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Abstract

Traditional viewpoints held by academic and non-academic professional groups of the white-collar crime offender profile(s) are that they are non-violent. Yet research has begun to unveil a sub-group of white-collar offenders who are violent, referred to as red-collar criminals, in that their motive is to prevent the detection and or disclosure of their fraud schemes through violence. This article is the first to discuss the origin of the red-collar crime concept developed by this author coupled with debunking white-collar offender profile misperceptions that have persisted for decades by offering current research on the anti-social qualities displayed by this offender group that predates their violence. Secondly, the article applies behavioral risk factors, such as narcissism and psychopathy, which contributes to our understanding of why some white-collar offenders may resort to violence while other white-collar offenders do not. Case analysis also draws upon gender distinctions, workplace violence and homicide methods used to illustrate that red-collar criminals are not an anomaly to ignore simply because they may not reflect the street-level homicides typically observed by society, investigated by law enforcement and studied by academia.
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1. The Origin of Red-Collar Crime

In 2005, the author of this article participated in a homicide trial as counsel to the accused who was charged with murdering his business partner (Hansen, 2004). During the homicide investigation, a motive offered was that the murder resulted from fraud detection by the deceased partner upon learning that her business partner committed financial fraud on their business. The accused, in order to avoid detection and or disclosure of the fraud silenced the partner by committing murder through blunt trauma force to the head with a hammer. Subsequent to the trial and conviction of the accused, the author explored, via internet searches, whether this author’s case facts reflected a statistical anomaly or whether violent white-collar offenders constituted an offender group researchers inadvertently overlooked. Through this method the author located homicide cases with similar motives within legal documents, such as court decisions, and homicide trials disclosed within various periodicals, where a white-collar offender was found guilty of homicide or those homicides that were attempted, but failed.

In addition, the author discovered that extant academic research on violent white-collar criminals, their potential motive(s) and behavioral profile was virtually non-existent with the majority of commentary indicating that white-collar offenders are non-violent. Unfortunately, a consequence of such a void in scholarship is that offender profile misperceptions prevail ultimately reinforced by academia, law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Moreover, because white-collar crime is classified as non-violent, the offender is assumed to be non-violent by nature; assumptions repeated with enough regularity that they are accepted as fact. A review of the researched cases revealed that violent white-collar criminals were not an anomaly and as illustrated within this article, they harbor behavioral risk factors that facilitate their use of violence as a solution to a perceived problem no differently than non-white-collar offenders that resort to violence, albeit for different motives.

From this author’s involvement with the above mentioned homicide case together with a review of the additional homicide cases collected, this author coined the term red-collar crime to describe white-collar criminals who turn violent. Red-collar criminals, however, should not be confused with white-collar criminals who have a mixed
criminal history of white-collar and non-white-collar crime that might include violent criminal histories. It is the motive behind the violence that determines the offender sub-group as a red-collar crime. Red-collar criminals engage in violence to silence those, as stated above, who are in a position to detect and/or disclose their fraud schemes: hence the name fraud detection homicide describing the motive to classify the murder. The instrumental, planned nature of these disclosed red-collar homicides together with those attempted were derived from case facts in written judicial opinions, investigative and prosecutorial disclosures and review of case facts that support conclusions as to the underlying motive.

In reviewing the various classifications of crime and in particular homicide, the author found that different types of homicides, such as sexual homicides, parricides, contract killings, domestic homicides to name a few, are counted, classified and studied for behavioral patterns and offender characteristics facilitating statistical analysis (Douglas et al., 1992). To date for example, fraud detection homicides are not tracked and studied in the same way, limiting the amount of research to support this paper. Thus there are no longitudinal studies as to how many red-collar crimes have been committed limiting the amount of knowledge available as to not only descriptive statistics such as age, gender, race, types of frauds that preceded the homicide, and victimology, but also as to their behavioral make-up. It is the author’s belief, however, that it is more advantageous to begin the conversation by offering a template to refine and clarify their profile rather than ignore this lethal group simply because information may be incomplete at the moment.

Section two of this article covers several important areas including white-collar offender profile misperceptions and the consequences of not understanding the anti-social qualities that are antecedents to their violence. However to understand red-collar criminals, it is necessary to examine the underlying criminal and behavioral traits of white-collar criminals that may facilitate the decision to resort to violence. Unfortunately, despite the enormity of economic damage committed by this offender group (Freidrichs, 2007), be it financial, emotional or physical (Pleyte, 2003), the characteristics of white-collar offending and their behavioral characteristics have been understudied to society’s detriment even though this offense, at times, is perceived as more serious than traditional street-level crimes (Harel, 2015). There exists a bias, whether conscious or not, that there is something inherently different about the white-collar offender profile that prompts a different analysis than non-white-collar offenders instead of examining the similarities in their criminal attitudes (Brody, Melendy, & Perri, 2012).

Furthermore, white-collar crime scholarship historically and behavioral traits associated with such offenders remains sparse (Simpson, 2013); however, this does not mean they may not harbor traits that facilitate criminal decision making (Alalehto, 2003). The fact that these offenders aggress against others in a manner that is not reflective of traditional notions of criminality or in ways that are easily recognizable by the general public does not mean that they are not capable of inflicting harm to others. Research has begun to reveal that white-collar offenders manifest their aggression in a different form against others and/or organizations to satisfy a motive no differently than non-white-collar offenders creating victims nonetheless (Perri, Brody, & Paperny, 2014). Yet, scholars have virtually ignored researching violent white-collar offenders (Brody & Kiehl, 2010). If behavioral traits are important risk factors for common forms of crime, their potential application to white-collar crime are a logical extension and an important issue to explore in the context of these offenders (Listwan, Piquero, & Van Voorhis, 2010).

Sections three through seven examines the transition from offenders that engage in white-collar crime to those that resort to violence by exploring the behavioral traits that may serve as violence risk factors coupled with reviewing red-collar cases displaying various behavioral traits. Although not a comprehensive explanation for white-collar crime, the author agrees with white-collar scholars Benson and Simpson in that if individuals harbor identifiable behavioral traits that can be considered risk factors that increase the probability of engaging in anti-social behaviors “we should not be particularly surprised” when they commit white-collar crime (2009, p. 51) or when they resort to violence (Perri, 2011c). Though only committed by a subgroup of white-collar criminals, a tendency towards violence is not surprising considering many white-collar criminals harbor the same deviant personality traits as conventional street-level criminals. Consequently, although fraud and murder are two distinct crimes, the behavioral traits of the offenders may be the driving force behind both crimes (Ablow, 2008). For example, research confirms that there is a relationship between the behavioral traits of narcissism and psychopathy, creating a negative synergy when they combine with criminal thinking patterns increasing the risk of both non-white-collar crime, white-collar crime and eventually violence (Perri, 2013).

The article also examines female participation in white-collar crime that eventually turns to lethal violence by examining gender distinctions and similarities. In addition, this author illustrates through case examples that red-collar crime permeates not only the workplace arena, but also unexpected venues such as families where one
family member is exploiting other family members through fraud schemes that eventually ends with members being murdered or with attempts on their lives being made.

This article concludes on a cautious note. At times relying on erroneous preconceived notions of what the face of criminality should resemble may expose one to risks that are real and lethal, but ignored. It is the author’s hope that scholars from diverse disciplines will devote their talents to researching this understudied offender group so that offender profile misperceptions can be neutralized, behavioral risk factors can be refined, violence investigations can examine homicide methods and motives that are apparent but not necessarily considered coupled with understanding this crime’s victimology.

2. White-Collar Offender Profile Misperceptions

Although Edwin Sutherland popularized the use of the term white-collar crime, for purposes of this paper, the socio-economic status of the offender important to Sutherland’s understanding of white-collar crime is not relevant for purposes of this paper. The socio-economic status of an offender may be important for profiling and statistical purposes, however, it is not relevant in classifying red-collar crimes because the offender’s socio-economic status does not alter the definition of what constitutes a homicide. Homicides are committed by a wide spectrum of individuals on the socio-economic continuum from those that are wealthy to those that are poor. Thus, white-collar crime is considered a broad category reflecting high-level corporate misconduct that reflected Sutherland’s perception of its offenders (Hasnas, 2003), occupational fraud schemes by middle-class citizens (Weisburd et al., 1991), as well as predatory offenders (Bucy et al., 2008).

White-collar criminals are often thought as unlikely to be processed in the criminal justice system following an initial brush with the law in addition to being “neither violent [nor] anti-social” (Mauer, 1974, p. 152). A common misperception is that white-collar crimes represent out of character offenses because white-collar criminals, who are generally educated, employed, and considered law-abiding, exhibit ethical behavior in other facets of their lives and are therefore less apt to engage in crime despite the magnitude of their harm (Brody, Melendy, & Perri, 2012). This misperception persisted for many decades because scholars in the various social and behavioral sciences failed to apply the criminal thinking traits to white-collar offenders as contrasted to non-white-collar offenders. Criminological scholarship focused more on conventional crimes such as violence, narcotics and property related offenses (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2011) as well as examining social processes within an organization that might serve as risk factors for fraud to flourish (Sutherland, 1949) while rejecting individual personality traits as potential fraud offender risk factors (Perri, Lichtenwald, & Mieczkowska, 2014). Both non-white-collar and white-collar offenders display consistent criminal thought patterns and attitudes about others and/or situations to exploit and these thought patterns apply to considering violence as a solution to a perceived problem regardless of one’s socio-economic standing (Samenow, 1984).

Understanding criminological thought patterns of white-collar offenders requires debunking myths surrounding the white-collar offender profile in that these offenders do not represent a homogenous offender group, which is often at the root of the misperception. The degrees of deviancy and criminal histories they represent is no different than non-white-collar offenders (Walters & Geyer, 2004) together with the fact that criminal thinking patterns coupled with behavioral traits attributable to white-collar offenders can no longer be considered anomalies to ignore (Ragatz & Fremouw, 2010). Not understanding the criminal thinking that supports offender attitudes exacerbates erroneous character assumptions individuals rely upon to form opinions about this offender group that may expose them to financial exploitation risks to being targets of violence by the same individuals they believed would not have the capacity to resort to violence. This author agrees with the comments by white-collar crime scholars Schlegel and Weisburd who state that “attention to white-collar crime will best be served in the future by studying the similarities and differences between white-collar crimes and those referred to as common crimes” (1992, p. 4).

2.1 Offender Criminal Thinking Patterns and Attitudes

Forensic criminal psychologist Dr. Stanton Samenow cautions against the premise that a crime may be out of character for an offender because of no history of prior offenses, has an excellent employment history, and appears to be an upstanding member of the community (Samenow, 2010a) and this premise holds true for white-collar offenders just as it does for non-white-collar offenders (Perri, 2013). Some academicians argue that offender character evidence is irrelevant as they relate to criminal behavior (Heath, 2008), however the issue is whether character and attitudes are revealed when a decision is made to engage in anti-social activity. During Samenow’s over 40 years of research, evaluation, and treatment of criminals, he has yet to find an individual who did something not within his or her character (Samenow, 2010b). He further states that often there is a lack of information about particular aspects of a person’s behavior, thought processes and thinking patterns pre-dating
their offense that have long been present, yet expressing themselves at a moment of opportunity (Samenow, 2010a). The fact that an offender chooses to engage in an act that was not within his or her ordinary lifestyle choice, or that the offender would have preferred an alternative path rather than having to commit a crime to satisfy a motive does not mean it was not within one’s character or that anti-social qualities were not revealed (Perri et al., 2014).

Offenders engage in a cost-benefit analysis or some type of risk assessment and decide whether it is more advantageous to move forward with a crime or not (Shover & Wright, 2001). Criminal, anti-social attitudes permeate all socio-economic levels and Edwin Sutherland was one of the first to begin to apply criminal thinking attributes to white-collar offenders (Bodeszek & Hyland, 2012). Anti-social/criminal thinking has been conceptualized as distorted or concentrated thought patterns involving attitudes and values that support a criminal lifestyle by rationalizing and justifying law-breaking behavior (Taxman, Rhodes, & Dumenci, 2011): in other words, thinking that says it is alright to violate others and/or the property of others. Criminal traits displayed include but are not limited to rationalizations, exploitations, entitlement, power orientation, lack of empathy, and a disregard for rules, norms, and social boundaries (Walters, 1995). These anti-social and criminal thinking traits apply to white and red-collar offenders (Walters, 2002; Walters & Geyer, 2004; Perri & Lichtenwald, 2007).

Adults convicted of white-collar crimes are often repeat offenders no differently than non-white-collar offenders (Weisburd, Warring, & Chaye, 2001), countering the belief that white-collar offenders “do not have a commitment to crime as a way of life” because the loss of “social status, respectability, money, a job, and a comfortable home and family” deters them from a criminal lifestyle unlike street-level offenders who have no concern about how criminality affects their future or status (Shover & Wright, 2001, p. 369). However, studies have shown that “[e]ven though fraud and larceny offenders have lower recidivism rates” for first-time offenders, for offenders with a criminal history, “the recidivism rates of these offenses exceeds 50 percent”, which is comparable with the recidivism rates for robbery and firearm offenders (Weissmann & Block, 2007, p. 290).

Walters and Geyer (2004) found that “white collar offenders do not form a homogenous group with respect to their pattern of offending, level of deviance, attitudes toward crime, or social identity” (p. 280), coupled with histories of violence, property offenses and substance abuse that are traditionally thought to be attributed mainly to uneducated, street-level offenders (Harel, 2015). There are white-collar criminals whose criminal deviancy and criminal thinking traits are indistinguishable from non-white-collar criminals, especially those that are chronic re-offenders (Walters & Geyer, 2004). Moreover, the complexion of white-collar criminals starts to change when there is evidence of a continuum of fraudulent activities, and they are considered pathological offenders or “predators” (Dorminey et al., 2010). For example, chronic white-collar offender Barry Webne stated, “if you put me in a position of trust again, chances are that I am going to violate that trust” (Patterson, 2011, para. 8).

2.2 Consequences of Offender Profile Misperceptions

Unsupported assumptions with respect to the underlying character aspects of fraud offenders and ultimately red-collar criminals invite interpretations about their offender profiles that are not grounded in thoughtful analysis, but reflective of personal biases of what we wish these offenders represent or do not represent. Thus it is not uncommon to hear that offenders are just “ordinary people who made a mistake” (Goodman, 2010, para. 8), “really nice, everyday people… [T]hey could be anyone walking down the street” (Weigel, 2013, para. 4). Some academicians have tried to label some fraud offenders as “accidental offenders” (Dorminey et al., 2010) which is rather contradictory given that fraud requires an intentional, knowing or reckless state of mind (Perri & Mieczkowska, 2015). Perhaps a more accurate description may be the “unexpected offender” reflecting offender traits that one would normally not equate with criminality because of the appearance of respectability (Perri et al., 2014).

Consider how white-collar criminals are perceived to be non-violent by academicians: “There are some notable differences involved [with] white-collar criminals compared with…criminals on the lower rungs of the offense ladder. For one thing, white-collar criminals pose no physical danger…Violence is not their thing” (Hobbs & Wright, 2006, p. 79). From the criminal justice arena, one United States federal judge stated, “White-collar criminals are not people who are threatening the lives of others; they are not violent people” (Wheeler, Mann, & Sarat, 1988, p. 63). Yet, consider the actions of former president of the AFG Financial Group, Alan Hand, who orchestrated a $100 million mortgage fraud scheme who personally wanted to kill the witness that had disclosed the fraud scheme to the authorities but could not because he was incarcerated. He attempted to hire contract killers stating, “I wish I was there to watch him suffer” (Rudolf, 2012, para. 3) and “kill the man’s wife and children if they were home” (AP, 2012, para. 9).
Part of the reason why there may be a disconnect between what traits white-collar offenders harbor and how they are perceived is because professionals may not have had the education and/or training to understand what comprises the criminal personality and behavioral traits harbored by such offenders. In addition, white-collar crime was not always perceived as a serious offense, thus further perpetuating offender profile misperceptions as somehow being less criminally inclined when contrasted to non-white-collar offenders. This is due to the fact that public perceptions of what crime entails disproportionately fueled the attention of researchers and criminal justice agencies towards violent crimes while ignoring white-collar offender scholarship for years and its victims in criminological surveys (Simpson, 2013; McGurrin et al., 2013).

Sutherland warned of being seduced by offender appearances and attributing a value system to the white-collar offender based on some of the descriptions mentioned above (Lilly et al., 2011) especially in light of the fact that they can harbor predatory traits no differently than non-white-collar offenders given their fraud schemes can last for months, even years (Freiberg, 2000). For example, Sutherland (1949) illustrates this bias of the criminal justice system that inures character traits to these offenders as being, refined, cultured with excellent reputations in their communities (p. 8) and this tradition still applies today (Moore, Gilman, & Kethledge, 2013). Yet, Brody and colleagues (2012) challenge unsupported assumptions of offender character traits perpetuated by academic, practitioner circles and offenders themselves. Is there a psychological explanation for the variance between what fraud offenders may actually represent and how they are perceived? One explanation advanced posits that professionals engage in projection bias to fill the void that is created when a framework does not exist to understand this offender profile because of a lack of research to neutralize such biases about offender characteristics. Projection bias is a psychological defense mechanism to reduce personal anxiety where an individual transfers his or her own attributes, values, thoughts, feelings, and emotions, usually to other people, given a set of circumstances.

It is the inclination to assume that others share similar values and beliefs with one’s own when there may not be a competing paradigm to offer more accurate information to neutralize these erroneous assumptions. Thus it may be surprising to learn that individuals, who are similar to us in terms of being educated, considered being trustworthy employees or employers, engage in white-collar crime. Furthermore the more similar in various characteristics we perceive others to be when compared to ourselves, such as religion and educational levels as examples, the more we tend to believe that a person harbors a similar value system, are perceived to be more trustworthy even though there is no evidence that similarity is a guarantee of parallel values because we can identify with them (Burgoon, Dunbar, & Segrin, 2002). Part of the challenge involves debunking the belief that because white-collar offenders do not harbor the same optics of criminality associated with the image of street-level criminals, then one is not truly criminal at heart (Kanazawa, 2011).

In essence, one has to look like and display criminal lifestyle characteristics to truly be a criminal that parallels Weisburd and colleagues (1991) in that white-collar and street offenders were drawn from distinctly different sectors of the American population. Ironically, even white-collar offenders distance themselves from stereotypes in order to appear more benign to authorities and the general public. For example, one offender comparing himself to street-level offenders stated, “I am not at all similar. I don’t look the same, talk the same, act the same” (Hare, 1999, p. 122). A securities fraud offender who spent time in prison stated, “I felt different from most of the men around me. My background was too different. They had tattoos, meth teeth, and they could hardly string together two grammatically correct sentences. We think our education and background separates us from the other criminals around us” (Perri, Brody, & Paperny, 2014, p. 39).

3. Red-Collar Offender Behavioral Risk Factors

Edwin Sutherland, albeit erroneously, rejected the notion that individual behavioral proclivities and personalities contributed to the understanding of criminality, focusing instead on group dynamics to explain why individuals succumbed to crime and white-collar crime (Perri, Lichtenwald, & Mieczkowska, 2014). Sutherland’s position is ironic in light of the fact that he believed white-collar offenders “are by far the most dangerous to society of any type of criminals from the point of view of effects on private property and social institutions” (Sutherland, 1934, p. 32). This is due in part to the antagonistic attitude that sociologist and criminologists, such as Sutherland, displayed toward other disciplines, such as psychiatry and psychology that attempt to understand how personality correlates with criminal propensities. The impact of Sutherland’s position influenced other scholars in rejecting personality traits as a factor to the detriment of developing and refining white-collar criminal profile(s) that would actually assist in understanding harmful risk factors they pose toward society.

As a result, decades were lost in not developing white-collar crime behavioral profiles that may have assisted both academia and non-academic professional groups. For example, scholars Shover and Grabosky state, “[W]e
are not interested in the reasons why some individuals and organizations commit white-collar crime more often than others” (2010, p. 430). Consider white-collar crime scholar James Coleman who states “[i]t is generally agreed that personal pathology plays no significant role in the genesis of white-collar crime” (Coleman, 2002, p. 184); in fact, this conclusion has been so widely accepted that only a few empirical studies on the issue have actually been done” (Coleman, 2002, p. 185). In reference to white-collar offenders, Heath (2008) states, “Why do psychologically normal individuals, who share the conventional value-consensus of the society in which they live, sometimes take advantage of opportunities to engage in criminal conduct (p. 602)?” Further, consider Alalheto (2015) stating “[T]he majority of white collar offenders do not suffer from psychological disorders” (p. 32).

Yet, the modern approach to studying white-collar crime incorporates the offender’s behavioral traits as a risk factor in the decision to commit crime even though there are legitimate debates on how important behavioral traits may be and which specific traits are common among offenders (Ramamoorti, 2008). Myths surrounding this offender behavioral profile are being dismantled and behavioral research is beginning to shed light on this offender group that is more accurate and not based on conjecture. What is becoming increasing clear is that white-collar offenders manifest their aggressions in different forms in order to satisfy their motive which at times involves using violence as a solution to problem. Contemporary research suggests that behavioral and personality traits should not be ignored as anomalies because they may at times be symptomatic of potential white-collar criminal behavior especially when criminal thinking traits are present (Ragatz, Fremouv, & Baker, 2012).

What is problematic when characteristics of white-collar offenders are ignored is that important factors in their offending patterns may be overlooked. According to forensic psychologist Dr. Robert Hare, white-collar criminal’s fraudulent activities may reflect a virulent mix of criminal thinking and behavioral traits, including a sense of entitlement, a propensity to deceive, cheat, and manipulate, a lack of empathy and remorse viewing others merely as resources to be exploited—callously and without regret (Carozza, 2008, p. 38). Research confirms that there is a relationship between anti-social dispositions, evidence of narcissism and/or psychopathy creating a negative synergy when they combine with criminal thinking patterns increasing the risk of white-collar criminal behavior together with those offenders who turn violent (Perri & Brody, 2012). Moreover, what do their behavioral traits tell us about the type of violence they prefer to engage in? Do red-collar offenders engage in a more reactive violent manner or do they take their time, in an instrumental manner, to think through how to execute their homicidal plans? The author cautions that harboring behavioral traits discussed below should not be interpreted as being the cause of criminal behavior, but their correlation is considered a red-collar crime offender risk factor.

3.1 Type of Violence: Instrumental or Reactive

In order to classify the type of violence displayed in red-collar crime, the author used the template offered by Woodworth and Porter (2002). For a homicide to be rated as instrumental, the offense had to be goal-oriented in nature with no evidence of an immediate emotional or situational provocation. Instrumental violence, in essence, is a means to an end; it is violence committed to further some other motive (Hart & Dempster, 1997). If there was “a cooling off period or a discernible gap in time between the provocation/frustration and the homicide” the homicide was classified as instrumental (Woodworth & Porter, 2002, p. 439). In contrast, for reactive violence to be present there must be strong evidence for a high level of spontaneity and a lack of planning surrounding the commission of the offense. Thus there is a rapid affective reaction prior to the act with no apparent goal other than to harm the victim immediately following a provocation and/or conflict.

Reactive violence put another way, is the end in itself (Hart & Dempster, 1997). Reactive violence is more illustrative between family members and acquaintances while instrumental violence is more illustrative of violence between strangers. Yet what is factually interesting in red-collar crime cases is that the exact opposite holds true for the majority of cases; the offender knew the victims, reflective of reactive violence scenarios but instead very instrumental in nature. The author reviewed the available facts of all the cases listed in Table 1 which revealed that the offender did not display reactive violence, but rather planned the homicide upon believing that the fraud scheme had been detected and or disclosed to the authorities. Case review revealed that there was a discernible time gap between the defendant’s belief that his fraud scheme was detected and or disclosed and the execution of the homicide. If the facts were ambiguous as to the type of violence displayed, the case was coded as “unknown”. Given article space limitation, only a few red-collar crime factual scenarios can be reviewed within this article.
Table 1. Red-collar crime cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Name</th>
<th>Type of Fraud</th>
<th>Number of Victims</th>
<th>Method of Homicide</th>
<th>Type of Violence</th>
<th>Case Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santé Kimes</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Kimes (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Kimes</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Kimes (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Gaede</td>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Gaede (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Mikos</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Mikos (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Tokars</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Tokars (1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irwin Margolies</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Margolies (1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernesta Bernal</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Cruz (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Cortes</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Spencer (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Moss</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>DiGiacomo (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Burke</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Smith (1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Washington</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Machen (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jose Alvarado</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Parcher (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hansen</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Curry (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Collins</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Collins (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Nelson</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Collins (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Walker</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Perri et al. (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Petrick</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Petrick (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Siegel</td>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Siegel (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natavia Lowery</td>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Martinez (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Porco</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Perri et al. (2008a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Hanson</td>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bludgeon/gun</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Hanson (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velma Barfield</td>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poison</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Barfield (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd Bogle</td>
<td>Credit card</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stabbing</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Herman (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Broyhill</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stabbing</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Blythe (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalba Contreras</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>KTLA (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Howell</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bludgeon</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Wright (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 The Robert Petrick Case

Janine Sutphen became aware of her husband, Robert Petrick’s schemes when she detected fraudulent transactions affecting her bank account. According to the prosecution, Petrick killed his wife after Sutphen detected his fraud schemes (Petrick, 2007; Lewis, 2005b). Janine Sutphen’s body was found near her home, wrapped in a tarp, sleeping bag, blankets, and chains, floating in a nearby lake. The prosecution offered evidence of a murder plan recovered from the defendant’s computer searches several weeks prior to the murder. The defendant had searched under 22 ways to kill a man with your bare hands, “neck”, “snap”, and “break” (Jones, 2005, para. 2), together with searches regarding the water level in the lake where Sutphen’s body was found. Petrick offered no explanation for searches on the topic of “body decomposition, rigor mortis”, or how the human body deteriorates (Lewis, 2005c, para. 7). During the period of time that his wife was allegedly missing, one witness recalled that when asked about his wife, Petrick appeared upset and indicated that she died of cancer (Lewis, 2005a). Another female witness testified that she and Robert had been going through pre-marital counseling and had set a wedding date—even before he killed Janine (Lewis, 2005b).
3.3 Narcissism, White-Collar Crime and Violence

Narcissism has been found to be a fraud offender risk factor (Blickle, Schelgel, & Fassbender, 2006; Bucy et al., 2008), and also a risk factor for white-collar offenders to commit murder (Perri, 2011c). Some of the underlying traits of narcissism include a pervasive pattern of grandiosity, a sense of entitlement to resources regardless of the imposition it places on others, exploitative, lacking in empathy, at times a sense of vulnerability, a belief that one is superior, unique, and “chosen”, together with inflated views of their own accomplishments and abilities. Consider that there may be adaptive qualities to narcissism such as ambition and motivations to succeed (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2009). Those deemed to be pathological exhibit defective self-regulation of their emotional states displaying maladaptive strategies to cope with perceived threats to their self-image (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2009). In order to restore homeostasis, they may exhibit interpersonal aggression to right when they believe they were wronged; hence resorting to revenge as a strategy to restore their self-image, grandiosity, sense of entitlement and superiority (Brown, 2004).

A narcissistic sense of entitlement can drive an individual to manipulate circumstances to satisfy their motives, whether the result is fraud, murder, or both (Ablow, 2008). Fraud offenders exhibiting narcissistic traits of extreme entitlement may not be deterred from committing fraud because they may not “fear being caught or what punishments may come their way” (Bucy et al., 2008, p. 417). In addition, their narcissism may not allow them to fully appreciate how their actions play themselves out because their sense of entitlement requires a need for gratification, and the use of deception to achieve fraud does not create a moral dilemma for them to resolve (Barnard, 2008). Narcissism is best understood as a risk factor that has been empirically linked to violent aggression (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998) especially when the offender’s inflated view of self is wounded by criticism or interference with a plan constituting a major threat because it signifies that one is not the omnipotent person they perceived themselves to be (Baumeister, 2001). Narcissists often target those they perceive to be a threat to their sense of grandiosity and egocentricity (Baumeister, Bushman, & Campbell, 2000). Moreover, recent scholarship has identified that narcissists who displayed traits of extreme entitlement and exploitation of others to achieve their goals were more likely to resort to extreme forms of aggression and deleterious violence against innocent people even in the absence of provocation representing some of the most maladaptive narcissistic traits (Reidy, Zeichner, Foster, & Martinez, 2008b).

In addition, Russ and colleagues (2008) found that malignant narcissists who display a history of interpersonal conflicts, criminal behavior, abuse, intense anger, blame externalization, entitlement, a lack of empathy, disdain for others, and arrogance are prone to violence. Further, narcissism is linked to revenge, increasing the risk of retaliation (Brown, 2004) by resorting to brutal forms of violence against those they perceive as interfering with their schemes (Reidy, Zeichner, & Martinez, 2008a). Even in the absence of provocation or criticisms, narcissists aggress against innocent individuals who might be viewed as potential threats foregoing an escalation in aggression, such as verbal aggression, and resort to intense aggressive acts as their initial method of resolving ego threats and satisfying their sense of entitlement (Martinez et al., 2008). Their grandiose, omnipotent nature produces an overconfident perception of their ability to avoid detection which is referred to as narcissistic immunity. For example a female colleague from the above mentioned case, Robert Petrick, testified that while visiting him in jail, he became aware that the police were searching a small lake near his home for Sutphen’s body. She says Petrick stated with “great disdain and arrogance, ‘they’ll never find her there’” (Lewis, 2005c, para. 13).

3.4 The Eric Hanson Case

Eric Hanson was found guilty of a quadruple homicide murdering his mother, father, sister, and brother-in-law (Hanson, 2010). According to the prosecution, the defendant is responsible for the theft of thousands of dollars from his parents through forgery, mail fraud, credit card fraud, and identity theft schemes (Golz, 2008a) continuing to use their credit cards even after their murders (Perri et al., 2008c). The prosecutor stated, “Eric Hanson in a cold, calculated and premeditated manner committed the execution-style murders out of greed and fear of having his fraudulent scheme discovered” (Rozek, 2005, p. 3). The deceased sister Kate Hanson confronted her brother Eric about the fraud and Eric threatened to kill Kate if she disclosed the fraud schemes (Gregory, 2008). Eric denied the threat, however, in a recovered letter he admitted to the threat (Golz, 2008b). Several weeks passed between the fraud detection and the murders. Interestingly, Eric’s mother attempted to find a way to pay off his fraudulently obtained money by taking out loans in the tens of thousands of dollars (Gutowski, 2008a).

Dr. Marva Dawkins, a clinical psychologist, evaluated Eric concluding that he exhibited narcissistic personality disorder coupled with anti-social features with no evidence of psychotic disorders or abuse (Gutowski, 2008b;
Eric exhibited antisocial features, including a history of domestic violence (Gregory & Barnum, 2008b) coupled with impulsive, irresponsible financial habits (Barnum, 2008b). Interestingly, a psychologist who evaluated Eric as an adolescent indicated that he “wasn’t a threat to commit more violence” (Gregory & Barnum, 2008a, para. 6).

### 3.5 Psychopathy, White-Collar Crime and Violence

The concept of psychopathy refers to a specific cluster of traits and behaviors used to describe an individual in terms of pervasive dominating personality traits (Hare, 1999), however there are debates of what personality traits should reflect the construct and how psychopathy should be measured (Skeem et al., 2011). Signature traits of psychopaths are their self-centeredness, pathological lying, lack of empathy, lack of conscience, exploitative, parasitic lifestyle, impulsivity, narcissism, thrill seeking activities, being irresponsible, displaying antisocial traits and the pursuit of their desires above all others in a way that disregards the rights or feelings of others (Cleckley, 1941, 1976; Hare, 1991, 1999). Dr. Hare further states, “[I]t is possible to have people who are so emotionally disconnected that they can function as if other people are objects to be manipulated and destroyed without any concern” (Chivers, 2014, para. 3). Lacking in feelings for others, they take what they want doing as they please, violating social norms and expectations without the slightest sense of guilt or regret (Hare, 1999; Burkley, 2010). Mental illness and psychopathy can co-occur (Murphy & Vess, 2003); they are not disoriented or out of touch with reality, nor do they experience the delusions or hallucinations, that characterizes most other mental disorders (Meloy, 2002). Moreover most psychopaths are capable of appreciating the criminality of their actions and can be rather methodical and strategic regarding their crimes even though they may display an impulsive lifestyle (Hanlon, 2010).

Psychopathy is not synonymous with criminality, however those that have psychopathic traits are more at risk for committing crime and acting out violently (Herve & Yuille, 2007) coupled with a diminished capacity to learn from self-destructive behaviors (Cleckley, 1941). This may be due to Gacono and Meloy (2012) observation that psychopaths “remain prisoners of the present, unable to project into the future and foresee the consequences of their actions, and lacking a capacity to reflect upon the past in any meaningful way” (p. 49). Furthermore, not all criminal psychopaths are violent and incarcerated criminals; some are unethical and predatory business associates (Walsh & Hemmens, 2008). Psychopathic behavior is a social problem that cannot be ignored especially its link to white-collar offenders (Bromberg, 1948).

A question that often arises is if there is an absence of or blunted emotions, lack of conscience and empathy coupled with the inability to form attachments to others, what replaces these human qualities? According to psychologist Dr. Liane Leedom, the inability to have emotions is replaced by the motivation for dominance, control or power; to them, having power over another is the pleasure (Leedom, 2006). For those psychopaths who view homicide as an acceptable and ultimate solution to controlling others, Dr. Leedom’s views are accurate considering that homicide is the ultimate control over another person. Another way to think about what replaces these human qualities is to consider, psychologist, Dr. Martha Stout’s assessment when she states that life, in essence, is reduced to a contest and human beings are nothing more than game pieces to be moved about, used as shields or destroyed—it’s about winning to satisfy an intrapsychic need (Stout, 2005).

Thus it is not surprising that psychopathic offenders search for vulnerability in other people to exploit (Hakkanen-Nyhom & Nyholm, 2012) supporting psychology professor, Dr. Robert Rieber statement “[F]or psychopaths, power can be experienced only in the context of victimization: If they are to be strong, someone else must pay. There is no such thing, in the psychopathic universe, as merely the weak; whoever is weak is also a sucker, that is, someone who demands to be exploited” (Rieber, 1997, p. 47). Psychopaths have a strong need for psychological and/or physical control to reinforce their authority especially if there are perceived threats by others (Martens, 2003). Psychopathy is one of the strongest predictors of aggression and violence and the distinct psychopathic traits of lack of empathy and lack of remorse are the best indicators of aggression especially in unprovoked aggression (Reidy, Zeichner, & Martinez, 2008a). Expanding on Martens (2003), research has shed light on the fact that the narcissistic sub-dimension of psychopathy is linked to the probability that a psychopath will resort to violence (Cale & Lilienfeld, 2006) to protect their self-image (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2009).

While several experts in the field allude to the idea of psychopathy and its influence on white-collar criminality, empirical research is sparse (Lesha & Lesha, 2012) as is research on the behavioral profile of these offenders (Ragatz et al., 2010) even though individuals of professional status who would be in a position to commit
white-collar crime do exhibit psychopathic traits (Mullins-Sweat et al., 2010). Although psychopathy has become a highly researched personality disorder predicting criminal behavior, “there is little understanding as yet how psychopathy contributes causally and under what circumstances” to criminal behavior in general (Skeem et al., 2011, p. 126). There appears to be anecdotal evidence of a relationship between the personality traits of psychopathy when they combine with criminal thinking patterns creating a negative synergy increasing the risk of white-collar criminal behavior (Perri, 2013). However, its application to white-collar criminality cannot simply be based on anecdotal evidence of an expression of psychopathy (Smith & Lilienfeld, 2012). Researchers suggest that some psychopaths are more capable of engaging in white-collar crime because their executive and cognitive abilities allow them to not act impulsively and instead focus in a conscientious manner (Glenn & Raine, 2009) while rarely relying on violence due to their intelligence (Herve & Yuille, 2007).

Ray and Jones (2011) examined the relationship between psychopathy and attitudes towards white-collar crime. They found self-centeredness that entails blaming others for their own mistakes, manipulative behaviors and a disregard for norms together with cold-heartedness that were positively associated with white-collar criminal attitudes and intentions to commit white-collar crime. Research also reveals traits reflecting egocentricity, manipulation, exploitation, and a Machiavellian attitude where the means justify the ends regardless of the criminal nature (Ray, 2007). Psychopathic white-collar offenders high in conscientiousness prefer planned rather than spontaneous behavior effectively regulating their impulses by keeping their behavior in check to prevent detection. This observation is interesting in that it parallels red-collar violence reflecting an overwhelming instrumental act and not an impulsive reaction. Ragatz and colleagues (2012) found that white-collar offenders had lower scores on lifestyle criminality but scored higher on some measures of psychopathic traits compared with non-white-collar offenders while white-collar versatile who committed white and non-white offenses were more predatory, planned, and instrumental manner as contrasted to non-psychopathic homicidal offenders by roughly a two to one margin (Woodworth & Porter, 2002, 2007). It has been theorized that the absence of emotion actually assists them in planning the homicide because they can, with coolness, think through a plan as opposed to reacting impulsively where emotions dictate one’s violent outburst that is contemporaneous with the provocation (Cleckley, 1976; Meloy, 2002). Psychopathic offenders are more apt to view murder as a means to an end (Porter & Woodworth, 2006), not an unpleasant act (Snowden et al., 2004), where the “end” may be the pleasure gained from the violent act itself (Warren, 2009) coupled with the fact that they do not see a difference from other instrumental actions simply because violence is involved (Porter & Woodworth, 2006). Psychopathic homicidal offenders are more likely to claim that their actions were reactive and not instrumental (Porter & Woodworth, 2007).

Psychopaths’ do not display a state of heightened emotional arousal at the time of the murder as contrasted to non-psychopaths whose murders exhibited an emotional discharge such as jealousy, rage or a heated argument during the offense (Porter & Woodworth, 2007). The rage displayed by a psychopath, in the context of instrumental violence, should not be confused with emotion displayed rage. Psychopathic rage represents a dispassionate expression of their devaluation of others where murder is a viable solution to satisfy their motives (Perri, 2011a). However their dispassion should not be interpreted to mean that they might not experience gratification, a smug satisfaction from their violence due to their belief that they have fulfilled their motive through dominance and control (Murphy & Vess, 2003; Perri & Lichtenwald, 2010). Furthermore, their rage may be invisible to an observer because it is disguised as silence or feigned indifference, however the thinking behind the placid, stoic exterior may be shockingly sadistic retaliating at a time least expected and in a manner totally unanticipated (Samenow, 1984).

What is confusing and may appear contradictory is how can psychopathic violence be instrumental when part of the psychopathic construct is that they are impulsive? Psychopathic impulsivity can have multiple definitions explaining the confusion (Hart & Dempster, 1997). For example, psychopathic impulsivity can refer to a tendency to commit harmful acts without planning or general “lifestyle impulsivity” that may reflect parasitic behaviors, irresponsible dispositions and lack of goals. Another reference is “impulsive aggression” referring to a tendency to perceive environmental stimuli as threatening and responding in an aggressive manner. The tendency toward impulsive aggression may reflect the fact that psychopaths see hostile intent in the action of others and are quick to react with a “preemptive strike” toward others be it family or non-family members (Hart & Dempster, 1997, p. 223).
Although psychopathic impulsivity can mean “unpremeditated”, “acting before thinking” or the “spur of the moment” behavior, one should not extrapolate this to mean that somehow psychopathic aggression is random, lacking in reflection, risk assessment or planning when acting without fully considering the consequences may reflect opportunistic behavior—ready to exploit a situation for immediate gratification. Clinician experience assessing psychopathic homicidal offenders supports the view that their violence can be methodical and strategic (Hanlon, 2010). The result is an individual who “appears impulsive, rash, irrational, and/or reactive to an observer although in reality, his or her plan came about in a calm, methodical, and instrumental fashion” (Herve & Yuille, 2007, p. 434). So what is meant by psychopathic impulsivity and what is its link to instrumental and reactive violence?

At the moment research debates still exist as to whether psychopathy is more related to instrumental violence and the exact reasons for this association is not entirely clear despite numerous attempts to refine the link because they also engage in reactive violence (Blais, Solodukhin, & Forth, 2014). Perhaps as Porter and Woodworth (2002) state some psychopaths exhibit “selective impulsivity” in that the more serious the type of violence they engage in, the more psychopaths are willing to take an instrumental rather than a reactive approach to a homicide and when convenient exhibit reactive violence (p. 443). More research is also revealing that psychopathy comes in different variations producing different expressions of the psychopathic construct due to how the impulsivity factor is manifested (Skeem et al., 2011). Thus, “there may be subtypes of psychopathic offenders who engage in more instrumental and severe violence than others” (Laurell, Belfrage, & Hellstrom, 2014, p. 292).

For example, some psychopaths are considered more impulsive, interpersonally hostile, anxious, aggressive, and more apt to engage in reactive violence while other psychopaths exhibit less anxiety, greater traits of emotional detachment, narcissism, and more instrumental in their violence where their goal is to control and dominate (Skeem et al., 2007, p. 406). Some researchers posit that psychopaths are “impulsively instrumental”—that is, that they commit goal-directed violence with little planning or forethought” producing a flawed risk assessment (Hart & Dempster, 1997, p. 226). In other words, how psychopaths engage in risk assessment may be different from non-psychopaths for various reasons. For example, psychopaths tend to be more immune to the thought of punishment as deterrence to engaging in crime as opposed to a non-psychopath who may experience fearfulness/anxiety at the thought of actually engaging in a criminal act and subsequently refrain from acting upon impulses (Skeem et al., 2011). In addition, narcissistic immunity may distort their risk assessment because their grandiosity produces the belief that they are above apprehension due to their superior planning skills (Perri & Lichtenwald, 2008b). This observation makes sense in that if white-collar offenders are capable of successfully engaging in fraud schemes, then it is plausible that their narcissist grandiosity would lead them to believe they are capable of superimposing their fraud scheme skills to successfully plan a homicide.

3.7 The Christopher Porco Case

During the early morning hours of November 15, 2004, Christopher Porco, then 21 years old, entered his family home and brutally murdered his father, Peter Porco, and attempted to murder his mother, Joan Porco, with an ax while they were sleeping. Prior to the homicide, Christopher fraudulently obtained loans in the thousands of dollars using his parent’s relevant personal and tax information (Lyons, 2006a) while accumulating thousands of dollars of debt from lavish spending and internet gambling (McNiff & Cuomo, 2006). The parents eventually confronted Christopher on his fraudulent behavior and threatened to go to the authorities to take action against him (McNiff & Cuomo, 2006). Within two weeks from the time the father warned his son, Christopher executed his plan to neutralize the threat. Behavioral data yielded warning signs of Christopher’s psychopathic qualities by leaving a trail of deceitful behavior such as falsifying college grades (Karlin, 2006), staging burglaries from his parents’ home (Lyons, 2006a), breaking into his former employer’s place of work stealing equipment (Lyons, 2006b) and lying to friends about a fictitious inheritance from his grandmother worth millions.

Several psychologists familiar with the case stated that Christopher fits the profile of a psychopath focusing on a continued pattern of lying and deceitful behavior. As psychologist Dr. Wulfert Edelgard stated, “There’s an overlap between psychopathic and narcissistic tendencies… He (Christopher) believes that the rules do not apply to him and he has a need to show off in front of people” (Grondahl, 2006, para. 23). Moreover, post-offense behavior is an important indicator of whether psychopathic traits are present because these offenders are less distraught and immobilized with fear (Hakkanen-Nyholm & Hare, 2009). For example, Christopher displayed no grief during the interview with detectives within hours of the homicide (Perri, 2011a). Additionally during a hospital visit, Christopher stated, “I saw her…I burst into tears. I fell on the floor right there” (Bell, 2007, para. 2). Yet a colleague who went to the hospital claimed to be “struck by Porco’s odd behavior because he did not seem to exhibit any grief” (Bell, 2007, para. 2). Psychopathic offenders engage in impression management by
attempting to read a situation to determine the appropriate emotional response others want to hear to enhance their credibility to outsiders (Hakkanen-Nyholm & Hare, 2009).

3.8 Comparison of the Christopher Porco and Eric Hanson Profile

Comparing the Porco and Hanson homicide cases for profile similarities and dissimilarities displayed in Table 2 raises some questions. For example, what can be a plausible explanation for why these red-collar offenders decided to kill their mothers even when they tried to help their sons? Consider the previously mentioned research that even in the absence of provocation, the narcissistic aspect of red-collar offenders illustrates aggression against innocent individuals viewed as potential threats, resorting to intense aggressive acts to satisfy their sense of entitlement. In addition, their controlling, psychopathic nature may predispose them to seeing hostile intent in the action of others resorting to a preemptive strike toward family members (Hart & Dempster, 1997). In these cases, their mothers too represented potential witnesses to their fraud schemes and to the murders of their husbands, thus, in cold blood, they needed to be eliminated as potential witnesses. These offenders display the criminal thinking trait of power orientation exemplifying the need to exert control over a person that appears to be interfering with an offender’s goal which is the perpetuation of fraud (Walters, 2002, p. 57).

Table 2. Offender profile trait comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Trait</th>
<th>Christopher Porco</th>
<th>Eric Hanson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial traits</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopathic traits</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissistic traits</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reckless financial lifestyle</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parasitic lifestyle</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of murder (Late Night)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder location (Parent’s Home)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of wounds (Head)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Violence</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-murder family violence</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior criminal record</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder of sibling</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple murder locations</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child lives with parents</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testify at Trial</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother murdered</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Red-Collar Crime and the Female Offender

Common and legitimate explanations used to rationalize homicides committed by females include killing because of a mental illness, coercion, abuse, or self-defense (Follingstad et al., 1989; Vronsky, 2007). However, women have been perceived to be capable of committing only reactive or “expressive” violence—an uncontrollable release of pent-up rage or fear—and that they murder unwillingly and without premeditation. Many in the social and behavioral sciences communities were unwilling to accept that women could be intentionally violent (Beckner, 2005). However, as for their criminal inclinations, “Women hurt others. They abuse, kill, inflict harm on the human spirit, and dominate others through pain and intimidation...Violence is not limited to men (Jack, 1999, p. 11)” Nancy Siegel, for example, murdered her fiancé by strangulation to prevent the detection of her fraud schemes against him (Siegel, 2008). It is interesting to compare the Robert Petrick case mentioned above to the Siegel case in that both were courting future partners for marriage while planning the murder of their current spouse or fiancé.
4.1 Female Behavioral Traits

Women exhibit anti-social behaviors (Dolan & Vollm, 2009) coupled with personality disorders (Warren & South, 2006) suggesting that they serve as red-collar crime risk factors (Perri & Lichtenwald, 2010). Psychopathy, for example, is displayed by both genders Cleckley (1976), although psychopathy has been studied in reference to men more than to women (Skeem et al., 2011). According to Dr. Robert Hare, there are many clinical accounts of female psychopaths, but relatively little empirical research (Carozza, 2008). Reasons for the neglect of research on female psychopathy include the persistence of rigid sex role stereotypes in society and the diagnosis of personality disorders is, to a large extent, influenced by sex role expectations (Widom, 1978; Brown, 1996). Female offenders diagnosed with narcissistic personality disorder (Warren et al., 2002) and psychopathy engaged in violence, homicide and white-collar crimes (Warren & South, 2006; McKee, 2006).

The available evidence suggests that male and female psychopaths share similar interpersonal and affective features, including egocentricity, deceptiveness, shallow emotions, and lack of empathy (Carozza, 2008), resorting to brutal violence including the use of instrumental violence and engaging in fraud (Wynn, Hoiseth, & Pettersen, 2012). Violence is a solution that is available to them as other forms to control someone such as deceit, manipulation, and charming someone. Female psychopaths were comparable to psychopathic males in terms of irresponsible lifestyles (Rogers, Jordan, & Harrison, 2007), higher unemployment rates and relationship instability (Salekin et al., 1998) more promiscuous behavior (Grann, 2000) and relying on manipulation to achieve goals (Nicholls & Petrila, 2005). Regardless of gender, they do not value traditional social norms, close relationships, can be vengeful, physically violent, and victimize others for personal gain (O’Connor, 2002).

Homicide and psychopathy have been linked to female offenders (Hicks, Vaidyanathan, & Patrick, 2010; Weizmann-Henelius, Viemero, & Eronen, 2003). Consider white-collar criminal turned serial killer, Velma Barfield, who poisoned her fraud victims because she believed they would detect and disclose her fraud (Barfield, 1983). Harvard professor and forensic clinical psychologist, Dr. Ellsworth Fersch, concluded that Barfield was a psychopathic criminal, exhibiting manipulation skills, antisocial behavior, coupled with no remorse (Fersch, 2006).

4.2 The Sante Kimes Case

After the victim, David Kazdin, detected that his colleague Sante Kimes committed mortgage fraud in which she obtained a $280,000 loan in his name, he began receiving threatening telephone calls from Sante demanding that he cooperate with the fraud scheme. Sante’s son, Kenny Kimes, indicated that his mother was concerned about Kazdin’s detection of the fraud scheme with Sante stating “we’re going to have to kill him” (Grace, 2004, para. 7). Kenny went to Kazdin’s home and shot him in the back of the head. In other homicide cases, Kenny testified that he and his mother drugged and killed a 55-year-old male banker by holding his head under water in a bathtub (AP, 2004). Sante and Kenny were also convicted of murdering 80-year-old Irene Silverman with the motive of fraudulently obtaining her residence, with the sentencing judge stating, “It is clear that Ms. Kimes has spent virtually all her life plotting and scheming, exploiting, manipulating and preying upon the vulnerable and the gullible at every opportunity” (King, 2002, p. 279).

Forensic psychologist Dr. Arthur Weider stated that Sante displayed psychopathic personality features with “no guilt, conscience, remorse or empathy,” adding that Sante was “socially charming, arrogant, full of herself [and] egocentric coupled with a superiority complex” (King, 2002, p. 266). Psychiatrist Dr. William O’Gorman “found Sante to have poor insight and impulsive” and lacking in reflective judgement (King, 2002, p. 252). Despite the extraordinary amount of planning that Sante engaged in, she left behind incriminating evidence perhaps reflecting the “impulsive instrumentality” previously mentioned. For example, Sante maintained voluminous notes of her criminal plans, coupled with maintaining evidence of the crime scene that prompted the sentencing judge to state that Sante “grossly over estimated her own cleverness” coupled with “the staggering stupidity of a criminal keeping a detailed to-do list” (King, 2002, p. 279): comments reflective of previously mentioned narcissistic immunity.

5. Red-Collar Crime and Murder-For-Hire

Murder-for-hire appeals to some red-collar criminals because of the belief, albeit erroneous, that it offers an airtight alibi for the person who takes out the contract, known as the solicitor, at the time of the killing. Contracts to kill begins in the mind of the solicitor who experiences some insurmountable problem that can best be solved by having someone else kill the target. The killing is referred to as a “hit” and the person being killed is referred to as the “target”. According to Professor James Black, Most solicitors do not see themselves as killers, “they want to get rid of a problem and go on with their lives...[T]hey see themselves protecting a way of life or restoring a way of life” by avoiding personal responsibility (Piper, 1999, para. 8). While murder-for-hire may
appear to outsiders to be an impulsive act, they are the product of considerable reflection and planning (Black & Cravens, 2000). In addition, the one that commits the homicide comes in different skill levels: some are professional and others may be classified as amateurish (Schlesinger, 2001). Moreover, international red-collar cases reflect murder-for-hire schemes (Perri & Lichtenwald, 2008b).

5.1 The Irwin Margolies Case

Executive Irwin Margolies was found guilty for the deaths of his controller, Margaret Barbera and her co-worker Jenny Chin (Raab, 1983b). According to Margaret, Irwin generated invoices that were fictitious to create the appearance of revenue in order to get advance payments from the fictitious invoices from a financing company with the fraudulently obtained advance payments laundered to foreign countries (Raab, 1982a). Margaret agreed to testify against Margolies in a fraud inquiry involving the company (Raab, 1982b). According to the prosecutor, Irwin conceived the scheme to have Margaret and Jenny killed in order to silence witnesses who were disclosing his fraud crimes (Raab, 1983a). Irwin wanted Margaret killed first because she had the records that showed the fraud he committed (Chambers, 1984b). Irwin’s attorney paid Donald Nash $2,000 to kill Margaret (Chambers, 1984a). Prior to the murder Nash stalked the federal witness for four months to learn her daily routine (Perri & Lichtenwald, 2008b).

5.2 The Fredric Tokars Case

Attorney Fredric Tokars was found guilty of murdering his wife, Sara Tokars, in a murder-for-hire scheme because Sara discovered documents revealing his involvement in money laundering and tax evasion activities stating that she “knows too much… I’m going to have to have her taken care of” (McDonald, 1998, p. 176). Fredric contracted with his associate, Ed Lawrence, to have his wife killed for $25,000 (McDonald, 1998), however Mr. Lawrence sub-contracted the killing to a third party for $5,000 (McDonald, 1993). Lawrence did mention to Fredric that his two boys would be without a mother and Fredric’s response was, “They’ll be all right… They’re young, they’ll get over it” (McDonald, 1998, p. 178). While in prison and in reference to Tokars, the psychiatrist stated, “Regarding his personality structure it seems apparent that he has been dealt many narcissistic blows. He has a long history of manipulating and coercing people. He did not talk of his crimes at all and he does not seem to have any remorse for his crimes” (Tokars, 2008, para. 17).

6. Red-Collar Crime and Workplace Violence

Workplace violence is any physical assault, threatening behavior or verbal abuse occurring at or outside the workplace and it does include homicide, one of the leading causes of job-related deaths (Perri & Brody, 2011). Typical examples of employment situations that may pose higher risks for violence include duties that involve mobile workplace assignments, working alone and working with volatile persons (Perri, 2011b). Although there are workplace risks, biases of what white-collar criminals are capable of in terms of aggression may cloud one’s judgment by not incorporating those risks factors when performing professional duties.

6.1 The Michael Howell Case

State insurance auditor Sallie Rohrbach was killed by insurance agency owner Michael Howell (Perri & Brody, 2011; Lowe, 2009) because Sallie detected evidence of his insurance fraud (Boudin, 2009; Wright, 2009). According to Howell’s wife, Howell became aggressive with Sallie as she questioned him about his finances eventually striking her with a computer stand while she was at his agency (Wright, 2009). One colleague stated, “[W]e just don’t expect our people in the field to be put in this kind of danger” (Boudin, 2008, para. 17). Ms. Rohrbach’s husband indicated that it was his belief Howell “snapped” and did not plan to murder Sallie (APA, 2008, para. 7). Burton and Stewart (2008) debunk the idea that a person just snaps and commits workplace homicide; they are planned in advance targeting specific individual(s).

7. Attempt Red-Collar Crime

Attempt murder is the incomplete, unsuccessful act of killing someone. The cases listed in Table 3 are reflective of attempt red-collar crime. Interestingly, these cases also reflect murder-for-hire schemes displaying planned, instrumental violence. In the Paul Kruse case, after an employee disclosed the securities fraud to the Federal Bureau of Investigations (FBI), Kruse hired hitmen to murder the former employee to prevent her from testifying for the government (USDOJ, 2013) while Paul’s brother who was an accomplice committed suicide prior to the resolution of the case. Consider there may be times when an individual commits suicide due to the fact that their fraud was discovered; however, such an act does not constitute red-collar crime because suicide is not considered a crime. Caution warrants that for investigative purposes a perceived suicide may reflect a red-collar crime given a homicide can be staged to look suicidal (Geberth, 2013).
Table 3. Attempt red-collar crime cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offender Name</th>
<th>Type of Fraud</th>
<th>Murder for Hire</th>
<th>Type of Violence</th>
<th>Case Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randy Novak</td>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Jones (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Martinez</td>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>USDOJ (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Kruse</td>
<td>Securities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>USDOJ (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bunchan</td>
<td>Securities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Saltzman (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Hand</td>
<td>Mortgage</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Rudolf (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Flowers</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>USDOJ (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sompang Khamsomphou</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>USDOJ (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Porco</td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Perri et al. (2008a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1 The Randy Novak Case

In 2008, Randy Novak was found guilty of attempt murder of an IRS agent (Smith, 2008). The prosecution argued that Novak’s motive for the murder revolved around the fact that he feared that the agent would disclose the tax fraud and money laundering schemes (Geary, 2009) coupled with not paying taxes for several years (Pera & Geary, 2008). Evidence consisted of recorded conversations between Novak and an undercover FBI agent posing as a hit man (Jones, 2008). Nowak paid him $10,000 to kill the agent (Jones, 2008) plus another $10,000 to burn down the local IRS office so that any documents linked his fraud would be destroyed (Geary, 2009).

8. Conclusion

For many decades misperceptions prevailed about the white-collar offender profile based on projection bias due to the fact that academia failed to devote some of its energies into understanding this offender class to produce a more refined and accurate behavioral profile of white-collar offenders in general and specifically to research those that display violent tendencies. As we have observed, red-collar criminals are not an anomaly to ignore, harboring anti-social and behavioral traits no differently than homicides that occur with street-level homicide offenders. As indicated at the beginning of this article, scholars from diverse disciplines devoting some of their time and resources would greatly assist in refining our understanding of this lethal, understudied offender group.

References


76


Hanlon, R. (2010, October, 19). *Correspondence and interview with Dr. Robert Hanlon*.


Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/).