final/docview/437009866/se-2?accountid=14739>.

---. "Media Try to Clarify Homolka Evidence Ban: [AM Edition]". *Toronto Star*, September 24, 1993. Accessed on January 6, 2022.

<http://cyber.usask.ca/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/newspapers/media-try-clarify-homolka-evidence-ban/docview/436903211/se-2?accountid=14739>.

Rivera, Geraldo. "Manson: Psycho." *Geraldo*. Investigative News Group, Tribune Entertainment, May 9, 1988. Accessed July 12, 2020. <http://index.geraldo.com/page/manson-psycho>.

Rivera, Geraldo. "Geraldo," accessed June 4, 2022, <http://www.geraldo.com>.

Senate, Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications.

Evidence, no. 2, session 2, 41st Parliament, February 11, 2014 (Konrad von Finckenstein).

Shade, Leslie Regan. "Desperately Seeking Karla: The Case of alt.fan.karla.homolka."

Proceedings of the Canadian Association for Information Science, 22nd Annual Conference.

McGill University, May 25-27, 1994. Accessed on January 7, 2022.

<https://groups.csail.mit.edu/mac/classes/6.805/articles/desperately-seeking-karla.html>.

Simonetto, Deanna Elizabeth. "Who is Karla Homolka? A Case of Media Identity Transformation." 49, no. 4 (2011); 2277.

Swardson, Anne. "Unspeakable Crimes." *Washington Post*. Washington, DC. November 23, 1993. Accessed January 6, 2022.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/lifestyle/1993/11/23/unspeakable-crimes/0b5070a4-37e0-45b5-b5c6-629db0fee5a6/>.

Telecommunications Research Group. "Research Project on Regionalisation of CBC-TV Programming." Government of Canada. March 31, 1975. Accessed on January 5, 2022. https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2020/isde-ised/Co24/Co24-341-1975-eng.pdf.

"Time for Change: The CBC/Radio-Canada in the Twenty-first Century." Senate, Proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications. Accessed January 5, 2022. <https://sencanada.ca/content/sen/Committee/412/trcm/rep/rep14jul15-e.pdf>.

Thompson, Jim, dir. *Geraldo*, "Manson: Psycho." Aired May 9, 1988, on Tribune Entertainment. <http://index.eraldo.com/page/manson-psycho>.

Wiest, Julie B. "Casting Cultural Monsters: Representations of Serial Killers in U.S. and U.K. News Media." *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 27, no. 4, 2016.

William M. Keith and Christian O. Lundberg, *The Essential Guide to Rhetoric*, Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008.

Williams, Stephen. *Invisible Darkness: the strange case of Paul Bernardo and Karla Homolka*, Toronto: Little Brown Book and Co., 1996.

Wood, Trish. "Trish Wood Is Critical". Accessed June 16, 2021. <https://www.trishwoodpodcast.com/>.

Vipond, Mary. "The Beginnings of Public Broadcasting in Canada: The CRBC, 1932-1936." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 19, no. 2 (February 1994).