

The Crime Cafe with

Doug Kari

Presented By:



Debbi ([00:52](#)): Hi everybody. I have with me today a fascinating guest for you. He is a true crime writer known for his hands-on investigative approach to research and writing. His work has taken him to places like shallow graves. He just lies in the shallow grave and kind of gets a sense of what it's like to have to be in a shallow grave, maybe avoiding gunfire or avoiding something.

([01:22](#)): And he also has followed leads on missing persons through Death Valley and Mexico, among other places, I assume. Anyway, he was an English major at UC Berkeley and received his law degree—All right, lawyers!—from UC Law, San Francisco. His latest book is called *The Berman Murders*. It's my pleasure to introduce Doug Kari. Is it Kari?

Doug ([01:54](#)): It's Kari. And thank you, Debbi. It's a pleasure to be on your show.

Debbi ([01:59](#)): Well, it's a pleasure to have you here. Thank you so much for being here. I do appreciate it. And your work just amazes me. I'm just blown away by it. How did you get involved in investigating the Berman murders?

Doug ([02:13](#)): For the Berman murders case, that was one that was really near and dear to my heart because of the location where the crime took place. It's a desert valley that's very difficult to access, that's in between the Sierra Nevada and Death Valley in Eastern California, and it's quite inaccessible. To get there, you have to follow a 50-mile dirt road. You have to cross mountains that are sometimes impassable depending on the time of the year. And once you're in the valley, it's like being on another planet. It's the kind of place, Debbie, that attracts counterculture types, the kind of folks I hung out with when I was a student at Berkeley, the hippie crowd, the seekers, and word of mouth, people have come into this valley and they travel there to hang out at Hot Springs. It was sort of like a mini Burning Man before Burning Man ever existed, a very eclectic crowd.

([03:18](#)): You might find firefighters mingling with people from a magic bus. Everybody seems to share the same vibe, the same energy, the same aura. So it was quite stunning, quite shocking when in January 1986, a couple of nondescript hippie campers walked off on a morning walk and never came back. And three years later, their remains turned up miles away in a shallow grave. They'd been murdered.

Debbi ([03:58](#)): Yeah, that had to be kind of shocking. It was in 1986 that they disappeared?

Doug ([04:08](#)): January 1986. And that was a time period when myself and others that were into mountaineering out there and exploring the desert, we would go to these hot springs. I took my kids out there. In fact, or January 1986 was just a few months before I brought my newborn daughter out there for the first time. So to have a crime like this occur in a place that you think of as being completely off the beaten path, very laid back, peaceful, beautiful, to have people turn up murdered was just outside the realm of what most people could comprehend. And because of that, it was a real shock for those who frequented this valley. And it nagged me for years, Debbi. And finally in 2014, I decided I was going to investigate what happened, because there had never been an arrest or a conviction in the case, and I wanted to see if I could figure out what happened to these people and why.

Debbi (05:24): So how much research did you do to create the book? How many hours of research and how many hours of going through doing interviews and going through those interviews and that research before you were able to write the book?

Doug (05:42): It was a very lengthy process. I started with a real intense push in the first year, and that resulted in a cover story for *LA Weekly* about the case. But then off and on, I continued to work on the case over the span of about nine years, interviewing people, trying to gather information. Debbi, information gathering was really tough in this case. Some of the people that I wanted to talk to wouldn't talk to me, and it took years and repeated efforts for them finally to soften up and agree to tell me what they knew. Tracking down, getting the case files from the sheriff's office took time. Everything was really difficult in this case. There are cases where there's a wealth of information available. This wasn't that kind of a case, but slowly the facts began to emerge. I began getting cooperation from people, locating people.

(06:39): I got the records from the sheriff's department. I went to the scene multiple times, and I already had a lot of knowledge of the area, and I started piecing things together, and it became clear that the likely suspect was one particular person. It's not like in January 1986 in the middle of this remote desert valley, there were thousands or even hundreds of people who could be likely suspects. You're talking about a few dozen people, and one stood out in particular. And so I did a deep dive on him, and ultimately in the book, I essentially lay out the case for why I believe the facts point to him as the likely perpetrator. Keep in mind, he's never been arrested, never been charged, but the facts point that direction.

Debbi (07:34): That's very interesting. I mean, this is long after the hippie movement was over, so these people were in a community that was very unique and very small and very... Probably the police were... I don't know. How were the police like around all this?

Doug (07:53): Everybody tolerated it. The thing about Inyo County, California where this took place, it's a very large county, about 15,000 square miles with a small sheriff's department, and they had a very kind of live and live attitude. I would call it more of a libertarian attitude. Look, they didn't want rampant law breaking, but they weren't out there to police minor drug or alcohol violations. They felt that the hot springs tended to police themselves and that there was a pretty good scene going on out there. Law enforcement was okay with it. It fit the vibe of the community, and you couldn't necessarily pinpoint it as being just hippies or counterculture types. I mean, you'd go out there and you'd see a mix of people, everybody ranging from gun enthusiasts to now and then people who like to explore off-road, and then of course the hippie types, the counterculture types, and everybody in between.

(09:08): Most people who are out there as regulars had a handle. They didn't use their birth name. They would use some handle like Chili Bob, Lizard Lee, names like that.

Debbi (09:22): Well, it sounds fascinating.

Doug (09:24): Oh, it's great. It's great. And I've been going out there for years, totally fit with my personality, although I wasn't a hangout at the hot springs guy so much. I fell in with a group of people who were more active. We like to explore the surrounding mountains and desert, and I actually co-founded a desert exploration group called Desert Survivors that still exists, and it's a niche environmental and exploration group that explores these kinds of remote areas of the desert. I was out there a lot with my family. Even though it's a desert valley with sand dunes and

it appears very dry, there's a mountain range, the Inyo Mountains, Debbi, that drops into that valley from peaks as high as 11,000 feet, incredibly steep with these deep canyons. Some of those canyons have waterfalls in them. There's one particular canyon where you can park and walk away up the canyon, and all of a sudden you come across a little waterfall.

(10:26): All three of my kids, we baptized them in that waterfall. So that's how near and dear this place was and remains to my heart. So when these murders took place, again, it was a shock to the system, what happened? And that's when, as I said, I finally decided to investigate. And there's been other cases I've followed up on out there also, Debbi. There was a more recent case involving a Vietnam veteran who just vanished off the map, a missing person case. I did work on that case and published articles in the *Las Vegas Review Journal* and ultimately came up with a theory, found a piece of evidence and came up with a theory of what happened to him. I don't believe it was foul play, but still don't have a body, so I can't prove that my theory is correct, but that's an area where I've put in a lot of time and investigation into cases.

Debbi (11:26): Now, at this point, are you still freelancing or are you focusing more on creating books?

Doug (11:33): Yeah, I freelance primarily for the *Las Vegas Review Journal*. I've done work that's been published in other places like *LA Times* and *San Diego Union Tribune*. As you know, Debbi, the journalism platform isn't the easiest anymore. When cases do come along, a lot of times they'll assign them to a staff writer, so there isn't really room for a freelancer like me, even though I don't charge for my work. Sometimes I get paid just because that's the newspaper policy, but I'm not in this for the money. I'm in it because I have things I want to say, and I want to have a voice and a platform to be able to say it. I've got a social media platform for that purpose, even though social media is not my primary goal in life. I do have one book out, *The Berman Murders*, and a second book coming out on February 4.

(12:33): My publisher is Bloomsbury, so I haven't had to endure some of the self-publishing challenges that you had to go through making a very successful platform off of. There's good and bad that comes along with having an agent and a mainstream publisher. The good is that you get some reviews and you get some credibility. Of course, the difficult part of it is that you're kind of at the publisher's mercy a little bit. Bloomsbury's a big publisher. They did the Harry Potter series. Once you sign a contract with them, they treat me very well, but you're just one of many people in their stable, and that's just how it is. But I've been very fortunate to land with Bloomsbury, and like I said, they've been quite supportive. I'm excited about the next book, *Taking Naomi*. It's about the abduction, the kidnapping and murder of a teenage girl in Northern Nevada. Again, another case set in a rural desert area.

Debbi (13:49): And when's that coming out?

Doug (13:51): February 4.

Debbi (13:53): February 4th. Thank you. Wow. Yeah, I was going to say, what kind of writing schedule do you keep and what kind of typical day do you have, or do you have a typical day?

Doug (14:09): It's tough. It's tough, Debbi, because even though I'm an older man now, I'm still very engaged in work. So my day job is working as a chief legal officer at a tech company that's

growing. We're in the AI space. We do AI products for physical security solutions, so things like threat recognition, we do airports and other projects around the world. We're not the installers, we're the ones who engineer and design the products. So there are sophisticated products that can spot a gun in somebody's hand or a knife. They're used in places like casinos, jails, schools, and it's a growing area, but because it's growing and we're expanding, I'm very busy with that. So right now, I haven't had a lot of time to do as much on the writing side as I'd like. I do a monthly blog. I put out some social media posts, although my posting has really dropped off just because of the demands of the work.

(15:12): And of course, very soon now I'm going to be promoting the release of the second book, so I put in what time I can. When I'm in the middle of writing a book, Debbi, it's a rough process. It doesn't just flow out of me. It's a painstaking process of just draft after draft after draft. And one thing I don't believe in is utilizing AI as a tool for writing. I can understand why some people do, and it's okay for me if people use it in drafting business emails or even personal letters, whatever they feel comfortable with. But as a writer, I don't care if an AI product might sound better than I sound. It's my voice. I want my voice to be heard the way I say it, and I would never utilize AI even to edit or make suggestions. I just don't believe in it.

(16:08): The other day though, I did go on to Gemini and I was self-educating a little bit about some of the current controversies and such in the AI space, and I asked Gemini to write a little summary of a case that I've published several articles about, the Aurora Phelps case in Las Vegas, and it came up with a pretty good 300 or 400-word summary. And then I said, "Rewrite the story in the voice of Doug Kari author." So it did. It rewrote it in what it thought was my voice and made it a little more sexy, I guess, made it sound a little more true crime because true crime has a certain thing to it, a certain type of voice that you have. It's not completely dry or academic or matter of fact. On the other hand, I don't like to go too hogwild with it either.

(17:01): I wasn't sure it was really my voice, but it was interesting to see that it thought it could speak in my voice. And then it asked me if I wanted an explanation of my writing style, and it actually made some pertinent observations. So anyway, this is a digression about AI and all the controversy. I'm kind of in the middle on it. I understand the concerns about what can happen if agentic AI is given tools without the proper training and the constitution and the system prompts so that it could go off the reservation and cause harm. But on the other hand, I think these are good tools. Again, that said though, I am dead set, dead set against ever letting it speak for me. My voice, it took me decades to develop this voice, and I'm jealous of it. I'm not going to outsource it to anybody.

Debbi (17:56): Absolutely positively agree with you. I mean, number one, you won't be able to copyright it. It's non-copyrightable, folks. You generate something by AI. If that's all it is, it's not copyrightable, so it's worthless.

Doug (18:15): Well, it's like if you're a singer, you're not going to ask AI to sing a song for you. Some of these AI-generated songs, they don't sound half bad. I've listened to them. I've made a decision for myself, Debbi, I'm not going to listen to AI-generated music. I prefer to hear the product of humans because I'm a human and I want to hear the voices, the musical voices of lived experiences and all the nuances that come with being a human being, the emotions, the memories, all of those things. One of the things I don't like about AI is that it has kind of unlimited access to information. Part of what makes us unique is we have limits. Each of us has a

limited amount of information that we work with. Our experiences, part of our uniqueness is in what we don't know and what we haven't seen, and so we've developed a unique perspective based on what we have felt and seen and lived and what we haven't, and that helps preserve our uniqueness.

(19:18): If everybody knows everything, then it just becomes white noise in a way. And that's, to me, how some of this AI generated stuff sounds. It sounds like it's carved out of white noise instead of being propagated from within.

Debbi (19:34): Yeah. I mean, when you write something, you are expressing yourself in the only way you should be expressing yourself. You are expressing you, your voice, your point of view, what you've seen, what you've experienced, even if it's fictional, even if you're making it up -

Doug (19:55): It's the same.

Debbi (19:55): Your experiences inform that. So how do you replace that with the hive mind of AI, everything kind of condensed into this thing, and maybe they pick out a few things that are in your style and then try to mimic it? And then it's like, where's the growth? You're supposed to also be growing as a writer, improving.

Doug (20:21): Well, that's a really good point, Debbi, and it's one thing that the AI models, at least the public-facing models don't have, which is neuroplasticity. Our brains exist in motion. We're constantly learning, developing as we go along. Even during the course of this conversation, of this interview, neurons are firing, our brains are developing, memories are taking place. You and I will both, in a neuron sense, be different after every experience, including this interview, including everything we do. We exist in motion, whereas these, especially the chat models, these LLMs, large language models, they are frozen in time as to a particular version. It's just a closed set of mathematical formulas. I had somebody tell me the other day that they didn't want to close what's called the context window. When you enter a prompt in AI and you can continue to add to it, because the person told me that, well, AI had gotten to know her, the chatbot had gotten to know her, and I thought, no, that's not how it works.

(21:36): What it's doing is taking this growing body of information. It's just applying numbers to it. It takes everything and assigns numerical values, and then pushes those values through a set of relational mathematical algorithms to relate those numerical values to other concepts out there in relational space and then turn it back into words. It's just math, and you can adjust the math. You can try this sometime with any of the chatbots, you can alter the voice, say, "Talk to me like Shakespeare," or you can just simply say, "Turn up the temperature," and you'll get a little more freewheeling answer or turn down the temperature. You'll get a more rigid scientific business-like answer. All it's doing when you say turn up the temperature or turn down the temperature is it's just increasing or decreasing probabilities. If you turn down the temperature, then it's only giving you the most boring high probability words.

(22:41): If you turn up the temperature high enough, you're getting words that have very little relational context and may sound wacky or far out there, but it's all math. It's just math and probabilities. That's why I'm not scared of it yet. Now, of course, it can become scary if you empower it, if you give it tools that it can independently exercise. It's not like it goes evil, it's just that it's not well-trained. That's all. Mathematically, the math is bad.

Debbi ([23:11](#)): It's a computer program.

Doug ([23:13](#)): It's a computer program.

Debbi ([23:15](#)): We have the ability to program these things or not program these things. We can make decisions about that.

Doug ([23:23](#)): We humanize this stuff. And I think that AI, the frontier companies like Anthropic, OpenAI, et cetera, they want us to look at them as human. They want to actually believe they have some sort of mystical powers. I think these geek mathematicians, they want to believe that they're godlike creatures who have created something that has consciousness. I call BS on that. It's just.

Debbi ([23:45](#)): It is. Yeah. And these guys need to see the movie *Frankenstein* or read the book or something. Yeah. There was a point being made there. Perhaps you missed it. Okay.

Doug ([23:55](#)): Right. That is a great story, by the way.

Debbi ([23:59](#)): You know, I have never read it.

Doug ([24:02](#)): Oh, it's good.

Debbi ([24:03](#)): I think I've seen the original movie all of once, and I should probably see it again. What advice would you give to anyone who is interested in a writing career? I have to ask this question each time.

Doug ([24:16](#)): Well, my first advice would be don't do it.

Debbi ([24:20](#)): Everybody says that.

Doug ([24:21](#)): Yeah. As a career, it's very difficult to make any kind of money out of it. I do it as a passion, and I consciously take the economics out of it. Sometimes my writing generates some money, but that's an afterthought for me. It's all about doing it for the passion of it. But even then, I would advise, really, think about this before you do it. I'll give you an analogy. I always like to use this analogy. Imagine that your life is the Thanksgiving table, and you've got the food set out, and then you've got each part of your life is one of the guests sitting at the table. So sitting at the table or your kids or your partner or your work or all these other things, and you're all set up to have a nice dinner and everybody's going to get their portion. Everything's great.

([25:15](#)): It's all perfect. And then Writer Guy shows up and takes a seat at the table, and Writer Guy is like an 800-pound gorilla that robs from everybody else's plate and just gobbles everything down, and everybody's mad at you because you don't have any time or energy left for them. All you're thinking about is writing because the writing has gobbled up your life. That's how it is for me. I can sit there and be working on something and look up, and hours have gone by, and then at the end of a whole day of working on something, I realized that it was a false lead, it was a false direction, and I end up just scrapping it, maybe saving it in the thought that I might use it someday or just deleting it all together. It's a little bit depressing, but that's part of the process, but it's so time-consuming.

(26:05): The good thing about it, of course, is it feels great to be able to have a medium of expression. If you have things you want to say, if you have an artistic heart, and like me, you can't sing, and you don't play an instrument, and you're not really a poet. I'm not even a fiction writer like you are, Debbi. I wanted to be Ernest Hemingway, but I don't have that kind of talent. But what I can do is take facts from the world about interesting cases and try to turn it into a factually accurate story, but a good story, like a story that you'll want to read that'll draw you in, that talks about real life and death stuff, real people.

Debbi (26:45): Has anyone ever called you a Gonzo journalist?

Doug (26:49): A Gonzo journalist?

Debbi (26:51): I have to ask.

Doug (26:53): I studied new journalism when I was at UCLA, and I actually had a class called New Journalism, and we studied Gonzo as one of the mediums. For people who aren't familiar with it, it's the voice of most notably Hunter S. Thompson who kind of combined the stream of consciousness and getting high along the way, incorporating that into his voice. I've imitated Gonzo writing a little bit, and God knows I was at Berkeley in the '70s, so if you're at Berkeley in the '70s, you sort of naturally were living a Gonzo journalism kind of experience back then. But my voice is a little more serious than that. I mean, I want you to be drawn into the story when you read it and to feel like you want to turn the page and know what happens next. But at the same time, I also want people to feel this isn't about me.

(27:48): This is about the people in the book. It's not less about my relationship with them and more about their relationship with each other. And the human dynamics in true crime cases are intense when you take the family, the victim, and then the people that surrounded the perpetrator, and then the law enforcement and the community at large, because nowadays, all high profile cases, you've got a community of people involved on social media, conventional media, and all of that comes together. All of that energy and that focus comes together, and all of those characters interact, and you've got a start and an end to all this, and something extraordinary happens. It's really, really interesting and very sobering when you interview people who have been close to a major crime. These are just people, regular people. Sometimes a family member might've been killed, or they themselves might've been a victim, or they're charged with trying to figure out what happened, or they're a member of the public who wanted to do something and then ended up getting involved in the hunt or involved in helping the family.

(29:00): Everybody comes out of it with their lives changed forever on one of these big cases. Everybody's changed forever.

Debbi (29:07): Yeah, I often think about that. Things that you see in the paper about people, what about the people in their lives?

Doug (29:17): Right? That's why I'm not too quick to beat up on people. Social media tends to move in one direction or another. When I got involved in the Hannah Kobayashi case, everybody thought she was this damsel in distress, a woman who had supposed to change planes flying

from Hawaii to New York to visit her sister. She's supposed to change planes in LA. Instead, she never gets on the connecting flight, and she's being followed around on video camera as they're pulling up surveillance cameras, trying to figure out what happened to her. Her behavior doesn't seem to be predictable. Where did she go? And then it turns out she was in Mexico. When it became clear that Hannah wasn't necessarily a damsel in distress, that she might've been a person in a bad situation that just decided, "You know what? I'm going to get away from this." All of a sudden, social media just turned on her. That kind of situation immediately makes me skeptical.

(30:22): Why the sudden turn? I think if somebody doesn't fit your description or your preconceived notion of what they're supposed to be, you mean a woman's only sympathetic if she's a damsel in distress? What if she's having personal issues? What if something else is going on? What if she made a mistake? Have you ever made a mistake? The way social media gravitates and immediately tacks either somebody's good or they're bad, there's not a lot of nuance on social media.

Debbi (30:52): Exactly.

Doug (30:53): That's a fascinating part of the dynamic too. You see that playing out in the Lindsay Clancy case where people either think she's a horrible murderer who murdered her children, or she's this sympathetic mother who had a postpartum psychosis much worse than postpartum depression, that she was actually in a psychotic state and we ought to sympathize with her. Then you've got people on the fringe who are disregarding all the facts and just saying, "Oh, her husband did it." It's like, "No, he didn't." I know you'd love that to be the narrative, but it didn't happen that way. I mean, if it did, you think her lawyer would've just overlooked that? I mean, come on guys. But perfectly reasonable people will go off on these tangents because that's what they want it to be. I like to try to make room for the real facts of a case, which may be more nuanced.

(31:48): Not every perpetrator is the personification of evil. They may be evil, but there may be also reasons why they personify evil. I'm not letting anybody off the hook saying they're not responsible for their own actions, Debbi. What I am saying is let's understand why people do what they do as part of analyzing it. Doesn't mean, oh, okay, they get a free pass for doing something terrible. No, but we should understand them as three-dimensional characters. Same thing with victims. It's not just crime victim. It's a person. It's a human being with a multidimensional life. So that's part of what I try to do in my stories, get in deep. Let's strip away layers of the onion and find out what was going on underneath in the lives of all the people involved and how that came to be.

Debbi (32:37): Well, that is obviously a labor of love and just wonderful.

Doug (32:46): A labor of obsession maybe.

Debbi (32:48): Obsession, love, whatever. I just think it's great what you're doing. I think the fact that you can do it and not be arrested or harassed terribly.

Doug (33:00): Not yet at least.

Debbi (33:02): Not yet at least. I was going to ask you about that, but I can save that for the bonus. I have all sorts of things I can ask you in the bonus. Is there anything you'd like to add before we finish up?

Doug (33:15): Well, I just wanted to say how much I appreciate being here. You have a very interesting background. You're a prolific writer. You don't talk much in the material that I saw about your work as a lawyer, but you have that in your background as well. I mean, you've done a lot of things, so I appreciate the opportunity to speak with someone who, like me, has had a multifaceted journey into this space.

Debbi (33:44): Yeah, for sure. Yeah. I was going to say, do you think lawyers make good fiction authors? I think we get wonderful ideas for stories from our cases.

Doug (33:56): Sure. I mean, John Grisham's an example of a lawyer turned writer who did a really terrific job with it. I tried my hand at some fiction writing, but it doesn't come naturally to me. I'm much more drawn to a set of facts. I really enjoy trying to uncover the facts and then organize them and understand what happened. It limits you in some ways, but in some ways it's very comforting because your own imagination limits you too. Whereas the facts of a case, those are chosen by others.

Debbi (34:30): Yeah, it's interesting because I too am sort of into doing research, so I can appreciate how awesome it is to find out stuff. I'm into that, totally.

Doug (34:46): When you really score an interesting piece of information, there was a probation report that had been written on the perpetrator in the Taking Naomi case, a really dark and complex character. That's why I wrote the book primarily. Naomi was a fascinating victim. I mean, we're talking about an 18-year-old young woman who spoke four languages and who had traveled multiple places in the world. She was a really interesting person with the experience that she'd gone through, not what you would expect at age 18 for someone to have seen and experienced as much as she had. But the perpetrator, he was fascinated because of the depth of his darkness and how it emerged early in life. One of the things I wanted to see was a probation report that had been written on him many, many years earlier. I had to go to court in Northern California to get a court order to get that document released.

(35:44): I had to sue the county. They weren't going to give it to me. Of course, you can imagine when I prevailed and I got a copy of it and it turned out to have a wealth of information, how exciting that was.

Debbi (35:55): Oh, that always feels so good.

Doug (35:58): Right. I'm reading a probation report and I'm just thrilled.

Debbi (36:04): Only lawyer geeks can get thrilled about things like this. I mean, yeah, I know exactly what you mean. It's like, "Ah, got it."

Doug (36:13): Yeah, really interesting information. Now and then you fight to get something and it turns out to just be pure gold in terms of understanding the situation. So many times, of course, you come up empty, you interview somebody and it turns out they don't really have much knowledge or you find the documents and you look through them and there's just not

very much information. But now and then, I mean, I just got files in this Aurora Phelps case, the woman who was seducing older men and then drugging them, and many of them, several of them at least ended up dead. She's now the subject of an international investigation and there's an indictment pending on her in Las Vegas, and meanwhile, she's incarcerated in Mexico. I went through old cases. There were some cases involving her, one of which was a bitter divorce, and she wrote a long single-spaced letter, email type letter to the judge, and it had all kinds of things that revealed parts of her personality.

([37:17](#)): You dig through files of dry, meaningless stuff, and then you come to something like that, and you're just like, "Oh, I'm starting to understand who this person is that went from being a mom of four boys to being an accused multiple murderer."

Debbi ([37:36](#)): Yeah, very interesting. Thank you for that. Really, thank you for being here today. I really appreciate your thoughts, everything you've had to say, and all the work that you do. I'm amazed by what you're doing.

Doug ([37:53](#)): My pleasure.

Debbi ([37:56](#)): To everyone listening, thank you very much. If you want to have early access to ad-free episodes plus access to my work, which I'm serializing on Patreon and Substack, you can join at the... I think it's the \$10 tier to get access to my work, and probably at some point I'll do something additional. I'm not sure what that is at this point because I'm not sure of much of anything, anymore. If you enjoyed the episode though, please leave a review. They help a lot. I appreciate that. Until next time, happy reading, and I'll be seeing you. Take care.