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The author is a member of the Editorial Board of this Journal. After a long period of teaching and research in the United States, he returned to the University of Bonn where he was Professor and Dean of Law, and where, before World War II, he had been associated with Professor Gustav Aschaffenburg. His two volume work on “Punishment”, and his study of the “American Desperado” have now been followed by studies dealing with “undeveloped” aspects of murder, the mechanics of murder, evolution of the murderous idea, murder collectives and the non-resisting or provocative victim and a recent book on the confidence man.—EDITOR.

I

Preparing the act to come and screening the deed done—these devices enter largely into the composition of murderous tactics. The defensive methods may question the legal qualification, allege self-defense, mistake of fact or enforcement of law, or impute the case of decease to suicide, accident, natural causes or the interference of third persons. They may try to obliterate the incriminating relation in time and space and thus establish an alibi. Of greater weight is what we would like to call the psychological alibi. The murderer is bent on introducing the element of improbability into the hazy set of circumstances. No stone is left unturned to create the impression that he could not possibly be the perpetrator of an atrocious crime. The conjecture to which he tries to lead the investigation is expressed by the familiar saying, heard so often and denoting our lacking insight into human character, that nobody would have thought the culprit capable of a murder.

Few murderers fight their victim man to man. The assassin is on the lookout for situations of defencelessness. We do protect ourselves first of all by mechanical means, bolted doors, closed windows, guns or watch dogs. Yet only hermits can seclude themselves from human society. All those who live in common can not for long maintain mechanical barriers. Whenever the door bell rings and is answered this pattern of safety has come to an end. It is reduced in passing a street or a park, in driving a car, when fishing, bathing, hiking and hunting.

When “uncovered” we protect ourselves by mobilizing defensive mental attitudes, suspicion, caution, alertness. In meeting, maybe only sensing, hostility mechanisms of alarm are set in motion. It is the main task of the man who plans foul play to overcome mistrust. His deceptive maneuvers have the additional subsequent advantage of misleading the investigators and public opinion; model husbands or kind-hearted and untiring nurses do not kill. They couldn’t have done it! It is hard to say whether it is more difficult to hide physically from the police, from the purchase of poison, or a ticklish motive. In family tragedies the murderer has to stay. His guard is limited to an attempt at removing suspicion, perhaps constructing a precarious alibi. A cynical judge has expressed the opinion that, in the case of a married couple, there was no need to look for the murder motive, since marriage was a motive in itself! Many couples, having no children, no servants, few friends, living in a place
of their own, being on their best behavior when in company or in public, are able to hush up disharmony, even hatred. A furious outburst of violence casts doubt into the minds of the jurors when incentives seem to be missing, and leads to a discharge. The phantom of the eternal prowler, seen and recollected, comes to the rescue of the defendant. It has not yet been studied. However these are exceptions. Most couples do not conceal their marital troubles. Their relatives, their friends, the servants know about it. Shouting and slammed doors have been heard; angry faces have been seen. Husband and wife have met in court or in lawyers’ offices. When murder is planned this unpleasant impression has to be obliterated. A comedy of amiability, reconciliation, or revived marital bliss or domestic concord is started. The wolf presents himself in tailor-made sheep’s clothing which is, of course, one of the oldest hunting devices.

II

The pre-murderous delusion, the make-believe of harmonious companionship, of filial love and true friendship to deceive the victim as well as the persons around, blended admirably with emperor Nero’s stagy nature when he had decided to get rid of his mother. The proceedings have been described by Tacitus and by Suetonius. Under the pretense of a reconciliation Nero invited Agrippina in a most charming letter to celebrate a holiday with him. She came by ship. This craft was stealthily made leaky by his order but did not sink. Nero then offered his own yacht, well prepared to collapse and to take his mother to the bottom of the sea. The canopy under which Agrippina rested was heavily weighted with lead.¹

Suetonius² tells us that the Emperor drew the banquet forth deep into the night, saw his mother in highest glee to the murder ship and bade her farewell by kissing her bosom.³ It was exactly as the proverb says: “When tyrants seem to kiss, ’tis time to fear.” From remotest antiquity to modern times the technique has not changed. The kiss,⁴ the ready smile,⁵ the flattering complaisance⁶ induce the guilelessness of the victim and precede the sudden assault. It is noteworthy that some of the most

¹Tacitus, Ann. XIV, 4
²Suetonius, Nero 34.
³Tacitus Reports; “clinging more closely than usual to her breast and kissing her eyes” (Ann. XX XIV, 4.) Dio Cassius (LXI, 13) speaks of kissing eyes and hands.
⁴Plutarch (Caesar 17) writes that the conspirators grasped Cesar’s hands and showered kisses on his breast and his head. Then they killed him with twenty-three thrusts.
⁵It was Wes Harding’s, the notorious outlaw’s trick, to grin at his opponent, to set him at ease and to pull the trigger. See my study: Der Desperado; Ein Beitrag zur Psychologie des Regressiven Menschen, Heidelberg, 1956, p. 211.
⁶Lady Macbeth reminds her husband before the murder of Banquo:
“... Come on
“Gentle, my lord, sleek o’er your rugged looks;
“Be bright and jovial among your guests tonight.” And Macbeth answers:
“So shall I, love; and so, I pray, be you:
“Let your remembrance apply to Banquo;
“Present him eminence, both with your eye and tongue.”—Shakespeare,
Macbeth III, 2. (“Present him eminence” is an old phrase for “treating with distinction” according to Shakespearean glossaries.
famous murder cases happened after a party and a merry meal. "In the last day of January 1910," we read, "there was a little social gathering in the Crippen home... The doctor had summoned two friends to have dinner and to play cards. The meal was served in a homely fashion, there being no servant present. Afterwards there was a game. The guests were surprised at the amicable conduct of the Crippens, for their domestic storms were known to all their friends and many had seen the wife assail her husband ferociously without regard for the presence of outsiders. But this night all was calm and placid. The two visitors left after midnight in a happy mood. They never saw Mrs. Crippen again.

Albert Snyder and his wife had attended a friendly bridge party which lasted into the early morning hours of Sunday, March 20, 1927. Ruth Snyder had been seen encouraging her husband to drink more than his usual share of cocktails. That same night, Judd Gray—more keenly alive to fitting girdles than selling them—and Ruth, his paramour, had sneaked into the sleeping room, had crushed Albert's skull with a sashweight, strangled him with a picture wire and put a chloroform pad over nose and mouth. The wife was found on the floor bound with heavy cord. In spite of the shock she was able to give a description of the huge Italian robbers who had killed her husband and tied her up. The house was in that incompetent sort of upheaval that deludes few detectives, and an Italian newspaper was on the floor, a mute testimony of Italian atrocities.

What can the murderer do when many people know that the son was at loggerheads with his mother, the daughter with her father, husband with wife? The break must be patched up, every one must know and see that a reconciliation has taken place and domestic harmony has been restored. After the Marquess of Brinvillier had made up her mind to poison her father, she joined the old man at his country place. All the old affection came forth, and whilst sharing all his pastime she found her way back into his love and confidence. She prepared his soups with her own hands, did not show the slightest trouble and seemed to be most solicitous for his health, whereas she added poison to the appetizing dishes.

In a more recent case (v. Heydebrek, Silesia 1926) wife and husband had quarreled, had separated, and were pitted against one another in court. The only witness left is the husband and his story is dubious. He told the jury that there had been attempts at reconciliation, that they had met and that peace had been reestablished. After a meal they went to bed and had intercourse. Arguments on money affairs had blazed up again and during the night the wealthy wife had shot herself, reaching over the sleeping man and using his gun. Murder was likely, suicide not impossible. The man was acquitted.

Murder was, according to the ideas of antiquity, especially heinous when executed during sacred ceremonies, during sleep, the performance of love, and during the meal. Tacitus speaks of killing "amid the sanctities of the table" (Ann XIII) "intra sacra mensae." On murder during the sex act, see the author's MURDER, Tubingen, 1956, p. 173.


Ione Quinby, MURDER FOR LOVE. New York, 1931, p. 29.


The murderer within a family group is aiming much more at deluding relatives, neighbors and friends than the married partner because he knows that they will be asked later in court about the state of marital relations. The constellation is somewhat different, when a married man thinks of detaching himself from an onerous paramour. Feelings have grown chilly. To regain the victim's confidence a return of the old passion has to be feigned. The lovers have to meet again. They do it furtively when the man is married or is planning a new and improved match. Peace is made on the sly. The victims are killed and unable to report the tricks used. Only talkative women, eager to make confidants of a friend or some other intimate, reveal the treacherous secrets of the murdered. They are dead, but witnesses will stand up and talk.

Dr. de la Pommerais (Paris 1863) had a love affair with a Mrs. de Pauw. He left her and married a rich girl. When, after two or three years, his marital relations had cooled down he went to see his old paramour, spoke of his unhappy marriage and swore to his newly awakened passion. He induced the easily trusting woman to have her life insured in favor of her children and to have the claim transferred to himself. Finally he poisoned her, and his crafty proceedings would have remained unknown, if Mrs. de Pauw had not poured out her heart to her sister and a few friends. "He is back again," she had told them in the triumph of her reconquest, "we have settled all differences, he loves me as dearly as before." De la Pommerais had taken her to the grave of her mother and put her on her oath, never to divulge the insurance scheme. The idea was to administer her some medicine, to make her sick and to offer the insurance companies a reasonable settlement before she had met death and the insurance companies had suffered the loss of 500,000 francs. Instead of weakening and restoring her health as arranged, he killed her.

The Richter case (Bonn 1926) is notable because of a rare poison, strophanthine, being administered rectally. The youthful doctor was deadly afraid of the importunate insistence of his former paramour, a divorced woman. He decided to kill her by an unfamiliar drug in an unfamiliar way. After he had learned that the woman's mother had left for a few days and that she was alone in her apartment, he came by devious routes to Bonn and sneaked into the house at night, thinking that no one would ever know of his presence. Before he applied the poison during a nocturnal medical examination, he must have dangled the hope of renewed relations before the woman's eyes, for, full of joy, she took out time to whisper to a friend who lived in the same building: "Believe it or not. Richter is back. He has turned over a new leaf. Everything will be alright again."

There is no end of similar experiences. The coachman who drove Tourville and his wife—she was to be hurled into a steep ravine briefly after—stated at the trial (Bozen 1877) that the couple was quite nice, she pretty and cheerful, he showing her every possible attention. In many other poison cases the illusion of the victim was complete. After a life of bitter quarrels a husband thought that domestic happiness had been completely restored. A wife who was to be poisoned soon, told her

14 DER NEUE PITAVAL, Bol. XIII, p. 98.
neighbors that her husband had become friendly and gallant again and had even bought her a new hat. A Hamburg banker’s wife who was to be drowned in an exploding motor boat wondered why her husband had treated her with unusual civility, had bought flowers and had stood her to champagne whilst he had not cared for her before.

A hundred years ago there occurred the Clifford murder in Vermont. The report says: “On Sunday, October 16 (1842) Clifford arose in better spirits than usual. He joked with his wife, pinched the baby playfully, and for the first time in months laughter resounded through the Clifford home.” The same day he drowned baby and wife in a nearby lake.

III

The common reaction to death, especially violent death, is keen regret, although in the case of enemies comfort may derive from the idea of a past danger. We would expect the affliction to be deeper when relatives or friends have passed away. Children are more bemourned than very old people. Sudden death is a greater shock than the fatal outcome of a lingering ailment. Medical men, moving day and night in the proximity of death and frailty, can not possibly help putting restraint upon their feelings. A long and sound experience has taught us to watch the different response to decease and to enclose our observations in a rudimentary system of suspicion.

For the psychological problem of post-murderous grief is full of perplexities. A tremendous variety of reactions is met. A new construction has to be put on the procurable facts in nearly every one of the more complex murder cases. Sir Norwood East reports the deed of a morally insane man who strangled a youth, his homosexual partner. “The next morning the maid on entering the room found him in bed asleep with the corpse by his side.” In a French case, sixteen-year-old Auguste Drevelle crept one night into the bedroom of his employer, struck him with a knife thirty-seven times, made his escape by the roof and gave himself up to the police, presenting not the slightest sign of an emotional uproar.

On the other side, we see murderers sunk deep into apparent despair after the death of their victims. “Come back, come back, my darling Mary Jane,” wailed the distracted husband, Dr. Pritchard. “Do not leave your dear Edward.” Then Pritchard left the death chamber, went to his consulting room and wrote letters, one of them bearing reference to the overdraft of a bank account. A few moments before his

16 Ibidem, Vol. XXXIII, p. 318. Of the murderer Johann Schneider Feurbach writes in, ARKENMAESSIGE DARSTELLUNG MERRWURDEIGER VERBRECHEN, Frankfurt, 1849, p. 100, “The day before the crime he was uncommonly friendly and kind with his wife.”
18 GEORGE E. MINOT. MURDER WILL OUT. Boston, 1928, p. 71. “A neighbor who called there during the forenoon went home and remarked that it looked as if the Cliffords ‘were going to make a go of it after all.’”
20 ALBERT BATAILLE. DRAMA OF FRENCH COURTS, London, no date, p. 181. “I envy them,” he had said before, “those condemned to death. They give them champagne in their cell and serve them with chicken and give them all they ask for.” ibidem, p. 180.
wife died Dr. Bowers of San Francisco turned “a stricken face to the attending physician” and cried: “Baby’s going, doctor—is there nothing we can do for her?”

Yet this overpowering grief was pure comedy. We are told that Dr. Castaing of Paris was “in a state of great grief and agitation” after having poisoned his second victim. The Bavarian veterinarian, Sandner, seemed to be out of his senses when his aged wife had succumbed to poison, wept, nearly fainted and did not calm down. The next day this “utterly crushed” husband sat down and sent a letter to his young paramour starting with “My Ann, dearest of all” and concluding with the words that he had read her lines with the greatest pleasure. In a recent German murder case a doctor’s wife perished in a flaming motorcar. The experts asserted that the fire could not have started by accident. A witness met the doctor when the car was still burning. He sobbed convulsively, flung himself on the ground and was wrathful with God for taking yesterday his mother, today his wife. He made a pretense at suicide, but could not find a knife.

It happens at times that a strange apathy takes the place of excessive distress which may or may not be the effect of a violent nervous shock. William Herbert Wallace (London 1931), first sentenced to be hanged, then acquitted, struck the medical expert as abnormal: “He was too quiet”, stated Professor MacFall in court, “too collected, for a person whose wife had been killed in that way that he described . . . I think he was smoking cigarettes most of the time. Whilst I was in the room, examining the body and the blood, he came in smoking a cigarette, and he leaned over in front of the sideboard and flicked the ash into a bowl upon the sideboard. It struck me at that time as being unnatural.”

The first detective who arrived saw Wallace sitting in the kitchen stroking a cat on his knees. In the murder case Dr. Wilkins (Long Beach 1919), the husband, had pretended that he and his wife had been assaulted by robbers. The wife had been badly hurt, he had escaped miraculously. Immediately after the attack Wilkins managed to have time to feed his pet monkey.


23 “He had married three wives in fifteen years and all had come to untimely ends. Dr. Bower’s behavior during his latest bereavement indicated that these successive blows were almost more than he could bear; he was the picture of manly grief, candid and unashamed . . . Beside the grave, robust man though he was, and professionally inured to the mystery of death, his grief so overcame him that he fainted dead away.” Ibidem, pp. 46 and 47.


25 “This is the term used in German obituaries, ‘der von namenlosen Schmerz gebeugte Gatte.’” The case has been reported in all details in the “NEUE PITAVAL, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 225 seq.

26 There will be a retrial this summer.

27 MURDERBOOK, p. 412 following the report of Dorothy Sayers. After the trial Wallace made an attempt to justify his attitude which is most instructive. He wrote in an article: “For forty years I drilled myself in iron control and prided myself on never displaying an emotion outwardly in public. I trained myself to be a stoic. My griefs and joys can be as intense as those of any man, but the rule of my life has always been to give them expression only in privacy. Stoicism is so little practiced today that, when seen, it is called callousness.” p. 413.

28 In seeing this idyllic gesture of innocence the Detective Inspector who conducted the investigation became doubtful. “He did not look to me like a man who had just battered his wife to death.” MURDERBOOK, p. 412.
and parrot and took a dog out for a walk, interrupted by a call from the hospital saying that Mrs. Wilkins had succumbed to her wounds.

The pains bestowed upon the remains have always been the scale of our emotional implication. In a recent Swiss double-murder, a schoolmate and friend of the killed man had attracted notice because he had not attended the funeral and had not sent a letter of condolence. Several times suspicion cropped up when obsequies were shunned: once a husband did not go to the cemetery; he was convicted of having poisoned his wife. At another occasion a prostitute was under suspicion of having killed another strumpet because she did not attend the funeral. She turned out to have been unrelated to the killing. The ambivalence of the symptom is manifest.

We are in general inclined to interpret godly and solicitous cultivation of the dead and their memory as a sympathetic feature. Timm Thode killed his family of eight persons single-handed. There was some suspicion that waned when he offered a reward of more than 4,000 Marks for the detection of the murderer and erected a memorial stone on the graves of his relatives. It was covered with Bible verses and dedicated to his parents, brothers and sister "cut down by a wicked murderer's hand."

Gross disdain of the dead may not always arouse suspicion, but is certainly provoking personal dislike which at all times has been the first step to suspicion. There is another trouble. Decent burial ceremonies being somewhat costly may bring innate and untimely greed to light. Material interests of the undertaker, the florist and other people are involved; dissatisfied and vexed people develop that keen observation and judgment of which creditors and mothers-in-law are the prototype. No one remembered the old Creighton trials twelve years ago which had ended in an acquittal. But a bakery boy who was getting tired asking payment for rolls and cakes delivered, did not suffer from the general slip of memory.

Only weak-minded or morally defective murderers do therefore disregard the protective mask of a decent burial. In addition a few cases have come to be known in which the extreme conceit and the murderer's confidence in his cunning have caused him to slight the deep-rooted feelings of mankind. For common folks, from which

---

29 The husband had hit her about seventeen times with a blunt instrument. NEW YORK MURDERS, edited by Ted Collins, New York, 1944, p. 148.
30 Kriminalistik, 1955, p. 85. He was, in fact, the perpetrator.
31 NEUER PITAVAL, Vol. XXXIII, p. 308. "In gloomy silence the crowd surrounded the grave and . . . enraged remarks were directed against the absent husband." This murderer had a printing business and sold "bibles and spiritual guides."
33 NEUER PITAVAL, Vol. XXXX, p. 244.
34 The usefulness of mothers in law in some murder cases, relentlessly pressing for a criminal investigation, has been discussed at length in the writer's recent murder study.
36 It was noticed unfavorably that the Swiss Luchsinger drove his herd as usual to the mountains after the body of his wife had been found the night before.
37 The Paris detectives did not like it at all when the famous Troppman (Paris, 1871) viewed his victims at the morgue without taking his hat off. NEUER PITAVAL, Vol. V, p. 126.
detectives, neighbors and rumorspreading gossips come, are most touchy in this respect. Foolish is the professional pride of the “perfect” murderer; more irrational still is the greed, the frightful greed for money. When G. J. Smith committed his murders and one of his many wives was found, her face submerged in a bath, “he made a bad pretense of weeping and talked about the lucky thing his wife had made her will....

"Everyone had the same impression: The woman who came to lay out the body, who found it lying naked on the bare boards; the undertaker, whom Smith instructed to bury his wife in a common grave, in the cheapest manner possible." Another murderer, Frederick Small, (New Hampshire 1916) economically ordered a $35 coffin for his wife. As soon as suspicion moved close to him, he bought a burial lot and asked a florist to send $24 worth of roses with the inscription in gilt letter upon the ribbon: “To My Love.”

Profuse grief, therefore, genuine or not, as much as preceding excessive kindness, deserve our attention. Wittmann poisoned four wives. The doctor had certified the cause of death as cholera, rampant at that time in the community. Wittmann weeping bitterly put his last wife in the coffin and kissed her on the mouth. He need not be afraid of contagion. He was the only one who knew the right diagnosis!

One wonders why so many murderers lay great stress on being the first to discover the body when the corpse had to be found. The reason seems to be that the excitement of the finding and the agitation of the perpetrator coincide and are outwardly superimposed. In the Clifford case, already mentioned, the murderer reeled like a drunken man when he told his story and stammered: “They were drowned, both of them. (wife and baby) I couldn’t save them.” He covered his face with his hands, “tears rolled down his cheek and his whole body shook”. In this predicament he was not expected to answer questions correctly. Much later a German farmhand, Duwe (Koenigslutter 1904) murdered a little girl in a ghastly way. After some time, he returned to the scene of the crime and alarmed the farm people, to divert suspicion as he admitted. He had been most helpful in carrying the small body from the death chamber. A police dog, without paying heed to any other person on the farm, went straight up to the murderer and bit him. It was dubious evidence because Duwe had touched the body later on. The pell-mell discovery, however, had effectively covered his anxiety and had given a satisfactory account of his confusion.

If criminology were as exact a science as zoology or botany every single pattern of criminal behavior would be studied and re-studied. The scream set up by the murderer following the crime is revealing and often typical. When Nan Patterson had shot Caesar Young, a gambler with whom she had an affair for some years, she shouted from the inside of a hansom cab: “Caesar, Caesar, why did you do it?”. Without doubt the bookmaker had not shot himself and put the gun back in his

40 The most interesting small case has been ably reported by Edmund Pearson, Murderbook, pp. 3-41.
41 Neur Pitival, Vol. IV, p. 117.
42 Minot, loc. cit. p. 73. By hiding his face the murderer is able to hide his emotional turmoil.
43 Pitival der Gegenwart, Vol. III, p. 117. The murderer shouted the news from a window. Distance is an additional factor of “veiling” his mimics and his state of mind.
More distinctive are the excited and unprepared shouts of murderers who killed for profit. It is mainly a strange order of values lost which emerges from their wailings and betrays a specific mentality. In an old German murder case (Oldenburg 1704) a matrimonial swindler, a false Baron von Muenchhausen, shot his wife, asleep at his side. The first cry which awakened the neighbors was: “Murder”, “Thieves”, “Help, Help!” “I have been robbed.” “My wife has been shot.” Frederick Small was notified that his place had burned to the ground and that his wife was missing. His first reaction was: “My God! my home! my pet! gone! I am alone in the world!” In 1919 Dan Kaber was stabbed to death in his Cleveland home by hired thugs. His wife hastened back from Cedar Point where she had driven for a little rest and a big alibi. Rushing into the house past newsmen and police she went straight to the dining room, not to her husband’s resting place. “My silver!” she gasped. “Robbers have taken everything.” Suddenly she was seized with the fright of a terrible blunder and a great danger. “Dan . . . my husband”, she sobbed. The treacherous sequence of her emotions could not be made good anymore.