



### D29 Do Come Over, Someone Has Killed Father

*Steven V. Gilbert, BA, MFS\* and Barbara A. Gilbert, RN, MSN\*, State University of New York at Canton, 34 Cornell Drive, Canton, NY 13617*

After attending this presentation, attendees will understand the method in which suspects respond to questioning often times provides interrogators with insights into the suspect's culpability. Investigators who are trained in interrogative techniques present challenges to the guilty, in that offenders are unaware of these strategies. The objective of this paper is demonstrate the guilt of Lizzie Andrew Borden based upon her manner of responses to subsequent questioning following the murder of her father and step-mother.

This presentation will impact the forensic community and/or humanity by demonstrating criminal interrogation which is a forensic discipline in which interrogators discover acts of deception. This presentation will demonstrate that Lizzie Borden, acquitted of murder, was in fact lying when answering relevant questions. This demonstrates the reliability of the three-step interrogation technique.

On August 4, 1892, two murders occurred in the small town of Fall River, MA. As history has recorded, Andrew Borden and Abby Borden were both bludgeoned to death with an unidentified weapon. Abby Borden died first, after suffering 19 injuries to the side and rear of her head. Approximately 90 minutes later, Andrew Borden was bludgeoned to death in the same manner, and died from 10 injuries to the left side of his face. The only known persons present during the time frame of the murders was Lizzie Borden and the housemaid, Bridget "Maggie" Sullivan. Lizzie Borden was quickly developed as the most likely suspect of the murders. The police investigation, which was cursory at best, failed to answer two important questions that supported the eventual acquittal. No murder weapon was ever definitively identified, and the lack of blood spatter on Lizzie or her clothing could not be explained.

Police and court officials questioned Lizzie Borden on four occasions. Her manner of responding is typically found in instances where interrogators use a technique known as the "three-step interview." This particular technique demonstrates that a suspect is practicing deception when answering specific questions. This technique requires that the suspect provide an initial free and uninterrupted statement surrounding the circumstances of the incident under investigation. The second step consists of randomly chosen facts for clarification. Step three requires the suspect to reiterate the circumstances of the incident. It has been seen that deceptive suspects fail to maintain consistency and accuracy during the third step of this technique.

To support the theory that Lizzie Borden was guilty of double murder, the scene was compared to Lizzie Borden's inquest testimony. Analysis of the testimony, as compared to the trial testimony of other witnesses, revealed that Lizzie Borden reacted in the same manner as other suspects when confronted with interviews similar to the three-step interview process. In the end, Lizzie Borden's statements concerning the murders began as her initial version of the murders, to mixed and questionable, to a different version. Truthful witnesses rarely have problems reporting the same information three times. In addition to the weapon and blood questions, Lizzie Borden's inquest testimony, which was the proof of her deception, was not permitted into her criminal trial.

#### **Lizzie, Borden, Murders**