

Karla Homolka - A Threat to Society

Amelia MacGregor

IDP4U Honours Thesis

December 22, 2005

Cotey, Melnyk, Nicholson, Chong

Karla Homolka was the beautiful girlfriend, wife and assistant to the notorious Paul Bernardo. Together they raped, tortured and caused the death of teenage girls Tammy Homolka, Kristen French and Leslie Mahaffy; and sexually assaulted a number of other young women. Homolka and Bernardo both had abnormal sexual desires and many of the things they thought of as pleasurable were illegal. In January of 1993, after being severely beaten by Bernardo, Homolka fled to a nearby hospital, marking the end of their relationship. Not long after, the press and justice system were set on fire when she reported Bernardo as being the Scarborough Rapist. The Crown was unable to find enough evidence to convict Bernardo, so after extended deliberation it was decided to make the “deal with the devil” - an arrangement that established Homolka as an assistant in convicting Bernardo in return for a more lenient sentence. Karla Homolka was legally obliged to lead police to evidence in order to convict her ex-husband. She would be granted a maximum prison time of twelve years if she held up her end of the deal, which included the absolute testimony against Bernardo in a court of law.

On July 4<sup>th</sup>, 2005, a Correctional Service of Canada representative said, “As of today, Karla Teale Homolka is no longer under the jurisdiction of the Correctional Service of Canada”<sup>1</sup>; Karla Homolka is a now free woman. Was this decision made by the Crown wise and does she still pose a threat in society? Homolka’s participation in the murders and rapes with Paul Bernardo and subsequent use of her knowledge of the crimes for her own benefit clearly exposes her as a cunning and manipulative woman who, is still a threat in society to re-offend. Ultimately, Karla Homolka’s participation in

---

<sup>1</sup> Correctional Service of Canada. New Release: Warrant Expiry Date (WED) Release of Karla Teale (Homolka). July 4 2005.

the crimes, were her choice. She used her knowledge of the crimes for her own benefit and considering Homolka's actions and behaviour throughout her prison sentence, officials realized she needed restrictions placed on her for the safety of society.

*Learned helplessness*, is a term used to describe a biological response of an organism to the repeated and unpredictable exposure to a painful stimuli. Karla Homolka was diagnosed with some of the signs of this condition by Dr. Malcom, after expressing feelings of powerlessness, passivity, and diminished capacity to solve problems<sup>2</sup>. It has been said that Karla Homolka's actions were a reaction to the abuse and manipulation of Paul Bernardo, and that she is merely a confused victim of Bernardo's sick games. Yet, as stated on a women's advocacy site, almost all women in abusive relationships are diagnosed with "Learned Helplessness", yet only a very small percentage commit acts of murder or sexual assault<sup>3</sup>, therefore this does not give Karla Homolka an excuse for her actions with Paul Bernardo.

Karla Homolka's lawyer stated that she experienced social isolation, threats of death to self and family, exhaustion, humiliation, and administration of intoxicating substances<sup>4</sup>, all of which resulted in a diminished level of self-control, which were holding her from making wise decisions. However, it is a fact that throughout their relationship, Karla Homolka held a full time position as a veterinary assistant at Thorold Veterinary Clinic, and later Martindale Animal Clinic<sup>5</sup>. It is obvious that right through Homolka's career there would have been numerous occasions where she could have spoken to someone to get assistance in her situation. Paul Bernardo was not constantly

---

<sup>2</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka"(p.78)

<sup>3</sup> Womens Rural Advocacy Programs. Why women stay – The barriers to leaving. [www.letswrap.com]

<sup>4</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka"(p.78)

<sup>5</sup> "Bernardo/Homolka timeline" CBC News Online. [www.cbc.ca/news/background/bernardo/](http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/bernardo/). (9 Sept.2005)

with her to withhold her from escaping his grip; therefore Homolka was not socially isolated. Her positions at the clinics were windows into society, and she chose not use those opportunities. To address the family death threats that Paul Bernardo threatened her with: Homolka's own sister, Tammy had already died from Bernardo's and Homolka's foolish, illegal and irresponsible behaviour, what more would Bernardo do? It is reasonable to assume that he would not have murdered more members of Homolka's family since it would have definitely attracted the attention of officials. Yes, Karla Homolka suffered in many negative situations and from many harmful actions, yet she was not isolated and definitely could have reached out for help.

It can be concluded that Karla Homolka had been exposed to Bernardo's actions of violence so often and repeatedly that she became numb to the height of these offences, a condition that has been named "Acceptable Violence". This condition is defined as, when violent actions are exposed to a person slowly over time, the person then becomes numb to the abusive patterns and is unable to recognize the set pattern and escalation of abuse.<sup>6</sup> However, Paul Bernardo asked for Homolka's hand in marriage after they caused the death of Tammy Homolka and the brutal murder of Leslie Mahaffy. Homolka accepted the proposal and they were united on June 29, 1991, in the beautiful town of Niagara on the Lake, and after the wedding they rode off in an intricate, luxurious white horse-drawn carriage. It was a truly beautiful wedding for two very undeserving people. Karla Homolka, in accepting Paul Bernardo's proposal was accepting the life and actions of Paul to be a part of her life. She made the choice to accept his actions; therefore she is responsible for her actions while with him. Women's advocacy argues that it is a simplistic ideal to expect a battered woman to leave or refuse the demands of an abuser<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Galligan, the Hon P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka"(p. 77)

<sup>7</sup> Woman's Rural Advocacy Programs. Why women stay – The barriers to leaving. [www.letswrap.com]

since there may be many emotional and financial ties. Despite this, Homolka had a job, a loving family therefore she did not need to stay Bernardo.

These arguments all involve Karla Homolka's emotional and mental state after she left Paul, along with her life with Paul. The evidence on acceptable violence and the simplistic expectation is taken directly from Women's Rural Advocacy program, a website which is a cooperative of Domestic Violence and Criminal Justice Intervention programs serving south-western Minnesota. One of the services offered to battered women is providing information about their situation, options and rights. The website was developed as an extension of that service. The psychological evidence was taken from a government report addressed to the attorney general, which included many doctors' and psychiatrists' opinions and diagnoses of Homolka's mental state.

Like many other women in the world, Karla Homolka did undergo severe acts of abuse from her ex-husband Paul Bernardo. Yet, she made her choice to go the next step by submitting herself to his illegal requests and playing a major part in his crimes. Many women in similar situations would have used this as a clear excuse to leave and report to officials. Karla Homolka made her choice in life, now she suffers the consequences.

Karla Homolka is a threat to society because she chose to go through with committing her crimes. While Karla was in the hospital, she was under the care and observation of three doctors. Dr. Malcom, a psychiatrist with forensic experience, found no traces of a psychotic disorder or personality disorder. Still he diagnosed Karla Homolka with *Dysthymia*, an illness that caused her to suffer from sleep disturbances, low self esteem, low energy levels, and feelings of hopelessness. Dysthymia can be treated by psychotherapy, and this condition is found in almost every case of wife abuse.<sup>8</sup>

The question to be asked here is, considering the pervasiveness of spousal abuse, how

---

<sup>8</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka" (p.78)

often do we have cases like Karla Homolka's? It is clear she let the situation run out of control, where many other women would have broken down and taken the situation to an official, doctor or friend. Karla Homolka took her situation to no one.

In Dr. Malcom's medical report, he wrote that Homolka showed no signs of any psychotic disorder and he could not detect the signs of any personality disorder. Dr. Malcom stated:

“She (Karla Homolka) does not show the instability, impulsiveness, and inappropriateness of a person with Borderline Personality Disorder”<sup>9</sup>

Dr. Malcom did guarantee that Karla was struggling with her self image, but he explained that would be due to her total defeat as a citizen, a wife and a family member.

Psychologist, Dr. Long, who worked along with Dr. Malcom stated and agreed that despite depression, emotional withdrawal, severe remorse and dysthymia, Karla Homolka was “technically of sound mind and free of disease of the mind of sufficient severity to cloud her awareness and cause her to be unable to appreciate the nature and quality of her acts”<sup>10</sup>

In an official report, the Honourable Galligan observed that the Supreme Court of Canada recognized the Battered Woman syndrome or dysthymia, in the law of self-defence, yet Galligan notes that the case notices her conduct and cannot excuse or ignore it. Psychological findings meet lay definitions of compulsion but cannot support a legal defence of mental disorder, or give necessity in Homolka's circumstances. Immunity

---

<sup>9</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) “Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka” (p.77)

<sup>10</sup> Galligan, the Hon P.T. (1996) “Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka” (p.80 - 81)

from prosecution relying on dysthymia, or the Battered Woman syndrome could not be granted.<sup>11</sup>

Karla Homolka's participation, even leadership, in the videotaped acts is proved by her dialogue, her maintenance in her "happy marriage", her lack of visible injury until the end of the relationship and numerous slippages and inadequacies in the explanatory aspect of her testimony<sup>12</sup>. This proves that Homolka knew what she was doing, her mind was well at work throughout her life with Paul Bernardo. Homolka was eager to make herself the centre of Bernardo's attention, by being a willing participant in the fulfillment of his desires, no matter how preposterous.

Karla Homolka stood by her lover through the forced sexual intercourse with underage girls; she preformed cunnilingus on victims, and possibly participated in the opening and mutilation of living bodies<sup>13</sup>. Various instruments were used by both Homolka and Bernardo in their victim's torture and death, such as pliers to remove teeth and nails, video cameras to record acts, and a power saw, which was used to dismember Mahaffy's body<sup>14</sup>. Paul Bernardo was known to use his tools to torture his victims until they would agree to perform certain acts for him or Homolka<sup>15</sup>, which proves she stood by during the torture and violence. Homolka's own sister, Tammy Homolka, was given to Bernardo by Homolka for a "Christmas present" on December 23, 1990<sup>16</sup>, because he had asked for Tammy's virginity. On the videotape, Homolka was caught smiling at the

---

<sup>11</sup> Galligan, the Hon P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka" (p.105)

<sup>12</sup> Patricia, Pearson. (1997) *When She was Bad: Violent Women and the Myth of Innocence.*(New York, Random House)

<sup>13</sup> Frank, Davey. (1994) "Karla Web: A cultural investigation of the Mahaffy – French murders" (Viking, Toronto) (p.50)

<sup>14</sup> Frank, Davey. (1994) "Karla Web: A cultural investigation of the Mahaffy – French murders" (Viking, Toronto) (p.57)

<sup>15</sup> Frank, Davey. (1994) "Karla Web: A cultural investigation of the Mahaffy – French murders" (Viking, Toronto) (p.5152 - 153)

<sup>16</sup> Frank, Davey. (1994) "Karla Web: A cultural investigation of the Mahaffy – French murders" (Viking, Toronto) (p.133)

camera while administering halothane to her unconscious sister while Bernardo was sexually violating Tammy. During the period they had Kristen French, Homolka watched as Bernardo forced their victim eat all her hair; an autopsy of Kristen French found her innards caked with her own hair<sup>17</sup>. Karla Homolka's most important part of the crimes and offences was to produce young female friends and acquaintances for Paul's gratification, based on her memory recall<sup>18</sup>.

Evidence shows that Karla Homolka played a huge part in the rapes, tortures and murders of their many victims. She stood by Paul Bernardo through all these acts and continued to live her ordinary public life as a complete lie to hide the true actions that were going on behind closed doors and drawn curtains. Along with evidence from government documents, ideas were taken from Patricia Pearson's book, When She was Bad: Violent Women and the Myth of Innocence. Pearson gave a frightening look at women not as the victims of violence but the perpetrators and aids to it. Pearson, a crime journalist who has written for Harpers and other magazines is dedicated to studying current notions of female aggression and she has uncovered some stunning stories, which she tells in her book.

Karla Homolka was not a victim, despite the fact that she had disorders and suffered from depression. Yet, who would not have in her situation? That is purely a natural human outcome when involved in such acts. Yet, it is ignorant to pronounce her innocent; she clearly acknowledged her actions and accepted them as her life. She is fully responsible for her actions.

It can be viewed that to help make up for all of her horrible acts Karla Homolka committed, she did all she could to assist the police and officials in every way possible.

---

<sup>17</sup> Frank, Davey. (1994) "Karla Web: A cultural investigation of the Mahaffy – French murders" (Viking, Toronto) (p.297-298)

<sup>18</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka" (p.81)

Supposedly, Homolka was determined to do the right thing, after making so many wrong decisions with Paul.

Police needed Karla Homolka's assistance to help accumulate evidence to convict Paul Bernardo of his brutal murders of both Leslie Mahaffy and Kristen French. Even when they had strong evidence on Karla, they decided that Paul would not be convicted without her help. Officials made a decision to offer a Resolution agreement, better known as the 'deal with the devil', so Paul would be convicted. The Resolution Agreement follows:

- A) Induced Statement: Karla was obliged to produce statements to the police; the statement was to be full, complete and truthful. The police must be satisfied with her assistance or else the deal would be terminated. The evidence provided could not be used against her.
- B) Cautioned Statement: Police were allowed to take cautioned statements that could be used as evidence against Karla Homolka in trial.
- C) Other Assistance: Karla Homolka was required to provide ongoing assistance to the police.
- D) Charge, Plea and Sentencing: It was set out that Karla would be charged with two accounts of manslaughter; she would plea guilty and would receive a total sentence of twelve years.
- E) Post Sentencing Matters: The resolution agreement obliged Karla Homolka to testify against Paul Bernardo while in custody.
- F) Other Matters: Karla Homolka agreed not to profit from her crimes by participating in the production of any books, movies, or like endeavours.<sup>19</sup>

After being approached with and agreeing to the 'deal with the devil' and understanding that she must aid in prosecuting Paul Bernardo, Karla Homolka assisted the police in the attempt to locate the tapes. She insisted that her ex-husband, Paul

---

<sup>19</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka". (p.91-93)

Bernardo, would not have destroyed them, and she was constant in saying they were hidden away<sup>20</sup>. Karla Homolka voluntarily provided key information regarding the murders of both Kristen French and Leslie Mahaffy at a point in time critical to the police investigation<sup>21</sup>.

Karla Homolka told the police that when concealing Leslie Mahaffy's body in a cement block, Paul had purchased too much concrete. She explained that Paul was very frustrated because he had to bring back the leftovers, and in order to get a full refund he had to disclose his name. Homolka informed the police from where Paul had bought the cement. The police immediately checked and found on June 17, 1991, Paul Bernardo returned a number of bags of cement that matched the kind used to encase Leslie Mahaffy's body<sup>22</sup>.

Again, while on bail Homolka gave information to the police that lead them to finding evidence linking Paul Bernardo to the Kristen French murder and rape. She pointed out an area on the carpet in their old home, where Kristen had vomited once while Paul was raping her. Karla had explained how she scrubbed the rug with many chemicals to ride it of its stain and smell, which was why she remembered the spot so well. Police took the carpet and found deep in the threads, traces of vomit matching Kristen French's DNA and semen matching Paul Bernardo's DNA<sup>23</sup>. It is quite probable that without Karla's assistance, police would not have found this evidence that helped convict Paul.

---

<sup>20</sup> Vince Bevan, Tony Warr. (1995). "Letter of advice to Green Ribbon Task Force" Ministry of the Attorney General. (p.3)

<sup>21</sup> Vince Bevan, Tony Warr. (1995). "Letter of advice to Green Ribbon Task Force" Ministry of the Attorney General. (p.4)

<sup>22</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka" (p.95)

<sup>23</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) "Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters relating to Karla Homolka" (p.96)

It can be argued that since Karla Homolka showed a willingness to help the police and officials, she was sorry for her actions and wanted to assist to help reverse the wrong. Although she did help to convict Paul Bernardo with the rapes and murders of both Leslie Mahaffy and Kristen French, it is more likely she used her knowledge-for her own benefit, leaving out any information that would lead to a harsher punishment on her part. She was in control of the information she told the investigators.

Karla Homolka used her knowledge of the crimes to manipulate the case to go in her favour. Other than Paul Bernardo, she was the only other person involved in the crimes that knew the whole truth. Obviously Homolka did not, and would not want to get herself into more trouble, so naturally she withheld information that would make her guiltier in the eyes of the officials.

Karla Homolka, while on her trial, conveniently could not remember, therefore did not mention Jane Doe – a girl who was sexually assaulted numerous times by both Bernardo and Homolka, yet was never killed and still lives today. Karla Homolka's psychologist did explain that Karla was suffering from repressed and returned memories, due to her battering, and other forms of violence and abuse. If she did not in fact remember the Jane Does assaults, Galligan concludes, then a perjury charge would not succeed and the bargain could not be voided by late disclosure. So Jane Doe was not included in the judgement because there was no memory.

Yet, finally after the testimony and trial, while Karla was in prison, she conveniently recalled specific events in a dream. Details like administering drugs to Jane Doe, Jane's breath stopping, calling 911, cancelling the ambulance and sitting up with her

all night, along with Paul sodomizing her and the videotaping<sup>24</sup>. Karla Homolka wrote to her lawyer explaining the issue;

“Why didn’t I remember all of this when they first questioned me? I never believed that the videotapes were destroyed; I believed the police were in possession of the videotapes when I was originally questioned. I... admitted my involvement in things that were far more incriminating to myself than this”<sup>25</sup>

Karla Homolka states that she was under the impression that the officials already knew the facts about Jane Doe from the video, and they were merely testing her when asking for information. Why would Karla lie about not knowing the truth if she believed they already knew? Yet, Karla when saying she could not remember the incidents involving Jane Doe, was taking a chance. She knew that if they had the tapes and knew about Jane Doe, then they could convict her. On the other hand, if she volunteered the information, they would also convict her. Consequently, she decided to take the chance, lie about her memory and hope that they did not have the tapes. Luckily for her, they did not have them and believed her, so she did not have to speak about Jane Doe during the trial.

In her book, Patricia Pearson discusses the fact that female serial killings occur more frequently than the general public imagines. She writes how they are less publicized because the cases tend to be place specific rather than nation-wide. She tells an example about a woman named Dorthea Puente, who killed eight of her tenants and buried them in her back yard. She covered her tracks by presenting herself as a dear old woman who only wished to take care of people. Even specialized professionals found it hard to

---

<sup>24</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) “Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters concerning Karla Homolka” (p. 131)

<sup>25</sup> Galligan, the Hon. P.T. (1996) “Report to attorney General of Ontario on certain matters concerning Karla Homolka” (p. 130)

believe<sup>26</sup>. The truth is people do not want to believe that women can be horrible and vicious, because it destroys that perfect ideal that women are motherly and nurturing.

Patricia wrote in her book:

“Women can operate the system to their advantage. Donning the feminine mask, they can manipulate the biases of family and community... in order to set men up.”<sup>27</sup>

For example, if a man tries to leave his female lover, or fight back, the woman can reach for the phone, dial 911 and can have him arrested on the strength of these words: “Officer he hit me.” Our society has idealized women as the peacemakers so often that it has become generalized, and some deceitful women can take advantage of this for their benefit. This is what Karla Homolka has done: she has twisted her disgusting actions into a making herself look like a pitiful victim, caught in a terrible web of crime.

Patricia Pearson’s book presents some alarming information; it states that the rate of women’s physical violence is rapidly increasing, especially among the young. “In Canada young women now account for twenty-four percent of all violent offences in their age groups: In the United States, it is eighteen percent.”<sup>28</sup>

In a study done on female sex offenders in Canada, it was found that, female sex offenders are under reported mainly because the general idea is that women are not typically the influential ones when it comes to sex, the stereotype is that females influence men to avoid sex.<sup>29</sup> The study also found that training programs for psychiatrists and police investigating sexual assaults were mainly focused on crimes

---

<sup>26</sup> Patricia Pearson. (1997). *When She was Bad: Violent Women and the Myth of Innocence*. (New York) (p.32)

<sup>27</sup> Patricia Pearson. (1997). *When She was Bad: Violent Women and the Myth of Innocence*. (New York) (p.32)

<sup>28</sup> Patricia Pearson. (1997). *When She was Bad: Violent Women and the Myth of Innocence*. (New York) (p.32)

<sup>29</sup> Myriam, Denvos. (2001). *A culture of denial: Exploring professional perspectives on female sex offending.* Canadian Journal of criminology. (p.304 - 307)

committed by a male perpetrator with the female being the victim<sup>30</sup>. For example, one detective described a case where a thirty-five year old woman was sexually abusing a thirteen year old boy. When asked to share views on the case, the detective explained how the woman was merely trying to educate the boy about sex<sup>31</sup>.

Karla Homolka is a dangerous woman, not only because of her crimes but because she has the ability to manipulate those around her to feel pity for her. Being a female cannot excuse her from her background of rape, murder and assault. Due to the fact that the officials came to her for help on the case, she had the advantage in that she could easily leave out evidence that would prove her even more dangerous. She was in control of what officials knew from the start.

Despite allegations against her, many will argue that Karla Homolka has served her time in prison and has repeatedly announced she has changed; she is a free woman now and should be left alone. The Crown made the resolution agreement deal with Karla in May 1993<sup>32</sup>, and they are expected to keep their end of the deal. Yet, what would be considered more lawful, instilling the rights of one individual with a very dark past, or protecting the public from an individual that has at one point, created complete havoc?

In a news article in The Globe and Mail, Karla Homolka's former lawyer, George Walker, the man who negotiated the controversial bargain said, "I think we both walked away with a fair deal"<sup>33</sup>. "Miss Homolka should not be considered a sexual predator" stated George Walker. He also does not think she is likely to try and profit from her story. On his last note, Walker makes it perfectly clear that Karla Homolka should not even

---

<sup>30</sup> Myriam, Denvos. (2001). A culture of denial: Exploring professional perspectives on female sex offending." Canadian Journal of criminology. (p.311)

<sup>31</sup> Myriam, Denvos. (2001). A culture of denial: Exploring professional perspectives on female sex offending." Canadian Journal of criminology. (p.317)

<sup>32</sup> "Bernardo/Homolka timeline" CBC News Online. [www.cbc.ca/news/background/bernardo/](http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/bernardo/). (9 Sept.2005)

<sup>33</sup> Lisa LaFlamme, Joe Friesen. "Homolka's Lawyer says she's no risk". The Globe and Mail. May 25 2005.

think about moving back to Ontario “she would be totally harassed”. Although it can be very comforting to hear that Homolka’s own lawyer trusts her, it is misleading. It can not be forgotten that George Walker is a criminal lawyer, and a criminal lawyers job is to fight for the rights of a complete criminal - there should be serious thought made before taking comfort in his words. Secondly, in a CBC News report, Karla Homolka’s lawyer pointed out that there were no reports of any kind of violent behaviour within the twelve years Homolka was in prison<sup>34</sup>. Psychiatric reports were also generally positive and she followed therapy and took courses to better herself, earning a degree in psychology from Queens University<sup>35</sup>. Homolka’s lawyer believes that should be enough proof to prove she is no risk. Although there were no accounts of violence, take into consideration Homolka’s prison, known as an “adult day care centre” by inmates. Karla Homolka is a smart woman, and she knew if she were to ‘act up’ her privileges in Joliette Institution would be ceased. Yet, now that she is free, there is no one to take away her privileges, that is, if she manages to keep from being caught.

In an exclusive CBC interview taken with Karla minutes after her release in July 2005, Joyce Napier questioned Karla on many topics. When asked if she will re-offend, Karla answered no, and used her age and desperation for a relationship as an excuse for her actions. Karla Homolka said, “I don’t want people to think I’m a dangerous person who’s going to do something to their children”<sup>36</sup>.

Sadly, due to Karla Homolka’s actions, the public believes she is a dangerous person, with good reason, and despite her claim to have changed, the fear of children being abused with either her involvement or consent is a real and continuous threat.

---

<sup>34</sup> CBC News. (2005) “Homolka at low risk of re-offending: psychiatrist”. June 3, 2005.

<sup>35</sup> Nelson Wyatt. (2005) “There’s no evidence she’s dangerous: Homolka’s lawyer”. Global Quebec.

<sup>36</sup> Joyce Napier. (2005) Personal Interview Transcript. CTV News.

Considering Karla Homolka's actions and progression throughout her prison time, officials realized she needed restrictions placed upon her for the safety of society. Karla Homolka spent most of her twelve year sentence at Joilette Institute, located in Joilette, Quebec<sup>37</sup>. The prison includes therapy and rehabilitation centers, psychosocial and psychological services, along with an up-to-date healthcare centre and many job opportunities. Although Homolka was serving her time and, as stated earlier, had no record of violence during her sentence, what officials were concerned about was her social life.

In March 2005, a Maclean's magazine cover read: "Karla Homolka – Girl Next Door", an in-depth article evaluating rumours and worst case scenarios following the release of Karla in the upcoming months. The article also provided many large colour images of Karla in prison which were sold to Maclean's by a former inmate at Joilette Institute. The images depict Karla on a swing, with her pet kitten, sunbathing, wearing Calvin Klein clothing and posing in a cocktail dress. The images alone made the public question her sentencing, what kind of prison allows pets and parties? It looks as if Karla was at college rather than in prison for manslaughter. The former inmate that sold the pictures described Joliette as an "adult daycare center that pampered inmates"<sup>38</sup>.

In June 2005, a month before her release, Karla Homolka was found to be having a relationship with convicted murderer Jean-Paul Gerbet, a 38 year old French national. Gerbet is serving time for murdering his girlfriend Cathy Carretta<sup>39</sup>, when she tried to leave him seven years ago. Cathy Carretta's father is afraid that Homolka has found a new replacement for her ex-husband Paul Bernardo, and warns that Gerbet is an evil and manipulative individual. Homolka and Gerbet were unable to have a physical

---

<sup>37</sup> Government of Canada (2005) [www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/releases/03-04-10\\_e.shtml](http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/releases/03-04-10_e.shtml)

<sup>38</sup> Charlie Gills. (2005) "Karla Homolka – Girl Next Door" Macleans.

<sup>39</sup> Alan Cairns, Stephanie Rubec. (2005) "Jailed Homolka falls for controlling killer" The London Press.

relationship, instead they wrote love letters to each other. When this story was let out into the public, many fears arose questioning her rehabilitation and the possibility of re-offending after her release. Homolka had always blamed Bernardo and his criminal behaviour for her actions; she claimed to be the victim of a sexual sadist's manipulation. Yet, why then is she putting herself in another criminal's hands? Through rehabilitation and psychotherapy Karla should have learnt that she needs to stay away from the dangerous characters, like Paul Bernardo.

Karla Homolka lacks the ability to evaluate relationships, which is obvious considering her relations with Paul Bernardo, a man she married even after knowing of his infatuation with raping, torturing and killing. Since Karla fell for another killer, what is stopping her from being 'manipulated' again and re-offending, like she did when she was with Paul? In July 2005, Claude Lachapelle, a lawyer representing Quebec at the Joliette courthouse said "There are others like Gerbet, not a lot but there are others"<sup>40</sup>. Claude Lachapelle continued in saying:

"I'm not telling you that Ms. Teale (Karla) will commit murder tomorrow morning, I'm saying I think that she's a risk and will cause personal injury to someone in the future"<sup>41</sup>.

Karla Homolka will find men similar to Paul Bernardo and Jean- Paul Gerbet, who she may re-offend with since having such a companion would make it easier for her to repeat the acts she did before. Surely a serious killer would influence Homolka back to her old ways, which is exactly what the public fears most.

Karla Homolka's ex lover, Lynda Veronneau, with whom she had a lesbian relationship with at Joliette Institute, warns the public in an exclusive CTV interview,

---

<sup>40</sup> Claude Lachapelle. (2005) Lawyer representing Quebec at the Joliette courthouse.

<sup>41</sup> Claude Lachapelle. (2005) Lawyer representing Quebec at the Joliette courthouse.

that Karla Homolka is a “master manipulator”<sup>42</sup>. Karla and Lynda lived together in a prison condo for four years, which began in 1998 while both were incarcerated in Joliet Institution. The relationship ended bitterly after Karla began to correspond with Jean-Paul Gerbet. Lynda recalls her shock when hearing about Karla’s relations with Gerbet. “It could have been anyone else, a taxi driver, a plumber, just not another killer”<sup>43</sup>.

In her interview Lynda expressed that Karla has no remorse for her actions and is a serious threat to society, especially since she is still affiliating herself with dangerous men<sup>44</sup>. In conclusion to the interview Lynda stated,

“I hope we just keep a real watchful eye on her, because she will re-offend if she can, she’s a psychopathic, pathological liar, and she’s a serial killer and will be until the day she dies.”<sup>45</sup>

While in prison, Karla Homolka also established herself with a university education, she is now armed with a bachelor’s degree in psychology from Queens University, which she took through correspondence<sup>46</sup>. Along with psychology, Karla is also bilingual, speaking fluent French, which she also learnt in prison<sup>47</sup>. With all this extra knowledge, especially that in psychology- the study of the mind, a more educated Karla Homolka is now ready to continue her life manipulating those around her.

Bill C-55 contains significant amendments to the Criminal Code, including: changes to the Dangerous Offender sentencing provisions; the creation of a new category of offenders, “Long Term Offender”, who will be subject to “Long Term Supervision” ; and the creation of a new provision authorizing the use of peace bonds for “high risk”

---

<sup>42</sup> Jennifer Tryon. (2005) “Karla’s former lover speaks out” Exclusive Interview with CTVs Jennifer Tryon.

<sup>43</sup> Jennifer Tryon. (2005) “Karla’s former lover speaks out” Exclusive Interview with CTVs Jennifer Tryon.

<sup>44</sup> Jennifer Tryon. (2005) “Karla’s former lover speaks out” Exclusive Interview with CTVs Jennifer Tryon.

<sup>45</sup> Jennifer Tryon. (2005) “Karla’s former lover speaks out” Exclusive Interview with CTVs Jennifer Tryon.

<sup>46</sup> Angela Mullholland. (2005) “Homolka readies herself for life on the outside” CTV News.

<sup>47</sup> Angela Mullholland. (2005) “Homolka readies herself for life on the outside” CTV News.

individuals. These proposed amendments are aimed at individuals who may be considered likely to commit violent or sexual offenses in the future<sup>48</sup>. Along with this, Section 810 was introduced in 1993 to allow for restrictions if there are reasonable grounds that a person will commit a sexual offense against someone under the age of 14<sup>49</sup>. Both of these laws back up the proposition of placing restrictions on Karla Homolka after she is released from prison, she is definitely still a threat to commit sexual offenses against any member of a community in the future.

The following lists Karla Homolka's restrictions that were placed upon her on July 6 2005.

- 1) Inform police on whereabouts at all times
- 2) Supply personal address, occupation, roommates
- 3) Report to police on the first Friday of every month
- 4) Inform police if moving or leaving home for more than 48 hours
- 5) No association with people who have a criminal record.
- 6) No contact with Paul Bernardo, his family, or families of victims.
- 7) No intake of drugs except those prescribed
- 8) No use of intoxicants that were used in the murders
- 9) Enter therapy immediately and continue for a year
- 10) Provide DNA sample to authorities
- 11) Cannot take on a role of authority with any children under age 16.<sup>50</sup>

These restrictions were set up specifically to guide Homolka while living as a free woman, and to ensure the safety of the public. Yet, recently, Homolka has successfully appealed these restrictions, and the conditions imposed on her, they were cancelled by

---

<sup>48</sup> Bill C-55: (2005) "High Risk Offender" Amendments to the criminal Code. [www.criminallawyers.ca/newslett/18-3/c55.htm](http://www.criminallawyers.ca/newslett/18-3/c55.htm)

<sup>49</sup> CBC News Online. (2005). "getting out of prison". [www.cbc.ca/news/background/crime/](http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/crime/)

<sup>50</sup> CTV.ca (2005) "Judge imposes restrictions on Karla Homolka's release"

Quebec Superior Court Justice James Brunton. Brunton said in a speech to the press, “The possibility that Ms. Teale might re-offend one day cannot be completely eliminated<sup>51</sup>”, yet he argued that since Karla had no record of any violence in prison, there is no concrete evidence that allows these restrictions to be enforced. Tim Danson, the lawyer representing the families of the victims, stated:

“We believe that there are very serious errors in law in the judgment, and the families are urging the attorney general of Quebec to appeal this decision to the appeal courts in Quebec<sup>52</sup>”.

The families are extremely disgusted and are seriously disappointed in the legal system of Quebec and Canada. A lot of the evidence used involve quotes and opinions from lawyers, acquaintances and Karla herself, along with articles, statements, bills and laws. These were helpful to show how the court was able to go through with placing restrictions upon Karla.

Karla Homolka is definitely a dangerous and manipulative woman; from her actions while in prison it is clear that she is unsuitable to be left completely independent in society. Restrictions must be placed upon her in order to ensure the safety of society.

The accomplice to serial killer Paul Bernardo, Karla Homolka, is clearly still a threat to society. Karla assisted Paul in capturing, assaulting, torturing and murdering teenage girls in Ontario from 1987 to 1993. She is a wise, cunning and manipulative woman who knows how to act in order to get the results she desires. Karla Homolka is a danger in society because she chose to go through with committing her crimes, she used her knowledge of the crimes to manipulate the case to go in her favour and considering her social indiscretion during her prison sentence, officials should come to the conclusion that it is necessary to have restrictions upon her to ensure the safety of society. It is quite

---

<sup>51</sup> CTV.ca (2005) “Court lifts all restrictions on Karla Homolka”

<sup>52</sup> CTV.ca (2005) “Court lifts all restrictions on Karla Homolka”

clear, considering Karla's past actions and behaviour in prison, mainly her affair with a murderer, prove that she is not ready to be on her own in the world. No matter which angle taken, its pertinence is clear. Karla Homolka needs to have restrictions placed upon her for the safety of society, she is a danger to re-offend.

## **Bibliography**

### **Primary documents, interviews**

Bevan, Warr, T. "Letter of advice to Green Ribbon Task Force". Ministry of the Attorney General. 1995

Bill C-55: (2005) "High-Risk Offender" Amendments to the *Criminal Code*:  
[[www.criminallawyers.ca/newslett/18-3/c55.htm](http://www.criminallawyers.ca/newslett/18-3/c55.htm)]

Brown, P. Investigative criminal profiler. Interviewed by Mike Duffy of CTV News.  
2005

Correctional Service of Canada. New Release: Warrant Expiry Date (WED) Release of  
Karla Teale (Homolka). July 4 2005.

Denov, Myriam. "A culture of denial: Exploring professional perspectives on female  
sex offending." Canadian Journal of Criminology. July 2001.

Galligan, Patrick T. Report to Attorney General of Ontario on Certain Matters Relating to  
Karla Homolka. Toronto Canada:1996.

Jennifer, Tyron. "Karla's former lover speaks out". CTV's News. Exclusive interview.  
2005

Joyce, Napier. CBC News. "Karla Homolka's Interview". July 4, 2005.

Lachapelle, C. Lawyer Representing Quebec at the Joliette Courthouse. 2005

### **Books, Journals and Periodicals**

Dale, Anne F. "Homolka is 'nervous' about her freedom." Toronto Star. 31 May 2005.

Frank, D. Karla's Web a Cultural Investigation of the Mahaffy - French Murders.  
Toronto, Canada: Penguin Group, 1994.

Gills, Charlie. "Karla Homolka: Girl next door". Maclean's. 21 March 2005:34-41.

Hewitt. Bill. "Record of Horror." People Weekly. 18 September 1995: 235- 239

"Homolka at low risk of re-offending: psychiatrist". CBC News. 03 Jun 2005

LaFlamme, Lisa, Freisen, Joe. "Homolka's lawyer says she's no risk". Globe and Mail. 24 May 2005

MaCann, Wendy K. "Homolka Describes Herself as a Changed Woman." Canadian Press NewsWire 3 Nov. 1999. Rpt. in . Toronto

Mulholland, A. "Homolka readies for life on the outside" CTV News. 2005.

Pearson, P. When She was Bad: Violent Women and the Myth of Innocence (New York, Random House) 2005

Pron, Nick. "Paul is one great guy, you make a great couple" Toronto Star. 30 May 2005.

Pron, Nick. "12 years behind bars" Toronto Star. 31 May 2005.

Pron, Nick. "From 17 and in love to murder and hate." Toronto Star. 31 May 2005.

Wyatt, N. "There's no evidence she's dangerous: Homolka's lawyer. Global Quebec. 2005

## **Internet**

"Bernardo/Homolka Timeline" CBC News online.  
<<http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/bernardo/>> (9Sept.2005)

Court TV Forensic Files. "Karla Homolka and Paul Bernardo: Party Girl " 2005:  
[[www.crimelibrary.com/serial\\_killers/notorious/bernardo/23.html](http://www.crimelibrary.com/serial_killers/notorious/bernardo/23.html)]

CBC News Online. "Getting out of prison". 2005:  
[<http://www.cbc.ca/news/background/crime/>]

CTV News.ca "Judge imposes restrictions on Karla Homolka's release"2005:  
[<http://www.ctv.ca/servlet/ArticleNews/story/CTVNews/>]

Women's Rural Advocacy Programs. "Why women stay – The barriers to leaving."  
[<http://www.letswrap.com>]