



A page from the 1693 second edition of Cotton Mather's account of the Salem Witch Trials, titled, with the charming verbosity of the age: *The Wonders of the Invisible World: Being an Account of the TRYALS of Several Witches Lately Executed in NEW-ENGLAND And of several Remarkable Curiosities therein Occurring.*

“Certainly a Man May Quibble For His Life”: Public Execution and Capital Punishment in Massachusetts

BRIAN J. RIZZO



Abstract: *The following article offers an overview of Massachusetts’ unique experience with the death penalty from the colonial period to the present. Despite its present ban, the Bay State executed criminals for capital crimes for much of its history. Initially reflecting the Puritan desire to enforce social order and religious conformity, Massachusetts authorities used the death penalty well into the twentieth century with considerable public support. As Dr. Rizzo shows, however, the state has also been the site of a vigorous, internal debate over the morality and efficacy of the death penalty, ultimately producing some of its most articulate critics. Examining the state’s experience with capital punishment in light of national trends, this review provides readers with a unique perspective on Massachusetts place in the larger debate. Dr. Brian J. Rizzo teaches criminal justice at Westfield State University.*

* * * * *

“Massachusetts once killed twenty witches in one year. The advance of reason has made us thoroughly ashamed of this spectacle and it is one of the historic facts about which we do not boast.”¹

— John Quincy Adams, 1846

“We in the General Court ... have an opportunity to correct an historical injustice which has besmirched the reputation and standing of Massachusetts in the eyes of the entire world.”²

— Alexander Cella, 1959

According to Edwin Powers, “the legal history of capital punishment in Massachusetts is both dramatic and highly controversial.”³ The Salem witch trials of 1692-1693 that resulted in the executions of 20 members of the Massachusetts Bay Colony certainly provided drama. The single case that provided the most controversy involved two defendants, Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, who were convicted of first-degree murder in 1921 and executed six years later.

Both cases blighted the Massachusetts justice system at the time. In the former case, the Massachusetts Bay Colony ultimately released more than 200 people accused of witchcraft. It admitted that the trials were a mistake and compensated the families of those convicted.⁴ The Sacco and Vanzetti case resulted in a 1959 hearing before the Joint Judiciary Committee of the Massachusetts legislature that convened to address a resolution to the governor to grant both men a posthumous pardon.

Those who believe in their innocence allege that anti-immigrant and anti-communist fervor contributed to the indictments and convictions and the case continues to be a topic of debate.⁵ On August 23, 1977, the fiftieth anniversary of their execution, Governor Michael S. Dukakis proclaimed “that any stigma and disgrace should be forever removed from the names of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti and from the names of their families and descendents.”⁶ Those who believe that justice requires a full pardon for both men continue to fight to clear their names. [Editor’s note: For reviews of recent books on the Sacco and Vanzetti case, see pages 178–182 in this issue.]

ARGUMENTS AND TRENDS

Whether it has centered around Salem witches, Italian immigrants, blacks, or any other dispossessed group, the capital punishment debate has historically focused attention on the constitutional issues of “cruel and unusual punishment,” “due process of law,” and “equal protection.” The result has been a robust and sometimes highly contentious contest of ideas.

Amnesty International sums up the argument for both sides of the death penalty debate. The retentionist argument for the continued use of the death penalty is based on three general points: death is the only fitting and adequate punishment for some crimes, the death penalty is a deterrent, and the death penalty protects society. The main arguments for the abolition of the death penalty include the notion that it is irreversible, that its deterrent effect is inconclusive, and that execution is cruel and unusual punishment.⁷

Nationally, four trends in the use of capital punishment have been identified: a dramatic reduction in the number and types of crimes punishable by death, the attempt to reduce the cruelty of executions by replacing one execution technology with another (seemingly more humane) technology, the attempt by policy-makers to ensure that death sentences are imposed fairly and rationally, and the transition of executions from a public spectacle to a private event.⁸ These four trends are evidenced in Massachusetts.

THE DEATH PENALTY’S EARLY HISTORY

Capital punishment in Massachusetts has a long history. Settled in 1630, the Massachusetts Bay Colony was directly influenced by English law. Almost from its inception, however, Massachusetts sought new rights and procedures that addressed due process concerns in capital cases. For example, in 1648, the colony’s Laws and Liberties included a provision ensuring that a capital defendant had a right to an attorney. This was a significant innovation because, according to English criminal procedure, council at trial could represent only persons charged with a misdemeanor.⁹ The colony continued to distinguish itself from English law and from other English colonies by extending various other rights for capital defendants, including the indictment by a grand jury for capital defendants, the affording of the opportunity to read the indictment, the

accommodation to secure legal representation, and the ability to challenge jurors in capital cases.¹⁰

Early Massachusetts' authorities often used the death penalty to punish violent offenses against public order. The first execution in the Bay Colony, for example, was of John Billingham for the killing of his neighbor in 1630, ten years after the Mayflower landed. The first woman executed was Dorothy Talbye, who, in 1638, was convicted of the murder of her child.¹¹ The last woman executed in Massachusetts was Rachel Wall in 1789. She was hanged on Boston Commons for highway robbery along with her two male accomplices.¹²

The Puritan influence on the Bay Colony's legal culture, however, shaped its use of capital punishment in distinctive ways. In 1641, the General Court drafted its first capital law, which was drawn directly from the Bible. The offense involved the worship of false gods. This law made Native Americans, Quakers, and witches susceptible to public execution. Some Native Americans escaped execution through their conversion to Christianity, while recalcitrant members of the latter two groups were executed.

The Bay Colony's "The Capital Laws of New England," the earliest records of capital offenses, listed the following crimes subject to death: idolatry, witchcraft, blasphemy, murder, assault in sudden anger, sodomy, buggary, adultery, statutory rape, man stealing, perjury in a capital trial, and rebellion. These crimes bear a resemblance to the Biblical Ten Commandments, and the severe punishment meted out to offenders reflects the colony's desire to secure divine favor for its Bible-based Commonwealth.¹³

The religious and English legal influences on capital punishment in Massachusetts were still prevalent in 1732. That year, the first recorded use of the doctrine of benefit of clergy was successfully used in a murder trial. The doctrine traditionally was for crimes other than treason and murder that were punishable by death. The defendant was convicted of the lesser crime of manslaughter and sought and received the benefit of clergy. To receive this one time "pass," a defendant had to read or recite a verse from the Bible.¹⁴

But agreement over the use of capital punishment was elusive, even in the earliest history of the colony. Historian Alan Rogers has argued that by the 1640s Massachusetts was divided over due-process concerns. There was increasing conflict, he argues, between "magistrates who demanded a measure of discretionary authority and a faction within the colony who believed that an explicit code of laws should govern the courts."¹⁵

In a concession to these demands for uniform legal standards, the 1648 General Court ordered the legislature's code of laws printed and distributed throughout the colony.¹⁶ The result was a gradual decrease in the designation of crimes as capital offenses. When the Bay Colony's charter was vacated in 1684, for example, there were twenty-one mandatory capital crimes listed. But under the second charter (1691-1771), The Province of the Massachusetts Bay in New England whittled the list down to 14 capital crimes.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts (1780-Present) continued to restrict capital crimes, and, by 1852, the Commonwealth repealed or converted to life imprisonment all capital laws, except the law providing death for murder ("willful murder with malice aforethought").¹⁷ In 1858, the legislature voted to divide the crime of murder into two degrees. Only murder in the first degree carried the mandatory sentence of death. If jurors were ambivalent about sentencing a man to death they could find him guilty of the lesser charge of murder in the second degree.¹⁸ In 1984, the Supreme Judicial Court (SJC) declared Massachusetts' capital punishment law unconstitutional and all capital offenses were eliminated. Thus, the Commonwealth abolished the death penalty entirely and joined eleven other states. Today there are fifteen states that have abolished the death penalty.¹⁹

MORE RECENT TRENDS AND DEBATES

Debates over the idea of deterrence and the method of execution also have a history in Massachusetts. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, public executions were used as a deterrence and as a form of social control. Ironically, public executions clearly did not achieve a deterrent effect, as public hangings often became "occasions for sadistic celebrations where thieves and pickpockets joined the other onlookers in the merriment."²⁰ Sometime between 1835 and 1853, therefore, public executions in were ended.²¹

The predominant method of execution in Massachusetts had been hanging. In 1898, the state introduced death by electrocution, which was considered more humane; and three years later Massachusetts electrocuted its first victim. During the twentieth century, Massachusetts executed 65 individuals.²² The last executions took place in 1947 when Philip Bellino and Edward Gerston were found guilty and electrocuted "shortly after midnight" at the Massachusetts State Prison for the murder of Robert "Tex" Williams.²³

The use of the death penalty in Massachusetts during the twentieth century is well documented. During the 1960s, William Bugden, Ph.D., the Supervisor of Research at the Department of Correction, published a report that provided answers to frequently asked questions regarding convictions for first-degree murder in Massachusetts between January 1, 1900 and December 31, 1962.

The number of convictions for first-degree murder (1900-1962) was 118 (117 men, one woman). The number convicted of first-degree murder between 1900 and the last execution in 1947 was eighty-eight (eighty-seven men, 1 woman). Bugden also provides the following dispositions: sixty-five electrocutions, twenty commutations (nineteen men, one woman), and three other dispositions. Between 1947 and 1962, thirty men were convicted of murder in the first degree. Of these, the jury recommended that the sentence of death not be imposed; instead ten defendants received life sentences, seventeen defendants had their sentences commuted to



Sacco and Vanzetti

Nicola Sacco (right) and Bartolomeo Vanzetti (left), handcuffed, walk through a crowd before their murder trial in South Braintree, 1920.

life sentences, and the three remaining cases had unique dispositions (for example, one defendant committed suicide prior to electrocution).²⁴ Between 1962 and 1972, thirteen more defendants originally sentenced to death had their sentences commuted or reduced by executive action.²⁵

Massachusetts has, of course, been affected by a larger national debate over the death penalty. In June 2000, for example, a study entitled “A Broken System: Error Rates in Capital Cases” found “serious reversible error” in capital cases post-1973. In a well-publicized rebuttal to that study, noted criminologist James Q. Wilson denied that innocent people were being executed and offered what he believed was a counter argument, showing how well the courts have shielded those convicted of capital crimes. Of the 5,760 death sentences handed down by U.S. courts since 1973, Wilson notes that there have only been 313 executions.²⁶

Like other states, Massachusetts has had to accommodate the shifting winds of federal law on this controversial topic. The U.S. Supreme Court decided in *Furman v. Georgia* 408 US 153 (1972) that the use of capital punishment as practiced by the states violated the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution and constituted “cruel and unusual punishment.” But four years later, in the other capital punishment landmark decision, the US Supreme Court in *Griggs v. Georgia* 428 US 153 (1976) decided that the death penalty was not always cruel and unusual punishment and individual states re-wrote their capital punishment laws to conform to the Court’s decision.

Yet in the midst of the changing national debate, Massachusetts has remained among the states with the lowest rate of executions. Between 1930 and 2008, there were 4,995 executions nationally. In the era following the 1976 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Griggs*, there were 1,099 executions. Texas (720), Georgia (409), and New York (329) led the way between 1930 and 1977, while Texas (405), Virginia (98), and Oklahoma (86) claimed the most executions post-1977. Massachusetts, by comparison, was 30th since 1930 with 27 executions. After 1977, Massachusetts was 1 of 15 states with zero executions. Eight states (Wisconsin, Rhode Island, North Dakota, Minnesota, Michigan, Maine, Hawaii, and Alaska) had zero executions pre- and post-1977.²⁷

PUBLIC OPINION AND THE DEATH PENALTY

The Department of Justice tracks attitudes toward many criminal justice issues including capital punishment. Between 1986 and 2006, when respondents were asked to choose between two punishments for

murder, the death penalty or an alternative sentence, there was a national decline toward the death penalty of 9% (56% to 47%). However, this trend was not direct because some years the support for the death penalty increased for murder before declining again. For example, 1997 recorded the highest percentage (61%) in favor of the death penalty. For the entire 20-year period, more persons chose the death penalty as the appropriate punishment in every year except 2006 where more respondents chose life-imprisonment (48% to 47%). A third category included responses “don’t know/refused” and showed respondents were most ambivalent in 1994 when 18% chose this response.²⁸

Yet the construction of survey questions often reveals contradictory responses. For example, between 1953 and 2009 a trend supporting the death penalty was observed. The survey question involved posed the death penalty for someone convicted of murder. In 1994, respondents overwhelmingly (80%) answered in the affirmative. By comparison, in 1986 only 42% answered “yes” and is the only year that the response not in favor of the death penalty was greater than that in favor (42% to 47%). Again, a third category “don’t know/refuse” was offered and the largest percentage recorded was in 1957 (18%).²⁹ One may draw the conclusion from these results that Americans appear to be opposed to capital punishment in theory, but are in favor of the practice when someone has been convicted of murder. This internal struggle can be one reason why historically there have been those who advocated for the retention of the death penalty, and those who fought for the abolition of capital punishment.

The Bay State has provided some of the most ardent opponents of capital punishment in American history, and its citizens have made important contributions to the ongoing debate. In the 1830s and 1840s, reformers opposed to the death penalty became more vocal in their drive to abolish capital punishment. A driving force to abolish capital punishment in Massachusetts was Democratic Party leader Robert Rantoul, Jr., who introduced an anti-death penalty bill in the State House of Representatives in 1834. Ultimately the bill was defeated but Rantoul’s ideas were taken up by other reformers and in 1845, the Massachusetts Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment was founded.³⁰ Another prominent Massachusetts reformer was Sara Erhmann, who headed the Massachusetts Council Against the Death Penalty (MCADP), which was founded in 1928 and is now the Massachusetts Citizens Against the Death Penalty (MCADP).³¹ The MCADP is the oldest death penalty abolition organization in the country.³²

In 1951, with the urging of the MCADP, the Massachusetts legislature passed the mercy law which stipulated that anyone found guilty of murder in the first degree “shall suffer the punishment of death, unless the jury shall by their verdict, and as part thereof, upon and after consideration of all evidence, recommend that the sentence of death be not imposed.”³³ The mercy law provided a way out for jurors who believed the defendant deserved to be punished but were uncomfortable with sentencing a person to death.

But Massachusetts’ voters have also lent support to the use of capital punishment, supporting referenda to retain the death penalty in both 1968 and 1982. When voters in 1968 were asked “Shall the Commonwealth of Massachusetts retain capital punishment for crime?” — 1,159,348 answered in favor, while 730,649 were against with 458,008 not answering.³⁴ Reflecting this public support, the Massachusetts legislature passed a death penalty bill in 1979 and, in 1982, 60% of Massachusetts voters approved a referendum question restoring capital punishment.³⁵ Although both acts were declared unconstitutional by the Massachusetts’ Supreme Judicial Court in 1984³⁶, the Massachusetts legislature fell just one vote shy of re-instituting the death penalty in 1997.³⁷

In the ensuing years, however, the legislature has voted against reinstating the death penalty 80 to 73 (1999), 92 to 60 (2001), and ninety-nine to fifty-three (2005). Most recently, the state legislature has taken a dramatic turn toward strengthening its opposition toward restoration of the death penalty when it voted 110 to forty-six against reinstating capital punishment.³⁸

CONCLUSION

The title of this article quotes the 1807 Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court decision in *Commonwealth v Hardy 2 Mass.* 303. The full quotation — “if ever quibbling is at any time justifiable, certainly a man may quibble for his life” — was penned by Chief Justice Theophilus Parsons. The ruling involved the Court’s procedural error in the case that denied defendant Hardy of a fair trial. Justice Parsons ruled in favor of the defendant’s motion and set aside the guilty verdict. At his second trial, Hardy was acquitted.³⁹ Justice Parsons succinctly stressed why capital punishment is unique. Alan Rogers, who has written the definitive work on the history of the death penalty in Massachusetts, states, “For most of its history Massachusetts executed men and women convicted of murder,

but reform and abolitionism often competed for cultural, political, and legal dominance.⁴⁰

Neither the nation's debate over capital punishment nor its counterpart in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is over. Even though Massachusetts is one of a minority of states without the death penalty, abolitionist groups remain ever vigilant. Historical events can change public opinion. A case involving the heinous and brutal murder of a child, or the cold-blooded execution of a Boston police officer, may ignite public fervor and sway legislators to enact a bill in favor of restoring the death penalty. Although the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court declared the death penalty unconstitutional in 1975 and 1984, the last three elected Republican governors of the Commonwealth (1991-2007) have endorsed re-instating the death penalty only to be rebuffed by the state legislature.⁴¹

In *The Ride: A Shocking Murder and Bereaved Father's Journey From Rage to Redemption*, journalist Brian MacQuarrie recounts the story of Bob Curley's transformation from death penalty advocate to outspoken abolitionist.⁴² In 1997, Curley's 10-year-old son, Jeffrey, was abducted from a Cambridge neighborhood by two men. The boy was suffocated, his corpse sexually abused and stuffed in a cement-filled container, duct-taped closed, and thrown off a bridge. This crime almost led to the restoration of capital punishment to Massachusetts. At the time, Curley wanted justice, and he believed the only way to get it was to have the case tried in Federal Court where the death penalty could be imposed upon a conviction.⁴³ Although he doesn't forgive his son's killers, Curley has since changed his mind about capital punishment. He said, "As time moves along . . . you can take a step back and you can look at the death penalty for what it is, and that's basically what happened to me."⁴⁴

Regardless of where one lives, whether it is a pro- or anti-death penalty state, in the end one's opinion on the death penalty comes down to a personal choice. As with Bob Curley, it is possible to change one's mind. As one of only 15 states without the death penalty, Massachusetts citizens continue to grapple with the moral and constitutional issues surrounding its use: "cruel and unusual punishment," "due process," and "equal protection." In doing so, the Commonwealth continues its historic legacy.

Notes

¹ John Quincy Adams in an 1846 letter to the Massachusetts Society for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. This organization, begun in 1845, was the predominant organization advocating the abolition of capital punishment until the Massachusetts Council for the Abolition of the Death Penalty (MCADP) was founded in 1928. Letter was referenced in the organization's 1928 pamphlet titled "Abolish the Death Penalty" found in the Arthur A. Esterbrook papers Special Collections/Archives, University at Albany, State University of New York.

² Alexander J. Cella wrote the foreword to the report, *Hearing before Joint Judiciary Committee of the Massachusetts Legislature on the Sacco-Vanzetti Case 1959*. The report was prepared by Tom O'Connor, Secretary, Committee for the Vindication of Sacco and Vanzetti, 1959.

³ Edwin Powers, "The Legal History of Capital Punishment in Massachusetts." *Federal Probation*, 45 no. 3 (1981): p. 15.

⁴ Jess Blumberg, "A Brief History of the Salem Witch Trials: One Town's Strange Journey from Paranoia to Pardon," *Smithsonian.com*, October 24, 2007.

⁵ Cella, p. 6.

⁶ Lawrence A. Lowell (1856-1943) Papers concerning the Sacco and Vanzetti case, Houghton Library, Harvard College Library. Found on-line: <http://oasis.lib.harvard.edu/oasis/deliver/~hou01789>.

⁷ Amnesty International. *The Death Penalty: Amnesty International Report* (London: Amnesty International Publications, 1979): p. 3.

⁸ Mark Costanzo, and L. T. White, "An Overview of the Death Penalty and Capital Trials: History, Current Status, Legal Procedures and Cost." *Journal of Social Sciences* 50 no. 2 (1994): pp. 1-18.

⁹ Alan Rogers, *Murder and the Death Penalty in Massachusetts* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2008): p. 3.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹² *Ibid.* p. 52.

¹³ Robert H. Loeb, *Crime and Capital Punishment* (Franklin Watts: New York, 1978): p. 25.

¹⁴ Rogers, pp. 22-23.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* p. 9.

¹⁷ Powers. pp. 15-16.

¹⁸ Rogers, p. 112.

¹⁹ The following states have abolished the death penalty: Michigan (1846), Wisconsin (1853), Maine (1887), Minnesota (1911), Hawaii (1948), Alaska (1957), Vermont (1964), Iowa (1965), West Virginia (1965), North Dakota (1973), Rhode Island (1984), Massachusetts (1984), New York (2007), New Jersey (2007), and

New Mexico (2009). New Mexico has two inmates on death row. <http://www.deathpenaltyinfo.org/states-with-and-without-death-penalty>. Accessed Aug. 24, 2010.

²⁰ Loeb, p. 14.

²¹ Powers, p. 16; Rogers, p. 93; Michael Reggio, *History of the Death Penalty*. www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/execution/read. In *Murder and the Death Penalty in Massachusetts*, historian Alan Rogers states: “The public execution ritual at the center of capital punishment for more than two hundred years was dropped quietly in 1835.” Michael Reggio in *History of the Death Penalty* cites 1835 as the year Massachusetts “enacted laws providing private hangings.” Edwin Powers, in “The Legal History of Capital Punishment in Massachusetts” gives 1853 as the year “public hangings were banished forever in Massachusetts.”

²² Rogers, p. 330.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 330.

²⁴ William Bugden, “An analysis of convictions of murder in the first degree in Massachusetts from January 1, 1900-December 31, 1962.” Massachusetts Department of Correction. Publication no. 312 Found on-line http://www.mass.gov/Eeops/docs/doc/research_reports/eval_3.pdf. Accessed August 4, 2010.

²⁵ Kathleen J. Burns, “Chronicle of the Death Penalty, Part Two of Two,” *Lawyers Journal* (Massachusetts Bar Association: Boston, 1999).

²⁶ James Q. Wilson, “What Death-Penalty Errors?” *New York Times*, July 10, 2000. p. A19.

²⁷ Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, accessed on-line at <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/pdf/t6842008.pdf> through Lloyd Sealy Library, John Jay College, City University of New York. Accessed Aug. 4, 2010.

²⁸ Respondents were asked, “If you could choose between the following two approaches, which do you think is the better penalty for murder — the death penalty or life imprisonment, with absolutely no possibility for parole?” Sourcebook <http://www.albany.edu/sourcebook/pdf/t2492006.pdf>. Accessed Aug. 4, 2010.

²⁹ Respondents were asked, “Are you in favor of the death penalty for a person convicted of murder?” *Ibid.*

³⁰ Rogers, pp. 80-81.

³¹ *Ibid.* p. 332.

³² <http://www.mcadp.org/about.html> August 6, 2010 The organization’s website calls itself Massachusetts Citizens Against the Death Penalty (MCADP). However, historian Alan Rogers refers to the organization founded in 1928 as Massachusetts Council Against the Death Penalty (MCADP) in *Murder and the Death Penalty in Massachusetts*.

³³ Rogers, p. 354.

³⁴ *Ibid.* p. 375.

³⁵ *Ibid.* p. 394.

³⁶ John H. Culver, "Capital Punishment Politics and Policies in the States, 1977-1997," *Crime, Law and Social Change* 32, no. 4 (1999): p. 287.

³⁷ "Massachusetts: Death Penalty Foes Appeal to Lawmakers," *Corrections Digest* 32, no. 8 (Feb 23, 2001): p. 6.

³⁸ Death Penalty Information Center. <http://deathpenaltyinfo.org/legislative-activity-massachusetts>. Accessed Aug. 18, 2010.

³⁹ *Commonwealth v. Hardy*, 2 Mass. 303 <http://www.lexisnexis.com.ez.lib.jjay.cuny.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>?. The Lexis source quotation begins, "If even quibbling" while Rogers' p. 72 quotes the following: "If ever quibbling is at any time justifiable," Parsons wrote, "certainly a man may quibble for his life." Rogers cited *Commonwealth v. Hardy*, 2 Mass. at pp. 315-316.

⁴⁰ Rogers, p. 405-406.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* Massachusetts Republican Governors: William Weld (1991-1997), Paul Cellucci (1997-2001), Mitt Romney (2003-2007). Republican Jane Swift served as interim governor (2001-2003) when Paul Cellucci stepped down to become U.S. Ambassador to Canada.

⁴¹ Chuck Leddy, "A Grieving Father's Journey to Soul-Searching," *Boston Globe* Jun 15, 2009: p. G8.

⁴² Judith Gaines and Jason Pring, "Mourning in Cambridge." *Boston Globe*. Oct. 6, 1997. p. A1.

⁴³ Deborah Becker, "A Grieving Father's Journey From Death Penalty Advocate to Opponent." Jun 29, 2009. Found <http://www.wbur.org/2009/06/23/the-ride>. Accessed Aug. 24, 2010.