

Professor Paul E Mullen

Forensic Psychiatrist

ABN 37 890 925 493

Provider No: 2050762X

Email: pmullen@bigpond.net.au

16th March 2011

PSYCHIATRIC REPORT

IN CONFIDENCE

JULIAN KNIGHT

1. I have prepared this report at the request of Mr Brendan Money of the department of justice. The report is based upon:
 - i. Two extended interviews with Mr Knight at Port Phillip Prison on 8/8/2011 and 1/3/2012.
 - ii. My prior contacts with Mr Knight over the last 20 years.
 - iii. A range of documents made available to me by the Department of Justice.
 - iv. A set of documents supplied by Mr Knight.
 - v. Access to Mr Knight's prison records. In particular, those covering his period in Port Phillip Prison.
2. In addition to preparing a general report I have been requested to comment specifically on the following.
 - i. What are Mr Knight's offence specific needs, and what type of therapeutic interventions would be most appropriate to these needs?
 - ii. Are you able to assess Mr Knight's readiness to engage in offence specific treatment at this time? What factors do you take into account in making this assessment?
 - iii. What dynamic risk factors does Mr Knight present at this time, and are these amenable to treatment?
 - iv. What is your assessment of Mr Knight's capacity to successfully engage in a group based treatment program, given the importance of

group dynamics such as trust, self-disclosure, and mutual support between participants?

- v. Having regard to Mr Knight's institutional history and current presentation, how would he manage his behaviour in a less restrictive environment?
- vi. Are there potential risks that Mr Knight may present to himself, other prisoners, and the stability of the prison units if placed in a less restrictive environment given his personality traits?
- vii. What is your assessment of Mr Knight's ability and willingness to engage with correctional staff given his history of non-compliance and expressed views?
- viii. What proactive strategies (regarding the location, clinicians, corrections staff) are suggested which the correctional system could implement in order to support treatment recommendations?
- ix. What is your assessment of Mr Knight's risk of re-offending?

State of Mind

3. There was an obvious change in Mr Knight from our interviews in the past. He looked fit and well. This probably reflects both his Crohns Disease being well controlled by a new medication, and his now being involved in regular exercise including the sport of boxing. The biggest change was, however, in his attitudes and presentation. Put simply he appeared to have matured considerably. There is an easier manner of relating and a sense of humour less contaminated by the caustic and sarcastic elements so obvious in the past. His mood was generally upbeat, though he showed obvious, and appropriate, distress on occasion. He remains caught up with his long standing battle with Corrections, though even here there was a degree of detachment and reasonableness not previously in evidence. Interestingly, he was generally positive about Port Phillip and it's prison staff. He contrasted the public prison system to the privatised system to the advantage of the latter.

There was nothing to suggest any significant disturbances in his mental state of the type associated with major mental disorder.

Personality Issues

4. Mr Knight has always been a somewhat rigid individual with marked obsessional traits around order, neatness, and control. With this come the qualities of persistence and fixation on issues. On the positive side this provides motivation and commitment, however, on the negative side produces stubbornness and a tendency to lose a sense of proportion when pursuing any particular goal. Pragmatism does not come easily to him, let alone compromise. He has been, in the past, the type of person who would rather be 'cut off at the knees' than take a step backwards. This was particularly unfortunate for a man in the position of a long term prisoner. Prisons demand conformity and compliance, however grudging, to all rules from the essential to the petty. His situation is complicated by the nature of his crime, which in the eyes of some who dealt with him disqualified him from any respect or human sympathy.
5. Over the years I have spoken to a wide range of prison officers and more senior Correctional staff about Mr Knight. Some, though not all, expressed understandable but totally unprofessional derogatory and punitive attitudes. Attitudes I have heard echoed by fellow prisoners and some mental health staff. Mr Knight has not helped himself in the past by assertive, not to say arrogant, demands for what he perceives as his rights. A performance of self-abnegation and shameful humility would have served him better, but it was not in his nature to even attempt such a self-presentation. It was of interest speaking to the younger prison staff at Port Phillip that many were too young to remember the Hoddle St Massacre, or were living outside of Victoria at the time. They do not share directly in the memory of the terrible impact of those events on the whole Victorian population.
6. Mr Knight is an articulate and intelligent man. He has spent his adult life in the company of men very few of whom are his intellectual equals. This has tended, in the past, to reinforce his sense of importance and superiority. There was a distinct

amelioration in Mr Knight's egoism on this occasion. He is growing up. He has had contact with professionals, particularly lawyers, and fellow prisoners whose knowledge and intellectual abilities he has been able to recognise as equal or better than his own. More importantly, was the recognition that abilities other than the purely intellectual are of as great or greater importance in other human beings and even in himself.

7. In the documents supplied to me was a statement that Mr Knight had been assigned a high score on a personality/criminality assessment instrument, the Hare Psychopathy Checklist. No details of who had performed the assessment or the scores on the various elements were present in the documents with which I was provided. I also note a number of suggestions that Mr Knight has one or other form of personality disorder. Mr Knight is also stated to be a high risk for reoffending, but again, the details of what risk assessment instruments were administered, by whom, and with what specific scores, were not in my documents.

Litigation

8. Mr Knight has engaged in repeated litigation since 2001 in pursuit of what he regards as justice and advancing his progress through the prison system. Mr Knight was declared a Vexatious Litigant at proceedings in the Supreme Court. Since this time Mr Knight informs me that he has sought and obtained the consent of the Supreme Court to proceed with litigating 10 issues with only 2 knocked back as trivial and/or vexatious. Mr Knight believes his resort to the Courts has achieved him "more in the last 4 years than over a decade of pleading and arguing with Corrections". He did, however, admit "going to Court is stressful and time consuming" noting "even I have better things to do with my time". In addition to believing litigating has worked for him he acknowledged a pleasure in being "a bit of a litigation expert" and "in getting his own back". On gentle pressure he accepted some of the cases he took were petulant (his word) and just a way of causing trouble. He was clear the litigation was about pursuing his own agenda and he made no claims to be representing some greater or universal good. He acknowledged that when provided access to lawyers that they had greatly assisted and were able to represent his interests more effectively. I read a number of his

submissions. They were not characterised by odd methods of expression, unusual forms of emphasis, gross verbosity, repetition, pointless pedantry, nor appeals to totally irrelevant legislation, charters or authorities.

The Offences and Current Attitude to them

9. One troubling aspect of Mr Knight's presentation in the past was the extent to which his ongoing self identity was tied up with being a mass killer. He had made himself an expert on massacres. He had been preoccupied with militarism. In conversation he used to return to these topics at every opportunity. The records note occasions when such preoccupations resulted in his making absurd and seriously self damaging remarks. An example was telling a Community Corrections Officer in 1993 that he should be sent to Iraq or Yugoslavia because having killed 7 people would be insignificant and could even be an advantage.
10. On this occasion, despite our first interview taking place shortly after the massacre in Oslo Fjord, Mr Knight did not speak of this or other massacres, despite being offered an opportunity. On things military he commented on his widening interest and on having largely abandoning this particular emphasis in his reading and fantasies.
11. Mr Knight's offences are all too well known (murder: 7 counts, attempted murder: 46 counts). There is extensive documentation of both the shootings and the interviews and assessments of Mr Knight in the aftermath. What many may remember, apart from the enormity of the crime, are aspects of Mr Knight's behaviour suggestive of glorying in the destruction he had wrought. Statements recorded soon after such as "you're not laughing at me now motherfuckers" and "this is payback on everyone" stick in the memory. What was also obvious at the time, and commented on at length in the reports, was the level of Mr Knight's distress and disturbance. In the days and weeks after the massacre he was suicidal and required constant monitoring to prevent him from harming himself. Dr Grigor (Report 15th September 1987) described Mr Knight on reception into prison as tearful, despairing, and regarding himself as a total failure. Though the opinions of mental health experts at the time varied on some aspects, all describe the 19

year old as immature. He also appeared self centred with an image of himself as a soldier of fortune.

12. There has been considerable concern expressed over the years at what is described as a lack of remorse on Mr Knight's part and his failure to empathise with his victims. This appears to have even been a focus in counselling sessions provided by Ms Sakellaridis in 2010.
13. Mr Knight, in our previous contacts, has tended to sidestep questions about how he feels about his actions in favour of talking about those whose offences he considers to have been even more heinous. In the first interview, however, he spoke at length. Initially he focussed on his habitual theme of being unfairly treated by Corrections. He spoke at length of being told he had to empathise with victims then when attempting to write back to an enquiry from such a victim being prevented and castigated. With a degree of humour he described being told he lacked remorse and when he requested to know how remorse could be recognised being told what amounted to "if you need to ask you don't have it". Unlike my previous experience of Mr Knight, on this occasion he did not stop at turning the massacre into his personal tragedy, nor into a purely intellectual game about the nature of remorse and reparation. He said "I ask myself repeatedly what the fuck did you think you were doing". He spoke of his incomprehension looking back at the events of that tragic evening. He said he "knew it was me doing that" and "I'm responsible" but no longer recognising the man who committed those acts. Mr Knight appeared both perplexed and distressed when trying to express these thoughts. It may be of relevance that when he changed topics it was to speak of the death of Kevin Carr, a fellow prisoner. At the point I saw for the first time Mr Knight visibly distressed and near to tears. When pushed back to the subject of the killings and woundings he was able to admit that he felt ashamed.

Behaviour in Prison

14. The records available to me contained an informative breakdown of the prison offences for which Mr Knight has been reported. When the trivial, e.g. smoking, are removed there remains a number of times when searches of Mr Knight's cell

has revealed weapons, or potential weapons, and 8 instances of assault. The breakdown of assaults appears to indicate that some involve him as the victim (e.g. 2nd March 1996), others being caught up in general melees and fights, with only 2 assaults on staff both of which seem to have occurred in the context of his being restrained for other reasons. No instances of assault are listed after 14th December 2000. No significant injuries are noted. In the last 4 years at Port Phillip it appears only 2 relatively minor disciplinary matters have led to a report.

15. Mr Knight, when permitted, has pursued a wide range of educational and training opportunities with considerable success.
16. Mr Knight informs me he runs a chess and backgammon competition. He is also now a regular attendee at the gym and associated social events. He attends meetings as a prisoner representative at Port Phillip. Though still somewhat isolated he believes he has coped well with being in the general prison population at Port Phillip. Between the first and second interview, Mr Knight obtained a position as one of the prisoner 'induction billets' charged with orienting and assisting new receptions. He spoke of how good he felt about this demonstration of confidence, and about his enthusiasm for doing a good job.
17. Mr Knight has served his sentence to date on a high security rating. This is a source of considerable resentment as he claims he received a medium secure rating as long ago as June 1999. Perhaps typical of Mr Knight, when we discussed which medium secure prison he would hope to be transferred to, he rejected all possible choices except Fulham. Even here, he refused to express a preference, simply stating that he would never be classified there because of the potential visibility of prisoners through the wire fencing. When pushed, he finally opted for staying at Port Phillip until classified to a low secure placement.

OPINION

Mental State and Personality

18. At the age of 19 when Mr Knight killed and injured so many people he was a disturbed, suicidal young man, enraged with the world, hopeless about his own

future, and with a markedly immature personality. The massacre was intended by Mr Knight to end in his death, either as a result of police action, or by his own hand. He made several suicide attempts in the weeks and months following. Only limited attempts were made at the time to delineate his personality traits beyond being immature and self centred (I seem to recall the use of the term malignant narcissism). This is understandable as the focus then was on whether he was insane. He was not.

19. Retrospectively it is possible to conclude that he was already a rigid individual with obsessional traits. He both admired the authoritarian and the militaristic, but at the same time resisted attempts by any authority to discipline and control his own behaviour. He had friends and sexual partners, but appears to have considered himself above those with whom he mixed. His fantasy life appears to have been shaped by the imagery of the soldier of fortune, the superior renegade hero who sacrifices himself in the struggle, for whatever. His life goal had been to enter the military. His discharge from officer training and the army brought down all his hopes and fantasies about his future life.
20. In attempting to assess Mr Knight today it has to be remembered he has grown to adulthood in prison with over 12 of the last 23 years spent in maximum security with extended periods of isolation. He has also had to cope with the awful crimes he committed (even if only by minimisation and displacement) and with the reactions to him of those with whom he lived as the perpetrator of those crimes.
21. Mr Knight, though less egocentric, remains a somewhat self righteous and self centred person. Something only likely to be ameliorated with greater social interaction and increased tolerance of the weaknesses and shortcomings of people and systems. I suspect Mr Knight will always remain a rigid individual, over concerned with maintaining order and control. If he cannot at least use his intelligence to increase his capacity to compromise the rigidity will cause him unnecessary problems. For example, Mr Knight has fixated on the goal of release on or about his earliest eligibility date. Intellectually he knows this is unrealistic but cannot seem to accept that making this an absolute principle will not just be ineffective but damaging to his interests.

22. In the notes Mr Knight is stated to score highly on the Hare Psychopathy Checklist. This I found, for a number of reasons, surprising. In my opinion he is unlikely to score higher than the average for a prison population. This is no small matter as the claims that he is psychopathic and/or seriously personality disordered impinge on assessments for future risk. Professor Ogloff has recently carried out a formal assessment of Mr Knight's personality, and has confirmed my suspicions that he does not have a psychopathic personality disorder. It is my understanding that the main personality deviation he found was that of the excessive self-absorption and self-centred approaches found in narcissistic personalities. Hopefully DOJ will have a report from Professor Ogloff, who is better able to provide an account of Mr Knight's personality and its importance to future management.
23. Mr Knight is not currently showing any signs of serious mental illness. He must be considered vulnerable to depressive episodes, given both his situation and history. There have been no recent attempts at self harm. Suicide could become an issue when his earliest release date approaches and he is faced with the reality that he will not be leaving prison for some years to come. Hopefully his contrariness and combative nature will prevent him embracing suicide which would potentially gratify those he sees as his enemies.

Litigation

24. Mr Knight's motivation and degree of involvement in his campaign of complaint and litigation is of some importance in assessing future risk (see below).
25. In my opinion Mr Knight does not fit into the category of a querulant complainant (see attached). He has the rigidity, fixation, egocentricity, and single minded commitment found in querulants. He has not to date developed the belief that he is pursuing some grand quest for justice of wide significance. He remains aware that his complaints and litigation are principally self-serving. He can acknowledge that some of his courses of action are sometimes petty and/or

making trouble for the fun of it. He is also able to enjoy the occasional victories and move on to the next little campaign. This is not the behaviour of the paranoid querulant.

26. In my opinion it is unfortunate that Mr Knight seems to be able to create issues for Corrections and DOJ which end up in the Courts. Considerable resources are being wasted in these cases. That Mr Knight wins at all, let alone as frequently as appears to be occurring, put the judgement of Corrections in question. Mr Knight is virtually powerless. Corrections has power over almost every aspect of Mr Knight's current and future life. This makes it difficult for me to understand why matters which Corrections recognise as trivial are ending up in expensive and public litigation. A process which is obviously to the disadvantage of Corrections and the Courts, and, though he does not seem to recognise the fact, to the great detriment of Mr Knight. This kind of publicity, and the provocative prodding of Corrections, is a disaster for Mr Knight's long term interests. I can only assume that Corrections make their stand on relatively trivial issues because they believe that if they do not the demands from Mr Knight will escalate until he raises issues fundamental to the good order of the prison system. Perhaps the time to make the stand is when, and only when, the issues are in fact sufficiently substantive to threaten the system. It is surely undignified for a large and powerful public body to be repeatedly squabbling in the Courts with one virtually powerless prisoner. This is true even if Corrections may garner support from their actions from some elements of the press because of Mr Knight's particular profile. Mr Knight does receive legal assistance with some of his cases, which at least reduces the waste of Court time which would be occasioned by his being an unsupported litigant in person. Perhaps providing him with an advocate and advisor would be more effective at earlier stages in the squabbles to prevent them from progressing. There is a real problem for corrections in not pandering to Mr Knight's desire to be treated as a special case with enhanced rights. The reality is, however, that Mr Knight is in truth, if not unique, then certainly a special case. He has, and for the present will continue to be, one of the longest serving prisoners, with one of the highest public profiles. This may justify a degree of flexibility not accorded to the general prison population. His high profile may occasionally result in not greater flexibility, but less flexibility in responding to his requests (or should one say

demands). It is true that Mr Knight will not only try to push the boundaries, but often respond to current positive responses and flexibility by turning the immediate generosity into a cause for complaint about past refusals. Managing this is no easy problem. Management may be improved by being aware that Mr Knight thrives on wars, and should not constantly be rewarded with another battle. Discussing openly the reasons for any refusal, and laughing at attempts to turn granting his requests into a new cause for war might assist.

27. I have addressed this issue at some length as in my opinion this litigious behaviour seriously damages both Mr Knight's progress and the possibility of eventual release.

Attitudes to the Offences

28. In my opinion there have been some promising shifts in Mr Knight's attitude to the offences. The self identity as a mass killer and the preoccupation with those who committed similar offences, seems to be becoming a thing of the past. He was able to acknowledge being ashamed of his actions on that day. Shame, in my opinion, is a less slippery concept than remorse, and potentially of greater relevance. Shame is about the realisation that in the eyes of the community you have disgraced yourself. With shame comes the need to re-establish yourself as worthy of some respect. Shame involves a repudiation of your actions and an acceptance that the community had the right to condemn.

29. A problem remains, in my opinion, over Mr Knight's attitude to the events of 9th August 1987. Mr Knight appears to see his case as comparable to others where the offender was convicted of killing multiple victims. He claims not to understand why he has been singled out by the media and politicians for so much obloquy. He is prone to blame the 'Herald Sun' and particular commentators for what he sees as a campaign against him.

30. Some of the statements of the 19 year old in the aftermath of the massacre suggest he understood that the attack was not directed at the individuals who were shot but "at everyone". It was an act of vengeance on the society he believed had rejected

and persecuted him. The events of that day are still experienced by many of the people in Victoria as an assault on them as a community and as individuals. This is why it is so easy to rouse public sentiment against Mr Knight. He has to understand that the public attacks on him are not simply unfair prejudice but reflect the continuing fear and distress he evoked when he launched his attack on "everyone". Only by understanding and accepting this reality can he, in my opinion, have any chance of persuading others that he is no longer that disturbed, angry, immature, and dangerous 19 year old. The public view will gradually change with the passage of years. He will not be forgotten by those who lived through the tragedy of Hoddle Street, and certainly not by the victims and their family. For most people time will reduce the emotion and fear created on that day, and for most he will merge into the population of serious offenders. The time that it takes for Mr Knight to become just another murderer is increased every time he pops up in court pursuing another litigation. Today he is reported to be back in court, and this is possibly yet another episode of the community recalling, and some reliving, the tragedy. This is a disaster for Mr Knight. A disaster he seems bent on repeating again and again.

The Risks of Reoffending

31. At Mr Knight's trial Dr Bartholomew gave evidence to the effect that Mr Knight's eventual release should depend not simply on there being no continuing evidence of his presenting a substantial risk to the community but on there being positive evidence that he was not such a danger. In short, not that there are no obvious reasons to fear further serious violence but that there be obvious reasons not to fear such events in the future.
32. The risks Mr Knight may present can be divided firstly into the risk of perpetrating another massacre, and secondly into the risk of other offending.
33. There are at least two broad types of civil massacres:
 - 1) The first is where an individual goes into a public place to attack and kill a number of people not because of who they are, but as randomly selected

representatives of the community or some particular sub group. The Hoddle Street massacre was of the type known by such terms as pseudo-commando. In these a young person, almost always male, decides to kill themselves in a manner which will bring them fame as well as expressing their rage at a world they believe has rejected them. Typically they are gun obsessed, fascinated by militarism, often adhere to extreme right wing ideologies, are socially alienated, and facing a life crisis which they experience as humiliating. Between 10 and 20% have a psychotic illness of a schizophrenic type and most are depressed and despairing in one way or another. Examples are the massacres such as those at Port Arthur and Virginia Tech.

- 2) The second broad type involves men, usually in their 40s or 50s who are querulants engaged in lengthy processes of complaint and litigation. These men believe that they are fighting and dying in a grand battle for justice. They are often precipitated into fatal activity by a life crisis which they experience as humiliating and which they believe has made life not worth living. Examples are the Dunblane massacre and the massacre in Switzerland by Friederich Leibacher in 2001. This group have a form of paranoid disorder characterised by fixed beliefs in the importance of their quest for justice which may sometimes amount to delusions. They are not usually antisocial or impulsive but rigid, self righteous isolates.

34. Both types usually carefully plan and prepare their massacre. Mr Knight was something of an exception as his attack appears to have been more impulsive. He was intoxicated when he acted, which is also unusual.

35. The chances, in my opinion of Mr Knight repeating a massacre like that at Hoddle Street are remote. The combination of youth, immature rage at the world's unfairness, suicidal despair, grandiosity, fixation on weapons, fantasies of self sacrifice are unlikely to be repeated. The question also has to be asked whether there are positive reasons for discounting a repetition. He is older but, though he is more mature, long term imprisonment does not encourage personal and social maturation. He is less caught up in militarism but it would be even more reassuring were he to be focussed on a totally different area of interest. This is

why continuing to facilitate his educational opportunities and providing some intellectual guidance is important. He is gradually becoming more sociable and this needs to be encouraged. When he leaves prison it is essential he has the ability and opportunity to find a place in society and at least some companions. Mr Knight's own image of his likely future if he were released is grim. He sees himself as having to live alone, under an assumed name, probably on benefits, and largely, if not entirely, excluded from the society of his fellow men. Were Mr Knight to return to the community in the near future this would probably be his fate. This is not acceptable if for no other reason than the risks of recreating isolation, rejection, and a sense of injustice. Preparing Mr Knight to be able to work, socialise, and make some contribution to society would create the positive reasons for discounting a repetition of anything like his previous crimes.

36. On the basis that past behaviour predicts future behaviour the possibility has to be considered of the repetition of a similar outrage. This is a very rare event. Most perpetrators die among their victims. Of those who survive I know of only two cases comparable in any way who have returned to the community and for what it is worth they have not reoffended. It is important to note with crimes of such rarity the usual predictive paradigms and risk assessment instruments can be of no clear value, at least with regard to repeats of such murderous behaviour. A fear is understandable that having once violated the social controls on murderous behaviour to this extent it is more likely such boundaries will be broken again. This, I presume is why such attention has been paid to issues of remorse and victim empathy. Certainly some shame and guilt with some positive signs of desiring to atone would be reassuring. To be fair, Mr Knight is an intelligent man who must understand that his crimes are beyond simple notions of restoration and reparation. They are not, however, beyond contrition and the attempt to become, at least for some others, a source of support and positive regard. This is why I took some hope from learning Mr Knight had begun in small ways to try and improve things for his fellow prisoners and that he expressed grief at the death of a particular prisoner. His grief and anger at Mr Carr's death in prison may well be in part his fear that this will be his fate. This makes it no less reassuring because such identification is the essence of empathy.

37. The concern I expressed about Mr Knight's involvement in repeated litigation in part reflects that such behaviour on rare occasions has culminated in a massacre. Currently Mr Knight does not show the features of a paranoid litigant. Every time he becomes caught up in another quest for his vision of justice he, however, risks travelling down that path. It would be positively reassuring if he could give up this silly and damaging behaviour. Corrections could help with a little more forbearance and understanding.
38. The risks of Mr Knight reoffending when in the community, in what might be termed the normal manner of dishonesty or violence directed at specific individuals, is somewhat easier to predict. But there is also a problem because what would be of no great concern in most released prisoners, such as threats, altercations or minor assaults, would raise enormous public concern in Mr Knight's case. Mr Knight has to face the reality that when he is released he will have to live his life as a citizen above suspicion. A detailed risk assessment using the HCR20 has been performed, and hopefully will point to areas where Mr Knight could be assisted in reducing both his perceived and actual risks of reoffending. Simple checklists like Static 99 and Violence Risk Guide are of little value, particularly in a man who has been in prison for 23 years (which make so many items such as employment, and stable relationships irrelevant or unfair). Mr Knight has had few disciplinary issues in the last decade, which is reassuring. Mr Knight's probability of general reoffending, currently is probably no higher than moderate. The dynamic and changeable factors which increase his risk must be managed both prior to any release and with continued work once he is in the community. Mr Knight needs to reach a point where he can be properly considered of low risk by professionals with the training and experience to make such judgements.

Management

39. One of the keys to Mr Knight's eventual release is an effective management plan. The nature of his offence makes notions of offence specific needs largely inapplicable. The problem could be restated as offender specific needs. Mr Knight killed and maimed a large number of people when 19 years old. He has spent

twenty years in prison, much of it in a restricted and socially impoverished environment. Only some elements of the intoxicated 19 year old mass killer remain in the long term prisoner of today. Much of what makes Mr Knight the man he is has been created by the experiences and environment in which he has survived for the last twenty years. Many of the elements which contributed to making it possible to commit the massacre are no more. Some do, however, remain. He continues to be a rigid, self-righteous man with marked obsessional traits. This contributes to a tendency to persist in behaviours which are destructive to himself, and potentially to others. It also erodes the sense of proportion, and the all important common sense which protects most of us from succumbing to extreme views or actions. His self-absorption, sense of entitlement, and grandiosity contributed to the terrible event. These are gradually lessening, but need to recede further for others to be entirely comfortable with him returning to the community where he will have to cope with rebuffs, injustice, and challenges, some beyond him, at least initially. The narcissist can too easily withdraw into their own world, dominated by the notion that others are to blame so there is no hope of your actions changing the reality, where resentment is the comfort, and aggression against self or others can provide a temporary relief. Psychological interventions will assist. In my opinion however, it is the influence of his ongoing social reality which will be the most important. As he pursues education, preferably among others, as he plays a positive role in the prison, as he finds peers, so with time he will change. Time and aging are on his side as far as the narcissistic traits are concerned. Few can sustain a grand self-image as age advances. Obsessionality, unfortunately, does not decrease with age.

40. Corrections deserves credit for arranging an extended period of counselling with one of their most experienced clinicians. In the event this had an unsatisfactory conclusion. Probably resource constraints and practical considerations influenced the decision to employ the same clinician for counselling as for preparing the all important clinical and risk assessments. Many of my colleagues would consider a professional, by placing themselves in the dual role of assessor and therapist was acting unethically. I am not of this view, but do believe such a potentially conflicted doubling has to be managed with great care and transparency. In the event Mr Knight, to use his own words, "believed it was more an intelligence

gathering exercise than therapy". He did acknowledge his personal regard for Ms Sakellaridis and her good intentions and tolerance, but he never overcame his distrust. The situation was potentially damaging to both Ms Sakellaridis and Mr Knight. Mr Knight was made to appear uncooperative and dismissive of help when proffered. Ms Sakellaridis was exposed to Mr Knight's considerable abilities to undermine and scorn. I would note in passing that the practice in a prison environment of using the same professional in therapeutic and assessment roles could place the professional at risk. With Mr Knight the worst that was likely to occur was becoming the butt of verbal games and rudeness. With some other prisoners the risks could be far more serious. Ms Sakellaridis' recommendation that in future a referral to Forensicare should be sought presumably reflects her awareness of the problems created by the dual role.

41. In my opinion, Mr Knight would benefit from a number of therapeutic approaches.
42. He is an intelligent and articulate man much given to intellectualising his problems and failing to confront his part in creating problems. An ongoing psychotherapeutic engagement could assist him in avoiding the repetition of self defeating behaviours and changing the dysfunctional attitudes and beliefs which underlie such actions. He would probably enjoy such individual therapy as long as a context is established of confidentiality and trust. At a later stage he might progress to the point where group psychotherapy was practical. If only group therapy is possible, this should be tried as long as he is with a group that share his experience of long term imprisonment, and there is a robust and experienced group leader.
43. Structured therapeutic interventions to improve his social and interpersonal behaviour would be of value. The HCR20 would probably point out other areas that could be addressed to reduce risk. Such work would require the expertise of a clinical psychologist. Communications between any psychotherapist and any clinical psychologists should occur only in Mr Knight's presence to maintain trust and transparency.

44. On a similar level Mr Knight requires a context where he can mix with other prisoners. He would benefit from continuing being given responsibilities which place him in a supportive role, such as being an induction billet. Mr Knight's narcissistic traits can be an advantage in teaching and helping others when it is linked to a desire to share knowledge and skills with those less informed. For Mr Knight, such roles offer a chance to give back something back to a community from which he took so much. The other positive outcome would be that confrontation with the realities of teaching and supporting usually creates greater modesty and a more realistic evaluation of an inflated self-image. In my opinion, Mr Knight would flourish in a less restrictive environment so long as he has positive roles in the prison as support educator and friend to fellow prisoners. In that context he would be a plus for fellow prisoners, not a threat.
45. Mr Knight's ability to sabotage attempts to help him should not, however, be underestimated; over 20 years experience of disappointment and petty injustice does not breed trust or optimism. Equally, years of cultivating a sense of being intellectual superiority and being victimised does not evaporate overnight. His increasing social involvement, and taking on the role of helping and supporting others should gradually break down his cognitive distortions. If he succeeds, and is provided more such roles, it will hopefully gradually change some of the institutional mindsets about Mr Knight.

I hope the report covers the points raised in Mr Money's letter. I would be pleased to clarify any points, or answer any queries the members of the department may wish to raise.

Paul E Mullen MB BS DSc FRANZCP FRCPsych
Professor Emeritus of Forensic Psychiatry, Monash University
Visiting Professor, Institute of Psychiatry, London
Previously Clinical Director of the Victorian Forensic Mental Health Services