

Why Jeff Dahmer's Plea Change Was a Brilliant Strategic Move

How Switching to 'Guilty but Insane' Eliminated the Need for Evidence While Creating Illusion of Justice



THE DAHMER CASE
MAR 18, 2025



Share

Jeff Dahmer initially pleaded not guilty but later, on September 10, 1991, changed plea to guilty but insane.

Since the case was entirely fabricated, the plea change from "not guilty" to "guilty but insane" was a masterful tactical decision. Let me break down why this worked so effectively:

1. No Need to Produce Physical Evidence

When a defendant pleads guilty, prosecutors don't have to show physical evidence to prove the crimes occurred.

Think about it: If you were creating a fake serial killer case, your biggest challenge would be producing actual bodies, murder weapons, blood evidence, and crime scene photos. A regular trial would require all this evidence to be presented in court, examined by experts, and potentially challenged by the defense.

But when Jeff pled guilty, this problem magically disappeared. The prosecution no longer had to produce the actual physical evidence of murders and dismemberments—they only needed Jeff Dahmer's confession and some supporting testimony. The guilty plea meant everyone simply accepted that the crimes occurred as described.

It's like claiming you baked 15 cakes but never having to show anyone the cakes, ingredients, or even your kitchen. You just say "Yes, I made them," and everyone moves on to discussing whether you were in your right mind while baking.

Remember that Jeff's attorney, Gerald Boyle, recommended on August 6, 1991—just two weeks after Jeff's arrest—that [key biological evidence be returned to the families of the victims](#). This recommendation directly violated [Wisconsin statute 165.81](#), which requires the preservation of evidence.

Why would a defense attorney want to get rid of biological evidence so quickly? In a genuine case, this evidence would be crucial for potential appeals or further testimony. However, if there was no actual biological evidence, this move creates a perfect explanation for why nothing could be examined later.



Jeff Dahmer (seated middle) with his father and stepmother

2. Changing the Central Question of the Trial

The plea change shifted the whole trial from "Did he kill these people?" to "Was crazy when he killed these people?"

This is a critical shift.

The first question requires physical evidence and proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The second question is much more subjective and can be argued through “expert opinions” from psychiatrists rather than hard evidence.

Think of it like this: Instead of having a trial about whether a bank robbery happened (which would require security footage, stolen money, and eyewitnesses), you have a trial about whether the admitted bank robber was sleepwalking during the robbery. The second question is far easier to manage and control.

This change meant everyone in the courtroom—judge, jury, media, and public—accepted the murders as fact and moved on to the more abstract question of Jeff Dahmer's mental state.

For more information, see [When a Monster Appears Just in Time: Jeff Dahmer and Archbishop Weakland's Convenient Distraction](#).

3. Creating the Illusion of a Fair Trial

The insanity defense made it look like Jeff was getting his day in court without re-exposing the holes in the story.

The public expects a major criminal case to have a trial. Simply having Jeff plead with no trial would have seemed suspicious and anticlimactic after all the media attention. However, a full trial examining all the evidence would have risked exposing inconsistencies.

The insanity defense provided the perfect middle ground—a dramatic, headline-generating trial that never questioned the basic facts of the case. The prosecution and defense could appear to be adversaries while both working within the same fabricated narrative.

It's like staging a debate in which both sides secretly agree on the conclusion but passionately argue about a side issue to keep the audience engaged and entertained.



Jeff Dahmer, 1980s

4. Guaranteeing the Desired Outcome

Insanity defenses almost never succeed, so this strategy ensured Jeff would go to prison while still giving the appearance of a fair legal process.

Statistically, insanity defenses succeed less than 1% of the time. The people behind this case would have known this. By choosing this defense, they could give Jeff's attorneys the appearance of trying their best while virtually guaranteeing the outcome the public expected—Jeff behind bars for life.

This approach satisfied everyone:

- The public got to see “justice served”
- The media got their sensational trial
- The fabricators maintained control of the narrative

- The Catholic Church got their distraction from abuse scandals

For more information, see [Why Did DA Michael McCann Share an Address with Dahmer?](#)

A Controlled Burn Rather Than a Wildfire

The beauty of this strategy is that it looked like a normal legal process to casual observers while carefully avoiding any risky exposure of the case's foundations. It was a controlled burn rather than a wildfire—dramatic enough to capture attention but never threatening to expose the truth.



5 Likes

Discussion about this post

Comments

Restacks



Write a comment...